CONCORDIA LIBRARY
BRONXVILLE, N. Y.

The Catholic Encyclopedia

VOLUME THREE

Brow—Clancy

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

AN INTERNATIONAL WORK OF REFERENCE ON THE CONSTITUTION, DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE AND HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

EDITED BY
CHARLES G. HERBERMANN, PH.D., LL.D.
EDWARD A. PACE, PH.D., D.D. CONDÉ B. PALLEN, PH.D., LL.D.
THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D. JOHN J. WYNNE, S.J.
ASSISTED BY NUMEROUS COLLABORATORS

IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES
VOLUME III

REF
BX
841
C3
1913
v.3
3796

GONZAGA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
SPOKANE, WASH.

New York
ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY

Nihil Obstat

REMY LAFORT

CENSOR

Imprimatur

✠ JOHN M. FARLEY

ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK

Copyright, 1908

BY ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY

The articles in this work have been written specially for The Catholic Encyclopedia and are protected by copyright. All rights, including the right of translation and reproduction, are reserved.

List of Contributors to the Third Volume

ABRAHAM, LADISLAUS, LL.D., Member of the Academy of Science at Krakow, Professor of Canon Law, Royal University, Lemberg, Galicia, Austria.

AIKEN, CHARLES F., S.T.D., Professor of Apologetics, Catholic University of America, Washington.

ALLARIA, ANTHONY, C.R.L., S.T.D., Lector of Philosophy and Theology, Abbot of San Teodoro, Genoa.

ALOYSIO, Mother MARY, Academy of the Holy Family, Baltic, Connecticut.

ALSTON, G. CYPRIAN, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England.

AMADO, RAMON RUIZ, S.J., LL.D., Ph.L., Madrid.

ARENDZEN, J. P., Ph.D., S.T.D., B.A., Professor of Holy Scripture, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England.

AUCLAIR, ELIE J., B.A., S.T.D., J.C.D., Professor, Laval University, Montreal.

AVELING, FRANCIS, S.T.D., Westminster, London.

BALESTRI, GIUSEPPE, O.S.A., Professor Emeritus of Sacred Scripture, College of St. Monica, Rome.

BANDELIER, AD. F., Hispanic Society of America, New York.

BARRET, T. B., S.J., Professor of Moral Theology, Woodstock College, Maryland.

BARRY, WILLIAM, Canon, S.T.D., Leamington, England.

BATTANDIER, ALBERT, S.T.D., J.C.D., Rome.

BAUMGARTEN, Rt. Rev. Mgr. PAUL MARIA, J.U.D., S.T.D., Domestic Prelate, Rome.

BECHTEL, F., S.J., Professor of Hebrew and Sacred Scripture, St. Louis University, St. Louis.

BENIGNI, U., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Pont. Collegio Urbano di Propaganda, Rome.

BERTRIN, GEORGES, Litt.D., Fellow of the University, Professor of French Literature, Institut Catholique, Paris.

BESSON, JULES, S.J., Professor of Canon Law, University of Toulouse, Director, "Nouvelle Revue Théologique" of Tournai, Toulouse, France.

BIRKHAEUSER, J. A., Racine, Wisconsin.

BIRT, HENRY NORBERT, O.S.B., London.

BOOTHMAN, C. T., Kingstown, Ireland.

BOUDINHON, AUGUST MARIE, D.D., D.C.L., Director, "Canoniste Contemporain", Professor of Canon Law, Institut Catholique, Paris.

BOURSCHEIDT, PETER J., Secretary of Central Verein (1899–1907), Member of Executive Board, Peoria, Illinois.

BROCK, H. M., S.J., Professor of Physics, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts.

BROSNAHAN, TIMOTHY, S.J., Professor of Psychology and Ethics, Woodstock College, Maryland.

BROWNSON, HENRY FRANCIS, LL.D., Detroit, Michigan.

BURKE, EDMUND, A.B., Instructor in Latin, College of the City of New York.

BURTON, EDWIN, S.T.D., F.R. Hist. S., St. Edmund's College, Ware, England.

BURTSELL, R. L., Ph.D., S.T.D., Rondout, New York.

BUTIN, R., S.M., S.T.L., Ph.D., Marist College, Washington.

BUTLER, RICHARD URBAN, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England.

CAMM, BEDE, O.S.B., B.A. (Oxon.), Birmingham, England.

CAMPBELL, T. J., S.J., Associate Editor, "The Messenger", New York.

CAPES, FLORENCE MARY, London.

CHAPMAN, JOHN, O.S.B., B.A. (Oxon.), Prior of St. Thomas's Abbey, Erdington, Birmingham, England.

CHATTE, P. M., Cape Haitien.

CLEARY, HENRY W., Editor, "New Zealand Tablet", Dunedin, New Zealand.

CONCORDIA LIBRARY
BRONXVILLE, N. Y.

CLUGNET, JOSEPH LEON TIBURCE, Litt. Lic., Paris.

COLEMAN, CARYL, B.A., Pelham Manor, New York.

CONNOLLY, GEORGE A., A.M., LL.B., San Francisco.

CORBETT, JOHN, S.J., Professor of Holy Scripture, Woodstock College, Maryland.

CORDIER, HENRI, Chinese Mandarin of the Third Class, Professor, School for Oriental Living Languages, Paris.

CROWNE, J. VINCENT, A.M., Ph.D., Instructor in English, College of the City of New York.

CURRAN, JOHN JOSEPH, B.C.L., LL.D., Judge of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec.

CUTHBERT, Father, O.S.F.C., Hassocks, Sussex, England.

D'ALTON, E. A., M.R.I.A., Athenry, Ireland.

DELAMARRE, LOUIS N., Ph.D., Instructor in French, College of the City of New York.

DELANEY, JOSEPH F., New York.

DELAUNOIT, LEOPOLD, S.J., Fiscal Advocate of the Diocese of Calcutta.

DERRY, GEORGE HERMAN, S.J., Professor of Latin, Greek and Comparative Literature, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Massachusetts.

DE SMEDT, CH., S.J., Brussels.

DESMOND, HUMPHRY J., A.B., A.M., Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

DE WAAL, Mgr. ANTON WLADIMIR, Domestic Prelate and Prothonotary Apostolic, Rector of the Campo Santo Tedesco, Rome.

DIETERICH, KARL, Ph.D., Leipzig-Conewitz, Germany.

DINNEEN, MICHAEL FRANCIS, S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore.

DIONNE, N. E., S.B., M.D., Librarian to the Legislature of Quebec.

DONOHUE, THOMAS A., S.T.D., M.R., Buffalo.

DONOVAN, STEPHEN M., O.F.M., Franciscan Monastery, Washington.

DOUGHERTY, Mother MARY CECILIA, Superior General, St. Joseph's Convent of Mt. Carmel, Dubuque, Iowa.

DOUGHTY, ARTHUR, C.M.G., F.R.S.C., M.A., Litt.D., Dominion Archivist, Ottawa.

DRISCOLL, JAMES F., President of St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York.

DRISCOLL, JOHN THOMAS, A.M., S.T.L., Fonda, New York.

DUBRAY, C. A., S.T.B., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Marist College, Washington.

DUFFY, DANIEL P., S.S., A.M., S.T.L., J.C.L., Professor of Holy Scripture, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore.

DUFFY, JAMES A., Cheyenne, Wyoming.

DUFFY, P. L., S.T.D., LL.D., Auditor of the Diocesan Curia, Charleston, South Carolina.

DUNFORD, DAVID, Diocesan Inspector of Schools, Hoddesdon, Herts, England.

DUNN, JOSEPH, Ph.D., Professor of Celtic Languages and Literature, Catholic University of America, Washington.

DUNPHY, Sister MARY AMBROSE, Mt. St. Vincent on the Hudson, Yonkers, New York.

EGAN, ANDREW, O.F.M., Professor of Theology, The Friary, Forest Gate, London.

ELLIOTT, WALTER, C.S.P., Professor, Apostolic Mission House, Washington.

ENGELHARDT, ZEPHYRIN, O.F.M., Watsonville, California.

FANNING, WILLIAM H. W., S.J., Professor of Church History and Canon Law, St. Louis University, St. Louis.

FENLON, JOHN F., S.S., S.T.D., President of St. Austin's College, Brookland, D. C., Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore.

FISCHER-COLBRIE, AUGUST, S.T.D., Bishop of Kaschau, Member of Magnates' House, Kaschau, Hungary.

FORD, JEREMIAH, D.M., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Smith Professor of the French and Spanish Languages, Harvard University.

FORTESCUE, ADRIAN, Ph.D., S.T.D., London.

FOURNET, PIERRE AUGUSTE, S.S., Professor of Belles-Lettres, Collège de Montréal.

FOX, WILLIAM, B.S., M.E., Associate Professor of Physics, College of the City of New York.

FUENTES, VENTURA, A.B., M.D., Instructor, College of the City of New York.

GANS, LEO, J.C.D., Professor of Canon Law, The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.

GARDNER, EDMUND GARRATT, M.A. (Cambridge), London.

GERARD, JOHN, S.J., F.L.S., London.

GERLAND, ERNST, Homburg-vor-der-Höhe, Germany.

GIETMANN, GERARD, S.J., Teacher of Classical Languages and Æsthetics, St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland.

GIGOT, FRANCIS E., S.T.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York.

GILDAS, M., O.C.R., La Trappe, Quebec.

GILLET, LOUIS, Paris.

GILLIAT-SMITH, FREDERICK ERNEST, Bruges.

GLANCEY, MICHAEL C., Canon of Birmingham, England.

GOYAU, GEORGES, Associate Editor, "Revue de Deux Mondes", Paris.

GRAS, JOSEPH, S.J., Caughnawaga, P. Q.

GRATTAN-FLOOD, W. H., Mus. D., K.S.G., M.R.I.A., Rosemount, Enniscorthy, Ireland.

GREANEY, JOHN J., A.B., S.T.L., Pittsburg, Pennsylvania.

GUINEY, LOUISE IMOGEN, Oxford, England.

GULDNER, B., S.J., St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia.

HAGERTY, JAMES EDWARD, Ph.D., Professor of Economics and Sociology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

HANDLEY, M. L., Madison, New Jersey.

HARTIG, OTTO, Assistant Librarian of the Royal and City Library, Munich.

HASSETT, MAURICE M., S.T.D., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

HEALY, PATRICK J., S.T.D., Assistant Professor of Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington.

HENDRICK, THOMAS A., S.T.D., Bishop of Cebú, Philippine Islands.

HENRY, H. T., Litt.D., Rector of Roman Catholic High School for Boys, Professor of English Literature and of Gregorian Chant, St. Charles's Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania.

HERNANDEZ, PABLO, S.J., Colegio del Salvador, Buenos Aires.

HILGENREINER, KARL, S.T.D., Ph.D., Imperial Royal Professor of the University of Prague.

HILGERS, JOSEPH, S.J., Luxemburg.

HINOJOSA, EDUARDO de, Member of the Spanish Academy, Professor of History, University of Madrid.

HOGAN, STANISLAUS, O.P., S.T.L., L.C.L., St. Lawrence's Priory, Adelaide, Australia.

HOLLAND, CORNELIUS JOSEPH, S.T.L., Providence, Rhode Island.

HOLWECK, FREDERICK G., St. Louis.

HOWLETT, J. A., O.S.B., M.A., Suffolk, England.

HUARD, V. A., Archbishop's Palace, Quebec.

HUNT, LEIGH, Professor of Art, College of the City of New York.

HUNTER-BLAIR, D. O., Bart., O.S.B., M.A., Oxford, England.

JAILLET, C., Corpus Christi, Texas.

JENNER, HENRY, F.S.A., Assistant Librarian, British Museum, London.

JERON, OTTO, O.M.Cap., Mt. Calvary, Wisconsin.

JOYCE, GEORGE HEYWARD, S.J., M.A. (Oxon.), Professor of Logic, Stonyhurst College, Blackburn, England.

KAVANAGH, DENNIS J., S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland.

KEATING, JOSEPH, S.J., London.

KELLY, LEO A., Ph.B., Rochester, New York.

KEOGH, WILLIAM FFRENCH, O.S.C., St. Mary's, Bayswater, London.

KIRSCH, Mgr. J. P., Professor of Patrology and Christian Archæology, University of Fribourg, Switzerland.

KURTH, GODEFROI, Director, Belgian Historical Institute, Liège.

LABOURT, JEROME, S.T.D., Litt.D., Member of the Asiatic Society of Paris.

LEJAY, PAUL, Fellow of the University of France, Professor, Institut Catholique, Paris.

LENHART, JOHN M., O.M.Cap., Lector of Philosophy, St. Fidelis Monastery, Victoria, Kansas.

LE ROY, ALEXANDER A., C.SS.P., Bishop of Alinda, Superior General of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, Paris.

LINDSAY, LIONEL ST. G., B.Sc., Ph.D., Editor in Chief, "La Nouvelle France", Quebec.

LINS, JOSEPH, Freiburg, Germany.

LOPEZ, TIRSO, O.S.A., Colegio de los Agostinos, Valladolid, Spain.

LOUGHLIN, Mgr. JAMES F., S.T.D., Philadelphia.

LUZIO, SALVATORE, S.T.D., Ph.D., J.U.D., Professor of Canon Law, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Dublin.

MAAS, A. J., S.J., Rector of Woodstock College, Maryland.

MacCAFFREY, JAMES, S.T.L., St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Dublin.

MacMILLAN, JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, Cardigan Bridge, Prince Edward Island, Canada.

MACPHERSON, EWAN, New York.

MAHER, MICHAEL, S.J., Litt.D., M.A. (London University), Director of Studies and Professor of Pedagogics, St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst, Blackburn, England.

MAKIL, Rt. Rev. Mgr. MATTHEW, S.T.D., Vicar Apostolic, Changanachery, India.

MANN, HORACE K., Headmaster, St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England.

MARCILLA, LOPEZ, Alberto, Campeche, Mexico.

MARTINDALE, CYRIL C., S.J., B.A. (Oxon.), Professor of Classics, Manresa House, Roehampton, London.

MATRE, ANTHONY, Supreme Secretary, Catholic Knights of America; National Secretary, American Federation of Catholic Societies; Associate Editor, "The Teacher and Organist", St. Louis.

McKENNA, CHARLES F., Ph.D. (Columbia), Secretary, Catholic Home Bureau, Vice-President, New York State Probation Commission, New York.

McMAHON, ARTHUR L., O.P., Lector of Sacred Theology, Professor of Moral Theology and Sacred Scripture, Dominican House of Studies, Washington.

McNICHOLAS, JOHN T., O.P., S.T.L., Lector, Immac. Conception College, Washington.

MEEHAN, THOMAS F., New York.

MEIER, T. GABRIEL, O.S.B., Librarian of the Monastery of Einsiedeln, Switzerland.

MELODY, JOHN WEBSTER, A.M., S.T.D., Associate Professor of Moral Theology, Catholic University of America, Washington.

MERSHMAN, FRANCIS, O.S.B., S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology, Canon Law, and Liturgy, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota.

MING, JOHN J., S.J., Professor of Ethics, Sacred Heart College, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

MOELLER, CH., Professor of General History, University of Louvain.

MONTES de OCA y OBREGON, JOSE MARIA IGNACIO, S.T.D., LL.D., Bishop of San Luis Potosi, Administrator Apostolic of Tamaulipas, Domestic Prelate to His Holiness and Assistant at the Pontifical Throne. Knight Grand Cross of the Holy Sepulchre, Knight of Isabella the Catholic, Knight Commander of Charles the Third, Member of the Madrid Academy of Languages and History, San Luis Potosi, Mexico.

MOONEY, JAMES, Ethnologist, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington.

MOREIRA, M. DE, A.M., Litt.D., New York.

MORICE, A. G., O.M.I., Kamloops City, British Columbia.

MORRISROE, PATRICK, Dean and Professor of Liturgy, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Dublin.

MOUGEL, AMBROSE, O. Cart., Charterhouse of St. Hugh, Parkminster, England.

MUELLER, ULRICH F., C.PP.S., Professor of Philosophy, St. Charles Borromeo Seminary of the Congregation of the Precious Blood, Carthagena, Ohio.

MURPHY, JOHN F. X., S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland.

MYERS, EDWARD, M. A. (Cambridge), Professor of Dogmatic Theology and of Patrology, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England.

NOLAN, PATRICK, O.S.B., Erdington Abbey, Birmingham, England.

O'BRIEN, MATTHEW PATRICK, Ph.D., Mt. St. Mary's Seminary of the West, Cedar Point, Ohio.

O'DANIEL, VICTOR F., O.P., S.T.L., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Dominican House of Studies, Washington.

O'DONOGHUE, D. J., Dublin.

OESTREICH, THOMAS, O.S.B., Professor of Church History and Sacred Scripture, Maryhelp Abbey, Belmont, North Carolina.

O'KANE, MICHAEL M., O.P., Ph.D., S.T.L., Limerick, Ireland.

O'LEARY, LOUIS JAMES, S.T.D., J.C.D., Chancellor of the Diocese, Chatham, N. B.

O'NEIL, LEO F., A.B., S.T.L., Boston.

ORBAN, ALEXIS J. T., S.T.D., A.M., Sulpician Convent, Frascati, near Rome.

OROZCO Y JIMENEZ, FRANCISCO, S.T.D., Bishop of Chiapas, Mexico.

OTT, MICHAEL, O.S.B., Ph.D., Professor of the History of Philosophy, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota.

OTTEN, JOSEPH, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania.

PETERSON, JOHN B., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Liturgy, St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Massachusetts.

PETIT, L., A.A., Constantinople.

PETRIDES, S., A.A., Constantinople.

PHILEMON, Brother, Provincial Superior of the Brothers of Charity, Longue-Pointe, Canada.

POOLE, THOMAS H., New York.

POWER, ALICE, R.S.H., Convent of the Sacred Heart, Kenwood, Albany, New York.

RANDOLPH, BARTHOLOMEW, C.M., A.M., Teacher of Philosophy and Church History, St. John's College, Brooklyn, New York.

REID, GEORGE JOSEPH, S.T.L., Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.

REILLY, THOMAS A'KEMPIS, O.P., Berlin.

REILLY, W. S., S.T.D., S.S., Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Massachusetts.

REMY, ARTHUR F. J., A.M., Ph.D., Adjunct-Professor of Germanic Philology, Columbia University, New York.

RICKABY, JOHN, S.J., Professor of Ethics, St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst, Blackburn, England.

ROBINSON, PASCHAL, O.F.M., Professor of Theology, Franciscan Monastery, Washington.

ROMPEL, JOSEF HEINRICH, S.J., Ph.D., Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria.

ROONEY, JOHN JEROME, A.B., A.M., New York.

ROY, J. EDMOND, Litt.D., F.R.S.C., Officer of the French Academy, Director, "Notarial Review", Lévis, Quebec.

RUDGE, F. M., M.A., Youngstown, Ohio.

RUFFIN, FRANCES GILDART, St. Joseph's Academy, Emmitsburg, Maryland.

RYAN, J. A., S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology, The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.

RYAN, JAMES J., J.C.B. (Lovan.), President and Professor of Church History, St. Patrick's College, Thurles, Ireland.

RYAN, MICHAEL JAMES, Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of Logic and of the History of Philosophy, St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, New York.

RYAN, PATRICK, S.J., London.

SAGMULLER, JOHANNES BAPTIST, Professor of Theology, University of Tübingen, Würtemberg, Germany.

SAMPAYO, THOMAS EDWARD de, K.C., Barrister at Law (Middle Temple, London), LL.B (Cambridge), Colombo, Ceylon.

SAN GIOVANNI, EDOARDO, Litt.B., A.M., Instructor in the Latin Language and Literature, College of the City of New York.

SAUER, JOSEPH, S.T.D., Editor, "Rundschau", Professor of Theology, University of Freiburg, Germany.

SAXTON, E. F., Baltimore.

SCANNELL, T. B., S.T.D., Editor, "Catholic Dictionary", Folkestone, England.

SCHAEFER, FRANCIS J., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of Church History, The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.

SCHLAGER, HEINRICH PATRICIUS, Harreveld bei Lichtenvoorde, Holland.

SCHRANTZ, CHARLES B., S.S., A.M., Catholic University of America, Washington.

SCHULTE, AUGUSTIN JOSEPH, Professor of Liturgy, Latin and French, St. Charles's Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania.

SCHWERTNER, THOMAS M., O.P., Washington.

SHEBBEARE, WILFRID GEORGE ALPHEGE, Musical Director, Downside Abbey, Bath, England.

SIEGFRIED, FRANCIS PATRICK, Professor of Philosophy, St. Charles's Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania.

SLATER, T., S.J., St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, Wales.

SLATTERY, J. L., Manager, School of Industry, Irish Christian Brothers, St. John's, Newfoundland.

SLOANE, THOMAS O'CONOR, A.M., E.M., Ph.D., New York.

SMITH, WALTER GEORGE, A.M., LL.B. (University of Pennsylvania), Philadelphia.

SOLLIER, JOSEPH FRANCIS, S.M., S.T.D., Rector and Professor of Moral Theology, Marist College, Washington.

SOUVAY, CHARLES L., C.M., LL.B., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of Holy Scripture and Hebrew, Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis.

SPAHN, MARTIN, Ph.D., University of Strasburg, Germany.

SPILLANE, EDWARD P., S.J., Associate Editor, "The Messenger", New York.

STEELE, FRANCESCA M., Stroud, Gloucestershire, England.

TAAFFE, THOMAS GAFFNEY, Ph.D., Instructor in English Literature, College of the City of New York.

THURSTON, HERBERT, S.J., London.

TIERNEY, JOHN J., A.M., S.T.D., Professor of Scripture and Semitic Studies, Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland.

TOKE, LESLIE ALEXANDER ST. LAWRENCE, B.A., Stratton-on-the-Fosse, England.

TOURSCHER, FRANCIS E., O.S.A., Regent, St. Thomas's College, Villanova, Pennsylvania.

TRACY, JOSEPH VINCENT, S.T.D., Missionary Apostolic, Boston.

TURNER, WILLIAM, B.A., S.T.D., Professor of Logic and of the History of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, Washington.

URQUHART, FRANCIS FORTESCUE, M.A., Lecturer in Modern History, Balliol College, Oxford.

VAILHE, S., A.A., Constantinople.

VAN CLEEF, AUGUSTUS, New York.

VAN DER ESSEN, LEON, Litt.D., Ph.D., Collège du Pape, Louvain.

VAN HOVE, A., D.C.L., Professor of Church History and of Canon Law, University of Louvain.

VAN KASTEREN, JOHN P., S.J., Maastricht, Holland.

VOLZ, JOHN R., O.P., Washington.

WALDRON, AUGUSTINE, O.P., Professor of Theology, Immaculate Conception College, Washington.

WALSH, JOSEPH, M.D., A.M., President of the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, Assistant Medical Director of the Henry Phipps Institute.

WARD, Mgr. BERNARD, President of St. Edmund's College, Ware, England.

WARREN, KATE MARY, Lecturer in English Literature under University of London at Westfield College, Hampstead, London.

WEALE, JOHN CYRIL MARIE DES ANGES, Cambridge, England.

WEBER, N.A., S.M., S.T.D., Professor of Apologetics and Church History, Marist College, Washington.

WEBSTER, RAYMUND, O.S.B., M.A. (Oxon.), Downside Abbey, Bath, England.

WILHELM, J., S.T.D., Ph. D., Battle, Sussex, England.

WILLIAMSON, GEORGE CHARLES, Litt.D., London.

WITTMANN, PIUS, Ph.D., Reichsarchivrath, Munich.

WOODS, JOSEPH M., S.J., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Woodstock, Maryland.

ZIMMERMAN, B., O.D.C., St. Luke's Priory, Wincanton, Somerset, England.

Tables of Abbreviations

The following tables and notes are intended to guide readers of THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA in interpreting those abbreviations, signs, or technical phrases which, for economy of space, will be most frequently used in the work. For more general information see the article ABBREVIATIONS, ECCLESIASTICAL.

I.—GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS.

a. . . . article.
ad an. . . . at the year (Lat. *ad annum*).
an., ann. . . . the year, the years (Lat. *annus, anni*).
ap. . . . in (Lat. *apud*).
art. . . . article.
Assyr. . . . Assyrian.
A. S. . . . Anglo-Saxon.
A. V. . . . Authorized Version (i.e. tr. of the Bible authorized for use in the Anglican Church—the so-called "King James", *or* "Protestant" Bible.
b. . . . born.
Bk. . . . Book.
Bl. . . . Blessed.
C., c. . . . about (Lat. *circa*); canon; chapter; *compagnie*.
can. . . . canon.
cap. . . . chapter (Lat. *caput*—used only in Latin context).
cf. . . . compare (Lat. *confer*).
cod. . . . codex.
col. . . . column.
concl. . . . conclusion.
const., constit. . . . Lat. *constitutio*.
curâ. . . . by the industry of.
d. . . . died.
dict. . . . dictionary (Fr. *dictionnaire*).
disp. . . . Lat. *disputatio*.
diss. . . . Lat. *dissertatio*.
dist. . . . Lat. *distinctio*.
D. V. . . . Douay Version.
ed., edit. . . . edited, edition, editor.
Ep., Epp. . . . letter, letters (Lat. *epistola*).
Fr. . . . French.
gen. . . . genus.
Gr. . . . Greek.
H. E., Hist. Eccl. . Ecclesiastical History.
Heb., Hebr. . . . Hebrew.
ib., ibid. . . . in the same place (Lat. *ibidem*).
Id. . . . the same person, *or* author (Lat. *idem*).
inf. . . . below (Lat. *infra*).
It. . . . Italian.
l. c., loc. cit. . . . at the place quoted (Lat. *loco citato*).
Lat. . . . Latin.
lat. . . . latitude.
lib. . . . book (Lat. *liber*).
long. . . . longitude.
Mon. . . . Lat. *Monumenta*.
MS., MSS. . . . manuscript, manuscripts.
n., no. . . . number.
N. T. . . . New Testament.
Nat. . . . National.
Old Fr., O. Fr. . . . Old French.
op. cit. . . . in the work quoted (Lat. *opere citato*).
Ord. . . . Order.
O. T. . . . Old Testament.
p., pp. . . . page, pages, *or* (in Latin references) *pars* (part).
par. . . . paragraph.
passim. . . . in various places.
pt. . . . part.
Q. . . . Quarterly (a periodical), e.g. "Church Quarterly".
Q., QQ., quæst. . . . question, questions (Lat. *quæstio*).
q. v. . . . which [title] see (Lat. *quod vide*).
Rev. . . . Review (a periodical).
R. S. . . . Rolls Series.
R. V. . . . Revised Version.
S., SS. . . . Lat. *Sanctus, Sancti*, "Saint", "Saints"—used in this Encyclopedia only in Latin context.
Sept. . . . Septuagint.
Sess. . . . Session.
Skt. . . . Sanskrit.
Sp. . . . Spanish.
sq., sqq. . . . following page, *or* pages (Lat. *sequens*).
St., Sts. . . . Saint, Saints.
sup. . . . Above (Lat. *supra*).
s. v. . . . Under the corresponding title (Lat. *sub voce*).
tom. . . . volume (Lat. *tomus*).

tr. . . . . translation *or* translated. By itself it means "English translation", *or* "translated into English by". Where a translation is into any other language, the language is stated.
tr., tract. . . . . tractate.
v. . . . . see (Lat. *vide*).
Ven. . . . . Venerable.
Vol. . . . . Volume.

II.—Abbreviations of Titles.

Acta SS. . . . . *Acta Sanctorum* (Bollandists).
Ann. pont. cath. . . . . Battandier, *Annuaire pontifical catholique.*
Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath. Gillow, Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics.
Dict. Christ. Antiq. . . Smith and Cheetham (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.
Dict. Christ. Biog. . . Smith and Wace (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Biography.
Dict. d'arch. chrét. . . Cabrol (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie.*
Dict. de théol. cath. . Vacant and Mangenot (ed.), *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.*
Dict. Nat. Biog. . . . . Stephen (ed.), Dictionary of National Biography.
Hast., Dict. of the Bible . . . . . Hastings (ed.), A Dictionary of the Bible.
Kirchenlex. . . . . Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexicon.*
P. G. . . . . Migne (ed.), *Patres Græci.*
P. L. . . . . Migne (ed.), *Patres Latini.*
Vig., Dict. de la Bible. Vigouroux (ed.), *Dictionnaire de la Bible.*

Note I.—Large Roman numerals standing alone indicate volumes. Small Roman numerals standing alone indicate chapters. Arabic numerals standing alone indicate pages. In other cases the divisions are explicitly stated. Thus "Rashdall, Universities of Europe, I, ix" refers the reader to the ninth chapter of the first volume of that work; "I, p. ix" would indicate the ninth page of the preface of the same volume.

Note II.—Where St. Thomas (Aquinas) is cited without the name of any particular work the reference is always to "Summa Theologica" (not to "Summa Philosophiæ"). The divisions of the "Summa Theol." are indicated by a system which may best be understood by the following example: "I-II, Q. vi, a. 7, ad 2 um" refers the reader to the *seventh* article of the *sixth* question in the *first* part of the *second* part, in the response to the *second* objection.

Note III.—The abbreviations employed for the various books of the Bible are obvious. Ecclesiasticus is indicated by *Ecclus.*, to distinguish it from Ecclesiastes (*Eccles.*). It should also be noted that I and II Kings in D. V. correspond to I and II Samuel in A. V.; and I and II Par. to I and II Chronicles. Where, in the spelling of a proper name, there is a marked difference between the D. V. and the A. V., the form found in the latter is added, in parenthesis.

Full Page Illustrations in Volume III

	PAGE
Buffalo	38
Erythræan Sibyl—Michelangelo Buonarotti	60
Coronation of the Virgin—Burgkmaier	64
The Abbey of St. Edmund, before the Reformation	86
St. Sophia, Constantinople	94
California	174
California Missions	182
Camaldoli	206
Cambridge	214
Canada	234
Tomb of the Archduchess Maria Christina—Canova	298
The Cathedral, Canterbury	300
Presentation of Christ in the Temple—Carpaccio	372
The Rock of Cashel	402
Catacombs	426
Benvenuto Cellini	490
Cemetery	504
Sisters of Charity	606
Charlemagne Frescoes, Rathaus, Aachen	612
Charles V—Titian	626
Cathedral of Notre Dame, Chartres	634
Chasubles	638
Chicago	654
Cincinnati	774

Coloured Plates

Mosaic in the Narthex of St. Sophia	100
Bust of Christ in the Catacomb of Pontianus	420
Chalice of St. Gozlin; Chalice of St. Remi	562

Maps

Byzantine Empire	120
Canada	238
Empire of Charlemagne	616
South America	662
China and Korea	686

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

B

Brownson, ORESTES AUGUSTUS, philosopher, essayist, reviewer, b. at Stockbridge, Vermont, U. S. A., 16 September, 1803; d. at Detroit, Michigan, 17 April, 1876. His childhood was passed on a small farm with plain country people, honest and upright Congregationalists, who treated him with kindness and affection, taught him the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Assembly's Catechism; to be honest and industrious, truthful in all circumstances, and never to let the sun go down on his wrath. With no young companions, his fondness for reading grew rapidly, though he had access to few books, and those of a grave or religious nature. At the age of nineteen he had a fair knowledge of grammar and arithmetic and could translate Virgil's poetry. In October, 1822, he joined the Presbyterian Church, dreamed of becoming a missionary, but very soon felt repelled by Presbyterian discipline, and still more by the doctrines of unconditional election and reprobation, and that God foreordains the wicked to sin necessarily, that He may damn them justly. Rather than sacrifice his belief in justice and humanity on the altar of a religion confessedly of human origin and fallible in its teachings, Brownson rejected Calvinism for so-called liberal Christianity, and early in 1824, at the age of twenty, avowed himself a Universalist. In June, 1826, he was ordained, and from that time until near the end of 1829, he preached and wrote as a Universalist minister, calling himself a Christian; but at last denying all Divine revelation, the Divinity of Christ, and a future judgment, he abandoned the ministry and became associated with Robert Dale Owen and Fanny Wright in their war on marriage, property, and religion, carried on in the "Free Enquirer" of New York, of which Brownson, then at Auburn, became corresponding editor. At the same time he established a journal in western New York in the interest of the Workingmen's Party, which they wished to use for securing the adoption of their system of education. But, besides this motive, Brownson's sympathy was always with the labouring class, and he entered with ardour on the work of elevating labour, making it respected and as well rewarded in its manual or servile, as in its mercantile or liberal, phases, and the end he aimed at was moral and social amelioration and equality, rather than political. The introduction of large industries carried on by means of vast outlays of capital or credit had reduced operatives to the condition of virtual slavery; but Brownson soon became satisfied that the remedy was not to be secured by arraying labour against capital by a political organization, but by inducing all classes to co-operate in the efforts to procure the improvement of the workingman's condition. He found, too, that he could not advance a single step in this direction without religion. An unbeliever in Christianity, he embraced the religion of Humanity, severed his connexion with the Workingmen's Party and with "The Free Enquirer", and on the first Sunday in February, 1831, began preaching in Ithaca, New York, as an independent minister. As a Universalist, he had edited their organ, "The Gospel Advocate"; he now edited and published his own organ, "The Philanthropist".

Finding, from Dr. W. E. Channing's printed sermons, that Unitarians believed no more of Christianity than he did, he became associated with that denomination, and so remained for the next twelve years. In 1832 he was settled as pastor of the Unitarian Church at Walpole, New Hampshire; in 1834 he was installed pastor of the First Congregational Church at Canton, Massachusetts; and in 1836 he organized in Boston "The Society for Christian Union and Progress", to which he preached in the Old Masonic Temple, in Tremont Street. After conducting various periodicals, and contributing to others, the most important of which was "The Christian Examiner", he started a publication of his own called "The Boston Quarterly Review", the first number of which was dated January, 1838. Most of the articles of this review were written by him; but some were contributed by A. H. Everett, George Bancroft, George Ripley, A. Bronson Alcott, Sarah Margaret Fuller, Anne Charlotte Lynch, and other friends. Besides his articles on literary and philosophical subjects, his political essays in this review attracted attention throughout the country and brought him into close relations with the leaders of the Democratic Party. Although a steadfast Democrat, he disliked the name Democrat, and denounced pure democracy, called popular sovereignty, or the rule of the will of the majority, maintaining that government by the will, whether that of one man or that of many, was mere arbitrary government, and therefore tyranny, despotism, absolutism. Constitutions, if not too easily alterable, he thought a wholesome bridle on popular caprice, and he objected to legislation for the especial benefit of any individual or class; privileges, i. e. private laws; exemption of stockholders in corporations from liability for debts of their corporation; tariffs to enrich the moneyed class at the expense of mechanics, agriculturists, and members of the liberal professions. He demanded equality of rights, not that men should be all equal, but that all should be on the same footing, and no man should make himself taller by standing on another's shoulders.

In his "Review" for July, 1840, he carried the democratic principles to their extreme logical conclusions, and urged the abolition of Christianity; meaning, of course, the only Christianity he was acquainted with, if, indeed, it be Christianity; denounced the penal code, as bearing with peculiar severity on the poor, and the expense to the poor in civil cases; and, accepting the doctrine of Locke, Jefferson, Mirabeau, Portalis, Kent, and Blackstone, that the right to devise or bequeath property is based on statute,

not on natural, law, he objected to the testamentary and hereditary descent of property; and, what gave more offence than all the rest, he condemned the modern industrial system, especially the system of labour at wages. In all this he only carried out the doctrine of European Socialists and the Saint-Simonians. Democrats were horrified by the article; Whigs paraded it as what Democrats were aiming at; and Van Buren, who was a candidate for a second term as President, blamed it as the main cause of his defeat. The manner in which he was assailed aroused Brownson's indignation, and he defended his essay with vigour in the following number of his "Review", and silenced the clamours against him, more than regaining the ground he had lost, so that he never commanded more attention, or had a more promising career open before him, than when, in 1844, he turned his back on honours and popularity to become a Catholic. At the end of 1842 the "Boston Quarterly Review" was merged in the "U. S. Democratic Review", of New York, a monthly publication, to each number of which Brownson contributed, and in which he set forth the principles of "Synthetic Philosophy" and a series of essays on the "Origin and Constitution of Government", which more than twenty years later he rewrote and published with the title of "The American Republic". The doctrine of these essays provoked such repeated complaints from the editor of the "Democratic Review", that Brownson severed his connexion with that monthly and resumed the publication of his own review, changing the title from "Boston" to "Brownson's Quarterly Review". The first number was issued in January, 1844, and the last in October, 1875. From January, 1865, to October, 1872, he suspended its publication.

ORESTES AUGUSTUS BROWNSON

The printed works of Brownson, other than contributions to his own and other journals, from the commencement of his preaching to the establishment of this review consisted of his sermons, orations, and other public addresses; his "New Views of Christianity, Society, and the Church" (Boston, 1836), in which he objected to Protestantism that it is pure materialism, to Catholicism, that it is mere spiritualism, and exalts his "Church of the Future" as the synthesis of both; "Charles Elwood" (Boston, 1840), in which the infidel hero becomes a convert to what the author calls Christianity and makes as little removed as possible from bald deism; and "The Mediatorial Life of Jesus" (Boston, 1842), which is almost Catholic, and contains a doctrine of life which leads to the door of the Catholic Church. He soon after applied to the Bishop of Boston for admission, and in October, 1844, was received by the Coadjutor Bishop, John B. Fitzpatrick.

The Catholic body in the United States was at that time largely composed of men and women of the labouring class, who had emigrated from a country in which they and their forefathers had suffered centuries of persecution for the Faith, and had too long felt themselves a down-trodden people to be able to lift their countenances with the fearless independence of Americans; or, if they were better-to-do, feared to make their religion prominent and extended to those of other faiths the liberal treatment they hoped for in return. It was Brownson's first labour to change all this. He engaged at once in controversy with the organs of the various Protestant sects on one hand, and against liberalism, latitudinarianism, and political atheism of Catholics, on the other. The American people, prejudiced against Catholicity, and opposed to Catholics, were rendered more prejudiced and opposed by their tame and apologetic tone in setting forth and defending their Faith, and were delighted to find Catholics labouring to soften the severities and to throw off whatever appeared exclusive or rigorous in their doctrine. But Brownson resolved to stand erect; let his tone be firm and manly, his voice clear and distinct, his speech strong and decided. So well did he carry out this resolution, and so able and intrepid an advocate did he prove in defence of the Faith, that he merited a letter of approbation and encouragement from the Bishops of the United States assembled in Plenary Council at Baltimore, in May, 1849, and from Pope Pius IX, in April, 1854. In October, 1855, Brownson changed his residence to New York, and his "Review" was ever after published there—although, after 1857, he made his home in Elizabeth, New Jersey, till 1875, when he went to live in Detroit, where he died in the following April. A little over a year before moving to New York, he wrote, "The Spirit Rapper" (Boston, 1854), a book in the form of a novel and a biography, showing the connexion of spiritism with modern philanthropy, visionary reforms, socialism, revolutionism; with the aim of recalling the age to faith in the Gospel. His next book, written in New York, was "The Convert; or, Leaves from my Experience" (New York, 1857), tracing with fidelity his entire religious life down to his admission to the bosom of the Catholic Church.

Brownson had not been many years in New York before the influence of those Catholics with whom he mainly associated was perceptible in the tone of his writings, in the milder and almost conciliatory attitude towards those not of the Faith, which led many of his old admirers to fear he was becoming a "liberal Catholic". At the same time, the War of the Rebellion having broken out, he was most earnest in denouncing Secession and urging its suppression, and as a means to this, the abolition of slavery. This alienated all his Southern and many of his Northern supporters. Domestic affliction was added by the death of his two sons in the summer of 1864. In these circumstances, he felt unable to go on with his "Review", and in October of that year announced its discontinuance. But he did not sit idle. During the eight years that followed, he wrote "The American Republic; Its Constitution, Tendencies, and Destiny" (New York, 1865); leading articles in the New York "Tablet", continued till within a few months of his death; several series of articles in "The Ave Maria"; generally one or two articles a month in "The Catholic World"; and, instructed by the "Syllabus of Errors" condemned by Pope Pius IX, "Conversations on Liberalism and the Church" (New York, 1869), a small book which shows that if, for a short period of his Catholic life, he parleyed with Liberalism, he had too much horror of it to embrace it. In January, 1873, "Brownson's Quarterly Review" appeared again and regularly thereafter till the end of 1875. His last article was contributed to the "American Catholic Quarterly Review", for January, 1876. Brownson always disclaimed having originated any system of philosophy and acknowledged freely whatever he borrowed from others; but he had worked out and arrived at substantially the philosophy of his later writings before he ever

heard of Gioberti, from whom he obtained the formula *ens creat existentias*, which Gioberti expressed in the formula *ens creat existens*, to indicate the ideal or intelligible object of thought. By the analysis of thought he finds that it is composed of three inseparable elements, subject, object, and their relation, simultaneously given. Analysis of the object shows that it is likewise composed of three elements simultaneously given, the ideal, the empirical, and their relation. He distinguished the ideal intuition, in which the activity is in the object presenting or offering itself, and empirical intuition or cognition, in which the subject as well as the object acts. Ideal intuition presents the object, reflection takes it as represented sensibly; that is, in case of the ideal, as represented in language. Identifying ideas with the categories of the philosophers, he reduced them to these three: Being, Existences, and their Relations. The necessary is Being; the contingent, Existences; and their relation, the creative act of Being. Being is God, personal because He has intelligence and will. From Him, as First Cause, proceed the physical laws; and as Final Cause, the moral law, commanding to worship Him, naturally or supernaturally, in the way and manner He prescribes.

ORESTES A. BROWNSON, *The Convert* (New York, 1857); HENRY F. BROWNSON, *Brownson's Early, Middle, and Latter Life* (Detroit, 1898–1900); IDEM, ed., *Brownson's Works* (Detroit, 1883–87).

SARAH M., daughter of Orestes A. Brownson, b. at Chelsea, Massachusetts, 7 June, 1839; married William J. Tenney, of Elizabeth, New Jersey, 26 November, 1873; died at Elizabeth, 30 October, 1876. She wrote some literary criticisms for her father's "Review", and many articles, stories, and poems which appeared mainly in Catholic magazines. Her other works were: "Marian Elwood, or How Girls Live" (New York, 1863); "At Anchor; a story of the American Civil War" (New York, 1865); "Heremore Brandon; or the Fortunes of a Newsboy" (in "The Catholic World", 1869); and "Life of Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, Prince and Priest" (New York, 1873). Her novels are interesting, genuine, and original, and all that she published is stamped with her distinguishing traits of character, and shows that she thought for herself, expressed herself freely, with good sense and judgment, without undue bitterness, and with great benevolence towards the poor; and she scatters over her pages many excellent reflections. The life of Gallitzin is her principal production, for which she spared no pains to collect such materials as remained. She more than once visited the scenes of the missionary's labours, and formed the acquaintance of priests and others who had known him, collecting such facts and anecdotes of him as they remembered. It is a sincere and conscientious tribute to the rare virtues and worth of an extraordinary man, devoted priest, and humble missionary.

HENRY F. BROWNSON.

Brownsville, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF, erected 1874. Previous to this date the entire State of Texas was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Galveston. It was then divided into two dioceses: Galveston, comprising all that part of the State north and north-west of the Colorado River; San Antonio, comprising all the territory south of the Colorado River and north of the Nueces River, with the exception of Bee, San Patricio, Refugio, Goliad, and Aransas Counties and the Vicariate Apostolic of Brownsville comprising Cameron, Hidalgo, Starr, Zapata, and Webb Counties, bordering on the Rio Grande; Encinal, Duval, and Nueces, situated north of these counties; the part of La Salle, McMullen, and Live Oak, south of the Nueces River, and finally San Patricio, Bee, Refugio, Goliad, and Aransas Counties, north of the Nueces River, a territory comprising 22,391 square miles.

Its principal cities and towns are Laredo (Texas side), with 12,000 inhabitants; Brownsville, near the mouth of the Rio Grande, with 8,000; Corpus Christi, on the Corpus Christi Bay, with 7,000; San Diego, in Duval County, with 2,000; Alice, in Nueces County, with 1,000; Rockport, on Aransas Bay, with 1,000; Goliad and Refugio with about the same population; Beeville, in Bee County, with 2,000. There are other towns with less population, Skidmore in Bee County, Kingsville in Nueces County, Falfurrias, Benavides, Realitos, Hebbronville, Edinburgh, Hidalgo, Carrizo (or Zapata), Minas, Rio Grande City, each with a population of 1,500. The Catholic population is estimated at 79,000, mostly Mexicans; there are about 3,000 English-speaking Catholics. The total population is about 110,000.

This southern part of Texas was inhabited by Indians less than sixty years ago. Corpus Christi had for its first settler Capt. Kenny, who had a store several times visited by hostile Indians. Brownsville owes its beginning to Major Brown, who came there at the time of the Mexican War. The church there was begun in 1852. San Patricio and Refugio were settled by Irish colonists under the Mexican Government. La Bahia is the most ancient settlement; it was built by the Spaniards to oppose the encroachments of the French under La Salle. After La Bahia the oldest place is Laredo, built at the end of the eighteenth century. In 1866 there was not a fence nor a railroad to be seen from San Antonio to Brownsville; now the whole country is fenced in, and there are six railroad lines in operation.

The Oblate Fathers, whose missions extend from San Ignacio to the mouth of the Rio Grande, located in Texas in 1852, their first superior being Father Verdet. Within a week he was drowned in the Gulf on his way from Brownsville to New Orleans. The mission of Rio Grande City was begun in 1872, the one at Roma in 1864, the San Diego mission in 1866. Laredo was in charge of Mexican priests until Father Girandon came in 1855. San Patricio was under the care of Irish priests. Father O'Reilly built in 1856 the first Catholic church of Corpus Christi. Brownsville, Laredo, Corpus Christi, Refugio, and Beeville have large and well decorated churches. There are twelve churches with resident pastors: Brownsville, Rio Grande City, Roma, Laredo, San Diego, Corpus Christi, Rockport, Goliad, Refugio, Beeville, and San Patricio. There are also forty chapels where regular monthly services are held. The vicariate has two hospitals, one in Laredo, under the care of the Sisters of Mercy, and a new one in Corpus Christi, under the care of the Sisters of the Incarnate Word, of San Antonio.

There are four academies, namely, Brownsville, Corpus Christi, Laredo, and Rio Grande City, with about 60 boarders in all, and about 200 scholars. Besides, there are nine parochial schools, with about 500 pupils, under the care of 52 teaching sisters, assisted by 20 lay sisters. There are, in addition to these, 12 hospital sisters, and 6 engaged in teaching non-Catholic public schools. There is but one college (in Brownsville, under the care of the Oblate Fathers), with about 100 pupils.

The Reverend Dominic Manucy, then rector of St. Peter's church, Montgomery, Alabama, was appointed first Vicar Apostolic of Brownsville, and consecrated Titular Bishop of Dulma, 8 December, 1878. He was born 20 December, 1823, and ordained priest, at Mobile, 15 August, 1850. He took possession at Brownsville, 11 February, 1875 and remained there until he was transferred to the Diocese of Mobile upon the death of Bishop Quinlan, 9 March, 1883. He resigned the See of Mobile the following year and was reappointed to Brownsville, with the Titular

See of Maronia. He died at Mobile, 4 December, 1885. Bishop Neraz of San Antonio, Texas, was then appointed administrator of Brownsville, and directed its affairs until 1890, when the Rev. Pedro Verdaguer, pastor of the church of Our Lady of Angels, Los Angeles, California, was appointed to Brownsville by a Brief, dated 3 July. He was consecrated 9 November, 1890, at Barcelona, Spain, Titular Bishop of Aulon, and was installed at Brownsville, 21 May, 1891. He was born 10 December, 1835, at San Pedro de Torello, Cataluna, Spain, and ordained priest, 12 December, 1862, at San Francisco, California, U. S. A.

SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1904); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy* (Milwaukee, 1898); *The Catholic Directory* (1907).

C. JAILLET.

Bruchési, PAUL. See MONTREAL, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Brück, HEINRICH, ecclesiastical historian and bishop, b. at Bingen, 25 October, 1831; d. 4 November, 1903. He followed for some time the cooper's trade. After a course of studies under the direction of a distinguished ecclesiastic, Dr. Joseph Hirschel, he entered the seminary at Mainz. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1855, exercised for some time the sacred ministry, made a postgraduate course at Munich under Döllinger, and at Rome, and in 1857 was appointed to the chair of ecclesiastical history in the seminary of Mainz. He continued to teach until his elevation to the episcopate, with the exception of the years from 1878 to 1887, when the seminary was closed by order of the Government. In 1889 he became a canon of the cathedral; he received also several positions of trust in the administration of the diocese. In 1899 he was chosen Bishop of Mainz; as such he directed the diocese with zeal and intelligence. The merit of Brück consists chiefly in his literary activity. Perhaps his best known work is his manual of church history, "Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte" (Mainz, 1874; 8th ed., 1902). It has been translated into English, French, and Italian, all of which translations passed through second editions before 1899, an evidence that its excellent qualities were widely appreciated. The author shows himself possessed of extensive knowledge not only in history, but also in theology and canon law. A more special work is his "Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland im neunzehnten Jahrhundert" —"History of the Catholic Church in Germany in the Nineteenth Century", in five volumes (1887–1905). It contains a rich store of information, arranged with thoroughness and sound critical judgment, and was received with universal approval by Catholic scholars. He was also the author of an account of rationalistic movements in Catholic Germany (1865), a life of Dean Lennig (1870), and a work on secret societies in Spain (1881).

SCHAEFER, *Dr. Heinrich Brück, Bischof von Mainz* in *Der Katholik* (December, 1903; in pamphlet form, Mainz, 1904); *Dr. Heinrich Brück, Bischof von Mainz* in *Deutscher Hausschatz* (1904), XXX; *Dr. Heinrich Brück, Bischof von Mainz, ein Gedenkblatt* (Mainz, 1903).

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Bruel (BRULIUS), JOACHIM, theologian and historian, b. early in the seventeenth century at Vorst, a village of the province of Brabant, Belgium; d. 29 June, 1653. After entering the order of the Augustinians he was sent to Bourges, France, to finish his studies in philosophy and theology. At Bourges he received the degree of Master in Sacred Theology. In 1638 he was chosen prior of the convent of his order at Cologne. Twice afterwards (1640 and 1649) he filled the office of prior provincial. He is of special interest to the student of Peruvian and Chinese missions.

Among his published works are: (1) "Historiæ Peruanæ Ordinis Eremitarum S. P. Augustini: Libri octodecim". This work follows the Spanish "Crónica moralizada del Orden de San Augustín en el Perú", published by Fra Antonio de la Calancha, Barcelona, 1638; continued by Fra Diego de Cordova, and printed at Lima, 1653. Bruel's Latin version was printed at Antwerp, 1651. (2) He made also a Latin translation of Mendoza's monumental history of China, "Rerum Morumque in Regno Chinensi" etc.

FRANCIS E. TOURSCHER.

Brueys, DAVID-AUGUSTIN DE, a French theologian and dramatic author, b. at Aix in 1640; d. 25 November, 1723, at Montpellier. His family was Protestant, and he was brought up a Calvinist. After devoting some time to the study of law, he applied himself to theology with so much success that he was made a member of the consistory of Montpellier. In 1681, he published an answer to Bossuet's "Exposition of Catholic Doctrine", entitled "Réponse au livre de M. de Condom intitulé Exposition de la doctrine catholique" (Geneva, 1681). He was soon, however, converted by Bossuet himself, abjured Protestantism in 1682, and, after his wife's death, became a priest. Before his conversion he wrote, besides the "Réponse", the "Suite du Préservatif (de Jurieu) contre le changement de religion" (1682).

His principal works, written after his conversion, are: "Examen des raisons qui ont donné lieu à la séparation des protestants" (Paris, 1683), in which he explains the reasons of his conversion; "Traité de la sainte messe" (Paris, 1683); "Défense du culte extérieur de l'Eglise catholique" (Paris, 1686); "Réponse aux plaintes des protestants contre les moyens que l'on emploie en France pour les réunir à l'Eglise" (Paris, 1686); "Traité de l'Eglise" (Paris, 1686); "Traité de l'Eucharistie" (Paris, 1686); "Histoire du fanaticisme de notre temps" (I, 1692; II, 1709; III and IV, 1713); "Traité de l'obéissance des chrétiens aux puissances temporelles" (Paris, 1710); "Traité du légitime usage de la raison principalement sur les objets de la foi" (Paris, 1717).

In collaboration with Palaprat, Brueys also wrote several comic plays and a few tragedies, most of which were produced with great success. They were published in two volumes in 1712, under the title of "Œuvres dramatiques". A new edition of three volumes appeared in 1735, with the author's life by De Launay; again in 1755 (5 vols.), under the title of "Œuvres de Brueys et Palaprat"; and finally in 1812 (2 vols.) as "Œuvres choisies".

DE LAUNAY, *Life of Brueys* in the first volume of his dramatic works (ed. 1735); HAAG, *La France protestante* (Paris, 1846–59), III, 41–44; RÄSS, *Die Convertiten seit der Reformation* (Freiburg, 1866–80), VIII, 232–240.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Brugère, LOUIS-FRÉDÉRIC, professor of apologetics and church history, b. at Orléans, 8 October, 1823; d. at Issy, 11 April, 1888. He studied with the Christian Brothers at St. Euverte, and at the Petit Séminaire of Orléans. His poem of 300 lines describing an inundation of the Rhône and composed in 1841, was printed and sold for the benefit of the flood victims at Lyons. He entered the Grand Séminaire of Orléans in 1841, and the Paris seminary in 1845, where he received the degrees of Bachelor, Licentiate, and Doctor. From 1846 to 1861, with the exception of two years spent as assistant in the parish of St. Aignan, Brugère taught the classics and philosophy in the Orléans diocesan college of La Chapelle-Saint-Mesmin. In 1862 he entered the society of Saint-Sulpice and was appointed professor of apologetics in the seminary at Paris where, in 1868, he occupied the chair of church history in addition to his other labours.

Brugère's teaching was characterized by rare tact

and discernment. It was his settled conviction that, in order to assist in the establishment of communication between the naturally darkened mind and the radiance of revealed truth, the Christian apologist must consider the individual mental attitude of those whom he would direct. Thus he was a strong advocate of the *methodus ascendens ab intrinseco*, which was introduced towards the end of the fifteenth century, and which holds that the apologist should first arouse interest by setting forth the needy condition of the human soul, with its problems unsolved and its cravings unsatisfied; then gradually suggest the unchanging organization which offers satisfaction and peace. Curiosity and interest thus intensified, and the admirable adjustment of Christianity to the needs of the soul once recognized, fairmindedness urging further research, the honest inquirer will learn how moral certitude, though differing from metaphysical and physical certitude, is nevertheless true certitude, excluding all reasonable fear of error, and is not to be confounded with probability, however great. Thus, only when prepared to recognize in the genuine miracle the credentials of the Divinity, may this inquirer be conducted back through history, from fulfilment to prediction, in the hope of discovering, by well authenticated miracles, that the Almighty has stamped as His own the Christianity preserved, defended, and explained by His one true Church.

Such, in brief outline, is the method advocated in "De Verâ Religione" and "De Ecclesiâ", two treatises which Brugère published in 1873, and which, from their adaptability to the needs of the day, merited the approval of competent judges. In addition to these treatises, Brugère published "Tableau de l'histoire et de la littérature de l'Eglise". But it is chiefly as a professor that Brugère is remembered. Gifted with a remarkable memory, his mind was a storehouse of exact information which he freely imparted, embellishing it with anecdote and illustration, so that students gladly sought him out for pleasure and profit.

BERTRAND, *Bibl. Sulpit.*, II, 459, 461, 600; AUBERT, *Ann. relig. du dioc. d'Orléans* (1888), June, July, August; ICARD, *Circulaire* (1888); *Bulletin des anciens élèves de St. Sulpice* (1904); PACAUD, *L'Œuvre d'apol. de M. Brugère; Revue pratique d'apol.* (1906).

DANIEL P. DUFFY.

Bruges, the chief town of the Province of West Flanders in the Kingdom of Belgium. Pope Nicholas I in 863 effected a reconciliation between Charles the Bald, King of the West Franks, and his vassal Baldwin "Bras-de-Fer"; by it the latter's abduction of his daughter Judith was forgiven and the union legalized. The Frankish king further invested his son-in-law with sovereign power over the northern marches enclosed by the North Sea, the Scheldt, and the River Canche, later known as Royal Flanders, of which he thus became the first count. On the ruins of an old burg, said to have dated from 366, Baldwin built himself a new stronghold, with a chapel for the relics of St. Donatian, the gift of Ebbo, Archbishop of Reims, the metropolitan see at that time of most of the Belgian dioceses, and by his valour and untiring energy speedily checked the inroads of the ravaging Northmen. The security he was thus able to afford his subjects caused merchants and artisans to gather round the new settlement, which rapidly grew in size and in wealth. Such was the origin of Bruges. But it was under the rule of the third count, Arnulph the Great (918–989), that the Church attained the full measure of its vitality in Flanders. This prince not only founded and richly endowed the famed Chapter of St. Donatian, but he established collegiate churches in the neighbouring towns of Aardenburg and Thorholt, and built or restored eighteen great monasteries, besides a number of minor foundations; and such was his prestige that it was to him St. Dunstan turned for shelter in the hour of danger, much as St. Thomas of Canterbury at a later epoch (1164) besought the protection of his successor, Thierry of Alsace, against the wrath of Henry II. Under the fostering care of the monastery learning and the arts speedily revived, while commerce and agriculture made equally rapid strides under the patronage of the court. The great charter of liberties conferred by Baldwin IV (988–1036) provided a new incentive to business, which increased by leaps and bounds, and the town so outgrew its boundaries that his successor was compelled in 1039 to rebuild and extend its walls. The epoch of the Crusades (1096–1270) contributed in no small measure to the fame and prosperity of Bruges. Count Robert II from the first of these great undertakings brought back from Cæsarea in Cappadocia the relics of St. Basil; Thierry of Alsace returned from the second with the relic of the Holy Blood presented to him by his cousin Baldwin, King of Jerusalem, as the reward of his great services; while Baldwin IX, who took part in the fourth, was raised to the imperial throne on the founding of the Latin Empire after the fall of Constantinople, 9 April, 1204. From 7 April, 1150, the day on which Thierry of Alsace returned to his capital with the precious relic, it has played no small part in the religious life of the city. The solemn Procession of the Holy Blood, instituted in 1303 to commemorate the deliverance of the city, by the national heroes Breidel and De Coninck, from French tyranny in May of the previous year and which takes place annually on the Monday following the first Sunday in May, is to this day one of the great religious celebrations in Belgium, to which thousands congregate from all parts. By the close of the thirteenth century Bruges had attained the height of its prosperity: it boasted a population of 150,000, a seaport with 60,000 inhabitants at Damme at the end of the Zwijn, three miles away, an important harbour at Sluus at the mouth of the Zwijn, seven miles further, besides several subordinate townships, and was one of the three wealthiest cities of Northern Europe. In 1296 the staple of wool was fixed at Bruges, in 1300 it became a member of the Hanseatic League, and by 1356 it was the chief emporium of the cities of the League.

With the removal of Baldwin IX the long line of purely Flemish counts came to an end, and Flanders passed under French domination. This period of foreign rule, which lasted the best part of a century, was a time of almost continual warfare between the suzerain power and the vassal people, complicated by internecine strife with the rival town of Ghent; and though humiliating disasters alternated with glorious victories, this the heroic epoch of Flemish history closed without the commercial prosperity of Bruges having suffered any very serious check. With the advent of the House of Burgundy in 1384, Flanders unhappily became involved in the religious troubles which were then agitating Europe. The new prince, Philip "le Hardi" (1384–1404), who favoured the pretensions of the antipope, soon proceeded from aimless sympathy to open proselytism, but the edict by which he forbade obedience to the Pope of Rome was utterly disregarded by his turbulent subjects, the clergy, almost to a man, and the great mass of the people acknowledging Urban VI. The Clementine Bishop of Tournai, whose spiritual administration embraced Bruges, came hither to ordain schismatic priests, but the people refused their ministrations, and a period of persecution followed during which public worship was entirely suspended. Ghent, however, had purchased the right to liberty of conscience, and so in 1394 the strange spectacle was witnessed of a whole town's population on pilgrimage from Bruges to Ghent to fulfil their Easter duties. Philip's successors, John the Fearless (1404–19) and

Philip "l'Asseuré" (1419–67), pursued this policy of subjugation, until in 1440, the year of "the Great Humiliation", the burghers of Bruges were completely at the mercy of their prince. The next quarter of a century was a period of pomp and pageantry, a feverish succession of gorgeous tournaments, public banquets, and triumphal entries, and a display of opulence out of all proportion to the true productive forces of the commonwealth. Like a true Duke of Burgundy Philip revelled in the splendour of his court. It was he who on 10 January, 1429, founded at Bruges the Order of the Golden Fleece. Munificent in all things, he gathered about him all the great luminaries of his day. It is also on record that within the twenty-four hours of one day about 1450, no less than one hundred and fifty foreign vessels entered the basin and canals of Bruges under the auspices of the resident consuls of seventeen kingdoms, several of whom were established there in sumptuous palaces. Industry at the time boasted no less than fifty-four incorporated associations or guilds, fifty thousand of whose members found constant employment within the city's walls. The days of Charles the Bold (1467–77) saw the culmination of all this splendour. And then suddenly the blow fell. The great haven of the Zwijn was found to be fast silting up; before the close of the century no vessel of any considerable draught could enter the port of Damme, and by the middle of the sixteenth century Bruges was entirely cut off from the sea.

By the marriage of the daughter of Charles the Bold to Archduke Maximilian Flanders passed under the rule of the House of Austria (1477), and from 1485 the decay of the old Flemish city steadily set in. A period of continual disturbances, ruthlessly repressed by a government destitute of stability, produced a feeling of uneasiness in the commercial world. Antwerp at the time was already proving a dangerous rival, and gradually the merchant princes, enticed by the greater security offered and the many advantages held out to them, removed to the city of the Scheldt. The religious disturbances of the last quarter of the sixteenth century hastened the exodus, even to the removal of the last of the foreign consuls. The severities of the Emperor Charles V (1519–56) and the harsher rule of Philip II (1556–98) and the Duke of Alva led to the capture of Bruges by the Calvinists in March, 1578, when for six years Catholic worship was entirely proscribed. The clergy were exiled or murdered, the churches pillaged and desecrated, some even levelled to the ground; and when peace returned in 1584 the population scarcely numbered 30,000. A period of utter misery followed, in which was developed among the wealthy, under the guidance of the Church—Bruges had been created an episcopal see in 1558—that great spirit of charity which led to the founding of innumerable *Godshuizen* (God's houses) which exist to this day for the relief of an impoverished community. Flanders then became the cockpit of Europe: there was the unsuccessful bombardment of Bruges by the Dutch in 1704, the surrender to the Allies in 1706, its surprise-capture by the French in 1708, its capture by Marlborough in 1712, its surrender to the French again in 1745, and eventually its return to the rule of Austria in 1748; in 1792 the French again took it, were expelled, and retook it in 1794, when it became the chief town of the department of the Lys; by the Treaty of Vienna (1815) it was incorporated in the new Kingdom of the Netherlands, eventually, as a result of the Revolution of 1830, becoming the chief town of the Province of West Flanders in the then constituted Kingdom of Belgium. In 1877 the idea of recreating the port of Bruges by the construction of a large maritime canal with an outer harbour abreast of Heyst was first mooted, thus reviving an old scheme of the painter and engineer Lancelot Blondeel (1496–1561), discovered in the local archives. Eventually the project, despite the determined opposition of Antwerp, received the sanction of the legislature on 11 September, 1895, the cost of the undertaking being fixed at 38,969,075 francs. Seven years was the limit allowed for the completion of the work, but it was not until 29 May, 1905, that the informal opening of the canal to navigation took place, the official inauguration being celebrated in July of 1907. The result has been a large increase in population (which stood at 56,587 in 1906), the establishment of considerable industries, and a corresponding decrease in the chronic poverty of the city; so that it is not surprising if its good folk are already indulging dreams of a revival of its medieval grandeur and prosperity.

It were difficult to exaggerate the importance attaching to Bruges from the point of view of art. Singularly ill-favoured as West Flanders was in respect of building material, the only local stone available (*veld steen*) being of a description little adapted to weather the centuries, Bruges presents no examples of stone architecture of the early period; and later, when suitable stone came to be imported from Tournai and from France, the master masons employed in its use and treatment were likewise of foreign origin. In respect of civic and domestic brick architecture, however, Bruges stands unrivalled, both for number and variety of design. Her school of sculpture was early held in high esteem, eliciting a large foreign demand for stalls and other descriptions of church and domestic furniture in oak, and the revival of the art during the past half-century has been attended with marked success. In equally high esteem stood her wrought-iron work, and in even greater her engraved monumental brasses, which, prior to the Calvinist outbreak in the sixteenth century, were exceedingly numerous throughout Flanders, and examples of which are of frequent occurrence in England, Germany, Scandinavia, and Spain, from which countries there was a constant influx of orders. In the department of embroidery and lace work Bruges likewise enjoyed a high reputation, especially in respect of ecclesiastical vestments, in the production of which, as of lace, a large number of hands are employed to this day. But above all, Bruges, since the second quarter of the fifteenth century, has been celebrated for her paintings. Owing to the greater peace and security enjoyed within her walls many master painters from the valley of the Maas, from Holland, and from Brabant were attracted thither at that period. These, however, had all learned their art elsewhere. John van Eyck, who worked there from 1431 to 1441, exercised a considerable influence, and the scheme of his altar-piece in the Town Museum was imitated by the Brabanter Peter Christus, the Rhenish Hans Memlinc, and the Hollander Gerard David. The Town Museum and the Hospital of St. John are treasure houses of paintings from the brush of these great artists. Gerard David was the first to form a school, whose traditions were carried on until the seventeenth century; and he with his pupils and followers produced an immense number of paintings, scattered all over Europe. Later on Peter Pourbus of Gouda and the Claeissens adhered to the old traditions, which held the field in Bruges longer than anywhere else. In the matter of illuminated books and miniatures it also enjoyed considerable celebrity, and examples of both are to be found in almost every library of importance.

In 1558 Pope Paul IV, at the request of Philip II, raised Bruges to a separate bishopric. The diocese at the present day comprises the entire province of West Flanders, an area of 1,249 square miles with 828,152 inhabitants, almost exclusively Catholics. Twenty-two bishops have so far administered the see. For the purposes of administration the diocese is

divided into the archpresbytery of Bruges and 14 rural deaneries, the former being subdivided into 8 parishes ministered to by 31 priests, and the latter into 286 parishes served by 642 priests. The cathedral chapter consists of 10 titular and 19 honorary canons, with 6 chaplains. The diocesan seminary at Bruges has more than a hundred students, advanced from the preparatory seminary at Roulers. For the purposes of general education there is an episcopal college at Bruges and eight similar colleges at the larger centres of the diocese in which all the humanities are taught, besides four others at minor centres where the studies are not so advanced; for technical education there is a normal school at Bruges and four in other parts of the diocese, all these institutions being almost entirely taught by ecclesiastics. Most of the religious orders, both male and female, have houses in the diocese, besides hospitals and asylums for the aged and the poor.

Bruges returns 2 members to the Senate and 4 members to the House of Representatives, while other portions of the Province elect a total of 7 senators and 16 representatives, the Provincial Council further electing 3 senators. Under the law of proportional representation, which first came into operation in 1900, Bruges returns 1 Catholic and 1 Liberal to the Senate, and 3 Catholics and 1 Liberal to the House of Representatives; other portions of the Province return 5 Catholics and 2 Liberals to the Senate, and 12 Catholics, 3 Liberals, and 1 Socialist to the House of Representatives; the 3 members returned to the Senate by the Provincial Council belong to the Catholic party; the result is that West Flanders (otherwise the Diocese of Bruges) is represented in the Senate by 9 Catholics and 3 Liberals (in addition to the Count of Flanders, who is a member by virtue of his title), and in the House of Representatives by 15 Catholics, 4 Liberals, and 1 Socialist. The government of the province is entirely in the hands of the Catholics, the governor and the great majority of the Provincial Council belonging to that party. As much may be said of the local administration of Bruges, the Communal Council (which consists of the burgomaster, 5 aldermen, and 24 councillors) with the exception of 6 councillors (five of whom are Liberals and one a Christian Democrat) being in the hands of the Catholic party.

MIRAEUS, *Rerum Belgicarum Annales* (Brussels, 1625); GILLIODTS, *Inventaire des Archives de la ville de Bruges, avec une introduction;* tables and glossary by EDW. GAILLIARD (Bruges, 1878–85); GILLIAT-SMITH, *The Story of Bruges* (London, 1901); ROBINSON, *Bruges: an Historical Sketch* (Bruges, 1899); VERSCHELDE, *De Kathedrale van Sint Salvator te Brugge: Geschiedkundige Beschryving* (Bruges, 1863); *Les anciennes Maisons de Bruges* (Bruges, 1875); W. H. JAMES WEALE, *Hans Memlinc: Biography; Pictures at Bruges* (Bruges, 1901); *Gerard David, Painter and Illuminator* (London, 1895); VON BODENHAUSEN, *Gerard David und seine Schule* (Munich, 1905); FRANCES C. WEALE, *Hubert and John van Eyck* (London, 1903).

J. CYRIL M. WEALE.

Brugière, PIERRE, a French priest, Jansenist, and Juror, b. at Thiers, 3 Oct., 1730; d. at Paris, 7 Nov., 1803. He was chaplain of the Ursulines and canon in his native place when his refusal to sign the formula of the acceptation of the Bull "Unigenitus" forced him to leave. He went to Paris where for twelve years he remained with the community of St. Roch. A strongly Jansenistic book which he wrote, "Instructions catholiques sur la dévotion au Sacré-Cœur" (Paris, 1777), brought this connexion to an end. When the Revolution broke out he welcomed it with enthusiasm. He rushed headlong into the fray with two books calling loudly for reform: "Doléances des églisiers" and "Relation sommaire et véritable de ce qui s'est passé dans l'Assemblée du clergé" (1789).

Brugière not only took the Constitutional Oath on the day fixed, 9 Jan., 1791, but he became as it were, the heart and soul of the Constitutional Church. Elected *curé* of St. Paul's he defended the civil constitution of the clergy against episcopal and papal censures in his "Discours patriotique au sujet des brefs du pape" and "La lanterne sourde" (aimed at Bonal, Bishop of Clermont). It is to his credit, however, that he energetically condemned the marriage of priests which the Constitution was doing its utmost to encourage. Against this practice he wrote his "Réflexions d'un curé", and "Lettre d'un curé" (1791), and together with several other constitutionals he denounced its advocates without mercy in "Le nouveau disciple de Luther" (1792). This brochure was aimed at Aubert, a married priest appointed by Gobel *curé* of St. Augustin. Brugière's fearless preaching placed him in the hands of the Revolutionary tribunal, and it was while he was imprisoned that he wrote to his followers the "Lettre d'un curé du fond de sa prison à ses paroissiens" (1793). Set at liberty, he continued his pastoral ministrations in spite of the charge of treasonable conduct, a dangerous thing in those days. But his ministrations were of a novel kind. Mass was said and the sacraments were administered by him in French, and in support of that singularity an appeal was made to the people, "Appel au peuple français" (1798).

Brugière had rebuked the bishops who condemned the oath. He had likewise rebuked the priests who married. Now he was no less violent against the Jurors who began to retract. He attended the two councils of 1797 and 1801 which were trying hard to sustain the ebbing life of the Constitutional Church, and he founded a society for its protection: "Société de philosophie chrétienne". Even after the promulgation of the Concordat of 1801 he clung to the then dead Constitutional Church. Besides the works already mentioned, Brugière wrote a number of pamphlets and left many sermons which were published after his death: "Instructions choisies" (Paris, 1804). Two contemporaries, the Abbé Massy and the Christian Brother Renaud, wrote his life under the title: "Mémoire apologétique de Pierre Brugière" (Paris, 1804).

FELLER in *Biographie universelle* (Paris, 1866); CONSTANTIN in *Dict. de théol. cath.*

J. F. SOLLIER.

Brugman, JOHN, a renowned Franciscan preacher of the fifteenth century, b. at Kempen in the Diocese of Cologne, towards the end of the preceding century; d. at Nimwegen, Netherlands, 19 Sept., 1473. He became lector of theology, vicar-provincial, and one of the founders of the Cologne Province of the Friars of the Minor Observance. For twenty years his name was celebrated as the most illustrious preacher of the Low Countries. Being the friend of Denis the Carthusian, it was due to his suggestion that the latter wrote his work: "De doctrinâ et regulis vitæ Christianæ", dedicating it to Father Brugman. He also espoused the cause of the Brothers of the Common Life, which congregation, successfully devoted to the interests of education, had been established by two priests, Gerhard Groote and Florentius Radewiyns. He addressed them in the two letters which are still extant to strengthen them in the persecution to which they were subjected. He died in the odour of sanctity and is commemorated in the "Martyrologium Minoritico-Belgicum" on the 19th of September. Father Brugman wrote two lives of St. Lidwina, the first of which, printed at Cologne in 1433, was reprinted anonymously at Louvain in 1448, and later epitomized by Thomas à Kempis at Cologne. The second life appeared at Schiedam in 1498; both have been embodied by the Bollandists in the Acta SS., 2 April. He also wrote a devout "Life of Jesus". Father Brugman ranked among the best poets of his day. Two of his poems "O Ewich is so lanc!" and "The Zielejacht" are included by Hoffmann von Fallersleben in his "Horæ Belgicæ" (II,

36–41). His life was written by Dr. Mohl under the title "Joannes Brugman en het Godsdienstegen Leven Onzer Vaderen in de Vijftiende eeuw", and published at Amsterdam in 1854. It consists of two volumes, the second containing Brugman's unedited works. ANDREW EGAN.

Brugnato, DIOCESE OF. See LUNI-SARZANA AND BRUGNATO.

Brumidi, CONSTANTINO, an Italo-American historical painter, celebrated for his fresco work in the Capitol at Washington, b. at Rome, 1805; d. at Washington, 19 February, 1880. His father was a native of Greece and his mother a Roman. He

FRESCO IN DOME OF THE CAPITOL, WASHINGTON

showed his talent for fresco painting at an early age and painted in several Roman palaces, among them being that of Prince Torlonia. Under Gregory XVI he worked for three years in the Vatican. The occupation of Rome by the French in 1849 apparently decided Brumidi to emigrate, and he sailed for the United States, where he became naturalized in 1852. Taking up his residence in New York City, the artist painted a number of portraits. Subsequently he undertook more important works, the principal being a fresco of the Crucifixion in St. Stephen's Church, for which he also executed a "Martyrdom of St. Stephen" and an "Assumption of the Virgin". In 1854 Brumidi went to the city of Mexico, where he painted in the cathedral an allegorical representation of the Holy Trinity. On his way back to New York he stopped at Washington and visited the Capitol. Impressed with the opportunity for decoration presented by its vast interior wall spaces, he offered his services for that purpose to Quartermaster-General Meigs. This offer was accepted, and about the same time he was commissioned as a captain of cavalry. His first art work in the Capitol was in the room of the House Committee on Agriculture. At first he received eight dollars a day, which Jefferson Davis, then Secretary of War of the United States, caused to be increased to ten dollars. His work attracting much favourable attention, he was given further commissions, and gradually settled into the position of a Government painter. His chief work in Washington was done in the rotunda of the Capitol, and included the apotheosis of Washington in the dome, as well as other allegories, and scenes from American history. His work in the rotunda was left unfinished at his death, but he had decorated many other parts of the building. In the Catholic Cathedral of Philadelphia he pictured St. Peter and St. Paul. Brumidi was a capable, if conventional painter, and his black-and-white modelling in the work at Washington, in imitation of bas-relief, is strikingly effective.

AUGUSTUS VAN CLEEF.

Brumoy, PIERRE, b. at Rouen in Normandy, 1688; entered the Society of Jesus in 1704; d. in Paris, 1742. Brumoy belonged to that distinguished group of humanists who shed lustre upon the Society of Jesus shortly before its suppression in France. Between the years 1722 and 1739 he contributed many articles to the celebrated "Journal de Trévoux" of which he was for some time the editor. Of the "History of the Gallican Church", which had been begun by Fathers Longueval and Fontenay, he wrote volumes XI and XII (1226–1320). He also composed several college tragedies on sacred subjects and many poems and discourses in Latin and in French. His Latin didactic poem "De motibus animi" (on the passions) was highly esteemed by his contemporaries. His most important work, "Le théâtre des Grecs", which was first published in 1730 in three volumes, has often been reprinted. It contains translations and analyses of the Greek tragedies, supplemented by keen critical and æsthetic observations. An English translation was made by Mrs. Charlotte Lennox with the assistance of the Earl of Cork and Dr. Samuel Johnson, and first published in London in 1759.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la c. de J.*, II, col. 243–251; DE ROCHEMONTEIX, *Un collège de Jésuites au XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles*, III, 96 sqq.; BAUMGARTNER, *Geschichte der Weltliteratur*, IV, 634; V, 421, 422. B. GULDNER.

Brunault, JOSEPH. See NICOLET, DIOCESE OF.

Brunellesco (or BRUNELLESCHI), FILIPPO, architect and sculptor, b. at Florence, 1377; d. there 16 April, 1446. As an architect Brunellesco was one of the chief leaders in the early period of the Renaissance movement. Though rather unprepossessing in appearance, he was of a cheerful and congenial disposition, of an active and inventive mind, and withal somewhat quick-tempered. Even in his childish games he evinced a decided inclination towards the mechanical. Beginning as a goldsmith, and later turning to sculpture, he finally applied himself exclusively to architecture without, however, neglecting his general culture. He read the Bible and Dante to feed his fancy, but devoted himself with decided preference to the study of perspective which he was the first to apply to art in accordance with definitely formulated rules. The correlated studies of mathematics and geometry also received his attention. He was considerably influenced by the lifelong friendship of the mathematician, Paolo del Pozzo Toscanelli, by his joint studies with his younger friend Donatello, by the artists and art-works of his native Florence, particularly by the monuments of Rome, to the study of which he devoted many years. Classical antiquity was already, at this period, well known and highly appreciated.

FILIPPO BRUNELLESCO

SCULPTURE.—The Duomo of Pistoia contains several examples of niello-work and two silver statues of prophets said to be the earliest works of Brunellesco. A wooden Magdalen in the church of Santo Spirito at Florence was destroyed by fire in 1471. His wooden crucifix in Santa Maria Novella is true to nature and beautiful, while that by his friend Donatello, in Santa Croce, deserved the

criticism ascribed to Brunellesco: "This is a rustic hanging on the cross". Two of his perspectives created a great sensation in Florence. Seventy years later they are described at length by his first anonymous biographer. Masaccio learned perspective from Brunellesco and according to Vasari, the architect's second biographer, it was also applied to intarsia. Brunellesco entered into competition with Ghiberti and other masters in 1401, when models for the reliefs of the second bronze door of the Baptistery at Florence were called for. The designs of both are exhibited side by side in the National Museum at Florence. We may agree with the verdict of the commission which awarded the first prize to Ghiberti and the second to Brunellesco. Ghiberti's relief is noteworthy for its agreeable dignity, while that of Brunellesco looks restless and laboured. Soon after Brunellesco went to Rome and for many years explored its ancient ruins, alone and with Donatello. The remains of the classic buildings so enraptured him that he decided to make architecture his lifework, instead of, as heretofore, an occasional occupation. In the meantime the much discussed problem of the completion of the Duomo (Santa Maria del Fiore) of Florence seems to have awakened in him the ambition to attain in this way undisputed supremacy in one of the plastic arts.

Church of the Holy Spirit, Florence

Architecture. — At the end of the thirteenth century Arnolfo di Cambio had begun the construction of Santa Maria del Fiore, substantially a Gothic cathedral, and carried it as far as the dome whose span of forty metres (one hundred and thirty-eight and one-half feet), nearly equal to that of the Pantheon, had deterred from its completion all contemporary architects. In 1417 a conference of experts failed to arrive at a solution. Brunellesco, who was present, did not fully declare himself, but instead visited Rome again, manifestly for the purpose of coming forward with greater assurance. The following year (March, 1419) a meeting of the most noted architects took place, and in the discussion relative to the cathedral dome Brunellesco with full confidence proposed to complete it without centering, since it was impossible to construct scaffolding for such a height. At first he was regarded as a fool, but later was actually commissioned to execute the work, with two other artists as associates. Whether to harmonize it with the pointed arches of the rest of the design or to relieve the substructure of the greater thrust, Brunellesco built the dome not on spherical, but on pointed octagonal, clustered-arches. He then braced it not only by means of the octagonal drum, previously agreed on, but also borrowed from the Baptistery, besides its lantern, the idea of a protective roof, not an ordinary roof, but a second and lighter dome. This novel concept of a dome made of two shells greatly relieved the weight of the structure, gave to the exterior an agreeable rounded finish, and in the space between the shells furnished room for ribbing, passageways, and stairs. In technical or constructive skill the dome of St. Peter's marked no advance on the work of Brunellesco; it is superior only in formal beauty. The crowning lantern, a statically important weight, adds sixteen metres to the height of the dome which is ninety-one metres; it is inadequate, however, to the lighting of the edifice. Brunellesco's work remained, in its essential features, a model for succeeding ages. The lantern was not completed until five years after the death of the master.

Inspired by classical art, he executed other domical structures and basilicas, in all of which the essential characteristics of the new style appear. For the sacristy of San Lorenzo at Florence he built its polygonal dome, without a drum, on a square plan, by means of pendentives (projecting spherical triangles). As a central feature for Santa Maria degli Angeli in Florence, he designed a dome resting on a substructure, octagonal on the interior and sixteen-sided on the exterior. On a free-standing centralized plan he built a still more charming structure, the Pazzi Chapel. Over the middle portion of the rectangular hall a dome with radial ribbings is carried on arches and flanked on two sides by barrel vaults. The square sanctuary rises on the long side of this rectangular hall and is covered with a dome. The corresponding square on the entrance side is also domed; he added to it an antique colonnade covered in by a barrel vault, thus forming a loggia that extends the entire width of the building. The interior wall surfaces are decorated with Corinthian pilasters. The straight entablature, the rounded windows, the coffered ceiling, the medallions, complete on a small scale an ideal Renaissance edifice. It is probable that the cruciform and domical church of Badia di Fiesole was built from Brunellesco's design. In all these works he treated antique classical principles rather freely. In larger churches his practical mind induced him to return to the basilica plan. In San Lorenzo, it is true, he found the cruciform plan already fixed; he added, however,

a wooden coffered ceiling for the nave, spherical vaults for the side aisles, and rectangular chapels with barrel vaults along the outer walls; lateral aisles also surround the transept. The external cornice is carried out in a straight line; the height of the nave is double its width; the Corinthian columns bear the classical triple entablature but with arches springing therefrom; to increase the height these arches bear another broad triple entablature. We are frequently reminded in this edifice of the ancient Christian and the Romanesque basilicas. Its dome was completed by Manetti, who allowed himself here, and to a greater degree in Santo Spirito, a certain liberty in dealing with the designs of Brunellesco. The plan of the latter church is in the main the same as that of San Lorenzo; the interior niches are rounded, though their exterior walls are rectangular. These niches follow the lateral aisles around the transepts and the apse. Over the meeting of the great nave and apse rises a low drum supporting a ribbed dome; it is finished with round windows and a lantern. Brunellesco executed also no little domestic architecture. He supervised the construction of the Foundling Hospital (Spedale degli Innocenti) and drew the model of a magnificent palace for Cosimo de'Medici which the latter failed to carry out through fear of envy. Finally he built a part of the Pitti Palace, and in this work left to posterity a model method of the use of quarry-faced stone blocks for the first story. In recognition of his merits this epoch-making architect, no less distinguished in the decorative than in the constructive arts, was buried within the sacred precincts of the cathedral.

SCOTT, *Filippo di Ser Brunellesco* (London, 1901); FABRICZY, *Filippo Brunelleschi, sein Leben und seine Werke* (Stuttgart, 1892); DURM, *Die Baukunst der Renaissance in Italien* (Stuttgart, 1903); SCHNAASE, *Geschichte der bildenden Künste* (Stuttgart, 1879), VIII.

G. GIETMANN.

Brunetière, FERDINAND, a French critic and professor, b. at Toulon, 19 July, 1849; d. at Paris, 9 December, 1906. After finishing his studies at the Lycée Louis-le-Grand, he took the entrance examination of the Ecole Normale, a higher training-school for teachers, but failed on account of deficiency in Greek. When the Franco-German war broke out, he enlisted in the heavy-armed infantry. After the war he returned to Paris and led a very precarious life as a teacher in private schools. In 1874, he began to write for the "Revue des Deux Mondes", then edited by Charles Buloz, whose principal associate he soon became. From the first he was an opponent of the Naturalist School, which in retaliation feigned to ignore him and declared that the name of Brunetière was the pseudonym of some writer of no account. His mastery of criticism and his immense and minute learning, which were combined with a keen and cutting style, soon proved his intellectual power. The editorship in chief of the "Revue des Deux Mondes" was tendered to him in 1893. Although he had not attained the higher academic degrees, he was appointed professor of the French language and literature in the Ecole Normale in 1886, a position he held up to 1905, when the school was reorganized. On account of his conversion to Catholicism, he was dropped from the list of professors. He was elected to the French Academy in 1893.

In 1897, M. Brunetière lectured in the United States, under the auspices of the Alliance Française. After delivering nine lectures on French poetry in the annual course of the Percy Turnbull lectures on poetry, at the Johns Hopkins University, he travelled through the country speaking to enthusiastic audiences on classical and contemporary literature. He met with a success that no French lecturer before him had ever attained. In New York more than three thousand persons gathered to hear him. His most famous lecture was on Zola, whose so-called lifelike pictures of the French bourgeois, of the workman, soldier, and peasant, he described as gloomy, pessimistic, and calumnious caricatures.

Brunetière was the greatest French critic of the last twenty years of the nineteenth century. His articles in the "Revue des Deux Mondes" resemble a strongly framed building, without frivolous ornament, majestic in proportion, impressive through solidity. They have been published in about fifteen volumes bearing various titles, as: "Etudes critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française"; "Questions de critique"; "Essais sur la littérature contemporaine", etc. Brunetière was a dogmatist, judging literary works not by the impression they made upon him, but according to certain principles he had laid down as criteria. According to his dogmatic system, a literary work derives its value from the general ideas it contains, and the originality of a writer consists only in setting his own stamp upon a universal design. A good survey of his ideas may be had from the "Manuel de littérature française" (tr. New York). This form of criticism was more or less borrowed from Désiré Nisard. About the year 1889, M. Brunetière changed his method and applied to literature the theories of evolution, explaining the formation, growth, and decay of the various literary *genres* in their development from a common origin, by the same principles as those by which Darwin explained the development of the animal species. (L'évolution des genres; L'évolution de la poésie lyrique au XIX^{e} siècle.) However weak the basis of such a system may be, all the details are interesting. In 1892 M. Brunetière showed himself an orator of the highest rank. His lectures at the Odéon theatre on "Les époques du Théâtre Français" proved very successful. In 1893 he delivered a course of public lectures at the Sorbonne on "L'évolution des genres", and in 1894 on "Les sermons de Bossuet". When he was deprived of his professorship at the Ecole Normale, in 1905, he became ordinary lecturer to the Société des Conférences. M. Brunetière was master of the difficult art of convincing a large audience. He had all the qualities of a true orator: clearness of exposition, strength and logic of reasoning, an unusual command of general ideas, a fine and penetrating voice, and above all, a certain strange power of conviction which won the immediate sympathy of the most prejudiced hearers.

M. Brunetière became a convert to Catholicism, in consequence of long and thorough study of Bossuet's sermons, and, strange to say, by a logical process of deductions which had been suggested to him by Auguste Comte's philosophy. (See Discours de combat, 2d series, p. 3.) In giving up his materialistic opinions to adopt the Catholic Faith he was prompted by a deep conviction, and there was no emotional element in this radical change. The article he wrote in 1895, "Après une visite au Vatican", augured his conversion to Catholicism. In this article, M. Brunetière showed that science, in spite of its solemn promises, had failed to give happiness to mankind, and that faith alone was able to achieve that result. Soon after, M. Brunetière publicly adhered to Catholicism and for ten years he made numerous speeches in all parts of France, to defend his new faith against the attacks of free-thinkers. Among these addresses may be mentioned: "Le besoin de croire", Besançon, 1898; "Les raisons actuelles de croire", Lille, 1899; "L'idée de solidarité", Toulouse, 1900; "L'action catholique", Tours, 1901; "Les motifs d'espérer", Lyons, 1901, etc. He devoted himself to this task with the greatest energy, for he was

naturally a man of will and a fighter. The most interesting feature of his apology is his attempt to show how much the positivism of Auguste Comte was akin to Catholicism. He endeavoured to prove that modern thought contained in itself, without suspecting it, the seed of Catholicism. (See "Sur les chemins de la croyance. Première étape, L'utilisation du positivisme.") On one occasion, in the course of a discussion with a Socialist, he went so far as to infer the identity of the social aspirations of Catholicism and the aspirations of the Socialists for a general reform of the world.

PELLISSIER, *Le mouvement littéraire contemporain* (1901); HATZFELD, *Les critiques littéraires du XIX^e siècle* (1894); FAGUET in *Annales politiques et littéraires* (16 December, 1906); DE VOGÜÉ in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1 January, 1907); PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française; American Review of Reviews* (1897), XV, 69.

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Brunforte, UGOLINO, Friar Minor and chronicler, born c. 1262; died c. 1348. His father Rinaldo, Lord of Sarnano in the Marches, belonged to an ancient and noble family of French origin, from which sprang the famous Countess Matilda. Ugolino entered the Order of Friars Minor at the age of sixteen and served his novitiate at the convent of Roccabruna, but passed most of his life at the convent of Santa Maria in Monte Giorgio, whence he is often called Ugolino of Monte Giorgio. In 1295 he was chosen Bishop of Abruzzi (Teramo) under Celestine V, but before his consecration the pope had resigned and Boniface VIII who suspected Ugolino as belonging to the Zelanti annulled the appointment (see Bull "In Supremæ Dignitatis Specula" in "Bullarium Francis.", IV, 376). Nearly fifty years later he was elected provincial of Macerata. Most scholars are now agreed on fixing upon Ugolino as the author of the "Fioretti" or "Little Flowers of St. Francis" in their original form. For recent research has revealed that this classic collection of narratives, which forms one of the most delightful productions of the Middle Ages, or rather the fifty-three chapters which form the true text of the "Fioretti" (for the four appendixes are additions of later compilers) were translated into Italian by an unknown fourteenth-century friar from a larger Latin work attributed to Ugolino. Although this Latin original has not come down to us, we have in the "Actus B. Francisci et Sociorum Ejus", edited by Paul Sabatier in "Collection d'Etudes" (Paris, 1902, IV), an approximation to it which may be considered on the whole as representing the original of the "Fioretti". That Ugolino was the principal compiler of the "Actus" seems certain; how far he may be considered the sole author of the "Fioretti" of the primitive "Actus Fioretti" is not so clear. His labour which consisted chiefly in gathering the flowers for his bouquet from written and oral local tradition appears to have been completed before 1328.

WADDING, *Script. ord. Min.* (1650), 179; SBARALEA, *Supplementum* (1806), *addenda* 727; LUIGI DA FABRIANO, *Disquisizione istorica intorno all' autore dei Fioretti* (Fabriano, 1883); *Cenni cronologico-biografici dell' osservante Provincia Picena* (Quaracchi, 1886), 232 sqq.; MANZONI, *Fioretti* (2nd ed., Rome, 1902), *prefazione;* SABATIER, *Floretum S. Francisci* (Paris, 1902), preface; MARIOTTI, *Primordi Gloriosi dell' ordine Minoritico nelle Marche* (Castelplanio, 1903), VI; ARNOLD, *The Authorship of the Fioretti* (London, 1904); PACE, *L'autore del Floretum* in *Rivista Abruzzese, ann. XIX*, fasc. II; VAN ORTROY in *Anal. Bolland.*, XXI, 443 sqq.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

Bruni, LEONARDO, an eminent Italian humanist, b. of poor and humble parents at Arezzo, the birthplace of Petrarch, in 1369; d. at Florence, 9 March, 1444. He is also called Aretino from the city of his birth. Beginning at first the study of law, he later, under the patronage of Salutato and the influence of the Greek scholar Chrysoloras, turned his attention to the study of the classics. In 1405 he obtained through his friend Poggio the post of Apostolic secretary under Pope Innocent VII. He remained at Rome for several years, continuing as secretary under Popes Gregory XII and Alexander V. In 1410 he was elected Chancellor of the Republic of Florence, but resigned the office after a few months, returning to the papal court as secretary under John XXIII, whom he afterwards accompanied to the Council of Constance. On the deposition of that pope in 1415, Bruni returned to Florence, where he spent the remaining years of his life.

Here he wrote his chief work, a Latin history of Florence, "Historiarum Florentinarum Libri XII" (Strasburg, 1610). In recognition of this great work the State conferred upon him the rights of citizenship and exempted the author and his children from taxation. In 1427 through the favour of the Medici he was again appointed state chancellor, a post which he held until his death. During these seventeen years he performed many valuable services to the State. Bruni contributed greatly to the revival of Greek and Latin learning in Italy in the fifteenth century and was foremost among the scholars of the Christian Renaissance. He, more than any other man, made the treasures of the Hellenic world accessible to the Latin scholar through his literal translations into Latin of the works of Greek authors. Among these may be mentioned his translations of Aristotle, Plato, Plutarch, Demosthenes, and Æschines. These were considered models of pure Latinity.

His original works include: "Commentarius Rerum Suo Tempore Gestarum"; "De Romæ Origine"; "De Bello Italico adversus Gothos"; and ten volumes of letters, "Epistolæ Familiares", which, written in elegant Latin, are very valuable for the literary history of the fifteenth century. He was also the author of biographies in Italian of Dante and Petrarch and wrote in Latin the lives of Cicero and Aristotle. So widespread was the admiration for Bruni's talents that foreigners came from all parts to see him. The great esteem in which he was held by the Florentines was shown by the extraordinary public honours accorded him at his death. His corpse was clad in dark silk, and on his breast was laid a copy of his "History of Florence". In the presence of many foreign ambassadors and the court of Pope Eugenius, Manetti pronounced the funeral oration and placed the crown of laurel upon his head. He was then buried at the expense of the State in the cemetery of Santa Croce, where his resting-place is marked by a monument executed by Rossellino.

SYMONDS, *Renaissance in Italy* (New York, 1900), II; *The Revival of Learning;* VOIGT, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums* (Berlin, 1893); the most complete ed. of Bruni's works is that of MEHUS (Florence, 1731).

EDMUND BURKE.

Brünn, DIOCESE OF, suffragan of the Archdiocese of Olmütz, embracing the south-western part of Moravia, an area of 3825 sq. m., and containing, according to the "Catalogus cleri Diœceseos Brunensis 1907", about 1,051,654 inhabitants, 1,000,607 of whom are Catholics.

I. HISTORY.—The erection of the Diocese of Brünn was due to Empress Maria Theresa. The territory comprised in this diocese belonged from a very early period to the Diocese of Olmütz. To obviate the difficulties arising from the administration of such a vast territory, Maria Theresa in 1773 entered into negotiations with Pope Clement XIV. Olmütz was to be raised to the rank of an archbishopric and two newly created bishoprics—Brünn and Troppau—assigned it as suffragans. Eventually, however, only one was created. By a papal Bull of Pius VI, dated 5 December, 1777, Olmütz was made an archbishopric and Brünn erected into an episcopal see. The collegiate chapter of the provostship of Sts. Peter and Paul which had been

in existence in Brünn since 1296 was constituted the cathedral chapter, and the provost-church was made the cathedral. Matthias Franz, Count von Chorinsky, mitred provost of the chapter was appointed by the empress first bishop. He was succeeded by Johann Baptist Lachenbauer (1787–99), Vincenz Joseph von Schrattenbach (1800–16), Wenzel Urban Ritter von Stuffler (1817–31), Franz Anton von Gindl (1832–41), Anton Ernst, Count von Schaffgotsche (1842–70), Karl Nöttig (1871–82), Franz Sales Bauer (1882–1904), since 1904 Archbishop of Olmütz, and Paulus, Count von Huyn, b. at Brünn, 1868, appointed bishop 17 April, 1904, and consecrated 26 June, 1904.

II. STATISTICS.—For the cure of souls the diocese is divided into 7 archipresbyterates and 37 deaneries with 429 parishes and the same number of parish churches, 30 simple benefices, 545 mission churches (*Filialkirchen*) and oratories. In 1907 the number of secular clergy was 751,612 engaged in the care of souls, 102 in other offices (professors, military chaplains, etc.), and 47 retired from active duty; regulars, 101, of whom 54 are engaged in the active ministry. The cathedral chapter consists of a dean, an archdeacon, 4 canons capitular, 6 honorary canons, and 1 canon *extra statum;* the consistory is composed of 15 members. In Nikolsburg there is a collegiate chapter with 6 canons and 4 honorary canons. The bishop and the 4 capitulars are appointed by the emperor, the dean by the cathedral chapter, and the archdeacon by the bishop. Among the benefices, 26 are by free collation, 106 subject to appointment by administrators of the religious fund, 8 by administrators of the fund for students, 23 by ecclesiastical patrons, 250 by lay families, 22 are incorporated with monasteries, and 2 of mixed patronage. For the training of the clergy there is a seminary, in connexion with which is a theological school with 11 ecclesiastical professors, also an episcopal preparatory school for boys. In the intermediate schools of the diocese 67 priests are engaged in teaching religion, in the primary schools and intermediate schools for girls 79 priests.

The following religious congregations have establishments in the diocese: *Men:* Premonstratensians 1 abbey (Neureisch) with 12 priests; Benedictines 1 abbey in Raigern (from which is issued the well-known periodical "Studien u. Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner- und Cistercienserorden"), with 20 fathers and 2 clerics; the Hermits of St. Augustine 1 foundation in Brünn, with 16 priests and 5 clerics; the Piarists 1 college at Nikolsburg with 2 fathers and 3 lay brothers; the Dominicans 1 monastery with 7 fathers and 7 brothers; the Franciscans 2 convents with 7 fathers and 5 brothers; the Minorites 1 monastery with 2 priests and 2 lay brothers; the Capuchins 3 monasteries with 9 fathers and 8 brothers; the Brothers of Mercy, 2 foundations with 3 priests and 15 brothers. *Women:* 32 foundations and 379 sisters engaged in the education of girls and the care of the sick: 1 Cistercian abbey (Tischnowitz) with 25 religious; 1 Ursuline convent with 21 sisters; 1 Elizabethan convent with 19 sisters; 3 foundations of the Sisters of Mercy of St. Vincent de Paul, with 34 sisters; 9 houses of the Sisters of Mercy of St. Charles Borromeo, with 71 sisters; 2 houses of the Daughters of the Divine Saviour with 26 sisters; 6 convents of the Poor Sisters of Notre Dame with 35 sisters; 1 house of Daughters of Divine Love, with 24 sisters; 1 mother-house and 5 branches of the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, with 108 sisters, and 1 foundation of the Order of St. Hedwig, with 4 sisters. The above named congregations of women conduct 4 boarding schools for girls, 21 schools for girls, 6 hospitals, 4 orphan asylums, 13 crèches, 5 hospital stations, 2 asylums for aged women, 2 homes for the aged, 1 institution for the blind, and 1 home for servant girls. Among the associations to be found in the diocese may be mentioned: the Catholic Journeymen's Union (Gesellenverein), 7; the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, 9 conferences; the Association of Christian Social Workers, the Apostolate of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, the St. Joseph's Verein for men and young men.

Chief among the churches of the diocese is the Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul at Brünn; built between the thirteenth and fifteenth century in Gothic style, it was destroyed in 1645, rebuilt as a Renaissance structure (1743–80), remodelled in 1906 and two towers added. The stateliest and most beautiful Gothic church of the diocese is the church of St. James at Brünn, begun as early as the thirteenth century but completed only in 1511. Other prominent ecclesiastical buildings are the church of St. James at Iglau, erected 1230–43, the first Gothic church with porticoes in Moravia; the royal monastic church in the old section of Brünn built 1323–53 in Gothic style; the former monastic church of Tischnowitz erected 1233–50 in the Roman transition style, with a noble, richly adorned portico; the church of the former Benedictine monastery at Trebitsch, built 1230–45, with three naves, a spacious choir, and a Roman portico; the Jesuit church at Brünn, erected in 1582 in the Barocco style.

WOLNÝ, *Kirchliche Topographie von Mähren* (4 vols., Brünn, 1857–61), Division II; WEINBRENNER, *Mähren u. das Bistum Brünn* (1877); PROKOP, *Mähren in kunstgeschichtlicher Beziehung* (4 vols., Vienna, 1904); TRAUTENBERGER, *Chronik der Landeshauptstadt Brünn* (5 vols., Brünn, 1893–97); *Die katholische Kirche in Wort u. Bild* (2nd ed., Munich, 1907), II.

JOSEPH LINS.

Brunner, FRANCIS DE SALES, founder of the Swiss-American congregation of the Benedictines, b. 10 January, 1795, at Muemliswil, Switzerland; d. at the Convent of Schellenberg, Duchy of Lichtenstein, 29 December, 1859. He received in baptism the name of Nicolaus Joseph. After the death of his father he entered, 11 July, 1812, the Benedictine monastery near his residence in Maria Stein. He made his vows two years later and studied for the priesthood under the direction of the pious Abbot Pfluger. Ten years after his ordination (1819) he felt a vocation for a stricter life and joined the Trappists of Oehlemberg, also near his home. This convent being suppressed, he offered his services for foreign missions to Gregory XVI, and was to have gone as Apostolic missionary to China, but shortly before the time set for his departure the order was recalled. Next he founded a school for poor boys in the castle of Löwenberg, which he had purchased from the Count de Montfort. In 1833 with his pious mother he made a pilgrimage to Rome, where they were both enrolled in the Archconfraternity of the Most Precious Blood. Returned to Löwenberg, his mother gathered around her pious virgins to "hold a perpetual (day and night) adoration and dedicate their lives to the education of orphans and the furnishing of vestments for poor churches".

Thus began the Sisters of the Most Precious Blood; their foundress died in 1836, and the community was brought to America under the second mother superior, Sister Clara, who died in 1876 at Grünewald, Ohio. Meanwhile, in 1838, Father Brunner had made a second visit to Rome, and had entered the Congregation of the Most Precious Blood at Albano. After his novitiate he returned, continued the work he had previously begun, and also began educating boys for the priesthood, so as to inaugurate a German province of the congregation. The Government interfering more and more with his school, he accepted the invitation of Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, brought to him by Monsignor Henni, to establish his community in America. Accompanied by eight priests, he landed, 21 December, 1843, at New Orleans

and, ascending the Ohio River, arrived at Cincinnati on New Year's Day. From Cincinnati they proceeded to St. Alphonsus, near Norwalk, Ohio, where the first station was erected. Their missionary circuit included all the Germans within a radius of 100 miles; they began to erect convents and parishes and entrusted the schools to the Sisters of the Most Precious Blood, who had followed them on the 22nd of July, 1844. After this Father Brunner made several trips to Europe in the interests of his institution, and it was during the last of these that he died. He was an indefatigable missionary and a very prolific writer on religious subjects. Many of his writings, all of which are in German, still await publication.

Leben und Wirken des P. F. S. Brunner (Carthagena, 1882); *Nuntius Aulæ*, I–X.

U. F. Müller.

Brunner, Sebastian, a versatile and voluminous writer, b. in Vienna, 10 December, 1814; d. there, 27 November, 1893. He received his college education from the Benedictines of his native city, his philosophical and theological training at the Vienna University, was ordained priest in 1838, and was for some years professor in the philosophical faculty of the Vienna University. The University of Freiburg honoured him with the degree of Doctor of Theology. In the revolutionary year, 1848, he founded the "Wiener Kirchenzeitung", which he edited until 1865, and in which he scourged with incisive satire the Josephinist bondage of the Church. It is mainly owing to his fearless championship, which more than once brought him into conflict with the authorities, that the Church in Austria to-day breathes more freely. He wrote some ascetical books and many volumes of sermons, also a biography of Clemens Hofbauer, the apostle of Vienna. His books of travel dealing with Germany, France, England, Switzerland, and especially Italy, are distinguished by keen observations on men and manners, art and culture, and most of all on religion, and are thus closely connected with his apologetic and controversial writings. Among the latter may be mentioned his book on "The Atheist Renan and his Gospel". Brunner's voluminous historical works are very valuable, particularly those on the history of the Church in Austria. It is, however, as a humourist that Brunner takes a permanent place in the history of literature, for he counts among the best modern German humourous writers. His works of this class were composed partly in verse, which at times reminds the reader of Hudibras, and partly in the form of prose stories. One of the best of the former is "Der Nebeljungen Lied"; of the latter, "Die Prinzenschule zu Möpselglück". These works, conceived with a high and noble purpose, are marked by brilliant satire, inexhaustible wit, and genuine humour, combined with great depth of feeling. A collection of his stories in prose and verse was published in eighteen volumes at Ratisbon in 1864. It is not surprising, though it is regrettable, that an author whose literary output was so vast and varied, often shows signs of haste and a lack of artistic finish. In his later years he turned his satirical pen against the undiscriminating worship of modern German literary celebrities.

Selbstbiographie (Autobiography) (Ratisbon, 1890–91); Scheicher, *Sebastian Brunner* (Würzburg and Vienna, 1890); Lindemann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Freiburg im Br., 1898), 938, 939; *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, XLVII (Supplement, 1903), s. v.

B. Guldner.

Bruno, Saint, Archbishop of Cologne, b. 925; d. at Reims, 11 October, 965; was the youngest son of Henry I of Germany (surnamed the Fowler) and St. Mathilda, and brother of the Emperor Otto I. He inherited his mother's piety and was even from boyhood destined for the Church. In his fourth year he was confided to the learned Bishop Balderich in one of the Carlovingian collegiate schools attached to the cathedral at Utrecht. He read widely in Latin literature, classical and patristic; his pillow book, as Ruotger avers, was the Christian poet, Prudentius. Through some Greeks sojourning at his brother's court, Bruno became proficient also in the Greek language, and he never lost his early love for learning. After a stay of ten years at Utrecht, he was recalled by Otto I in 939. From the beginning of Otto's reign, in 936, many learned men from Germany and abroad collected at his court; by the side of so characteristic a product of Carlovingian culture as Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, were Scots, Romans, and Greeks. From all, Bruno found much to learn. Soon he himself began to teach, and a notable renascence of higher studies ensued in the schools.

In 940, Bruno began to exercise the functions of imperial chancellor (Mon. Germ. Dipl., I, 120 nr. 35). After he had received deacon's orders in 941 or 942, the emperor appointed him, despite his youth, Abbot of the monasteries of Lorsch, near Worms, and of Corvei on the Weser. In both communities he soon restored the strict observance of St. Benedict's Rule. He was ordained priest about 950 and in 951 became archchancellor (Mon. Germ. Dipl., I, 218, nr. 138 sq.); even from the year 940 on, all Otto's state papers were prepared by Bruno's hand. As the executive administration of affairs was conducted chiefly through the royal chancery, Bruno's influence now extended to all parts of the empire. Relations between Germany and France were by his good offices greatly improved. He took part in the Synod of Verdun, in 947, and assisted in the adjustment of the quarrel, of such consequence to the Kingdom of France, about the Archbishopric of Reims. In 951 he accompanied the Emperor Otto to Italy. In the troublous times which soon followed during the revolt of Ludolf, Otto's eldest son and heir-apparent, and Conrad, Duke of Lorraine, Bruno proved his loyalty and devotion to his brother. For this service, after the death (9 July, 953) of Wicfrid, Archbishop of Cologne, the emperor caused Bruno to be elected his successor in that see, and likewise entrusted to him the administration of the Duchy of Lorraine. On the 21st of September, the nobility of that province swore allegiance to Bruno at Aachen, and on the 25th he was consecrated and enthroned at Cologne. Through Bruno's mediation Ludolf was reconciled with his father, and the rebellion of Conrad effectually quelled. In the struggle between the last of the Carlovingians and the rising house of Capet, Bruno's prestige enabled him to act, in the name of his imperial brother, as a supreme arbitrator in French affairs, countless disputes being satisfactorily settled by his prudence and tact.

In Bruno's personality as prince-bishop, was represented the perfect union of Church and State which was the corner-stone of the policy of Otto the Great; for Bruno, despite his tireless temporal activities, was a great bishop and zealous pastor. He ruled by personal piety and singular holiness of life. With scrupulous care he watched over the moral discipline of his diocese, improved the higher education of the clergy and lavished his resources on monastic and ecclesiastical institutions throughout the realm. The monastery of St. Pantaleon at Cologne, begun in 956, was his foundation. The literary distinction to which Lorraine, before other parts of the kingdom, early attained may be accounted not the least remarkable result of his work. Bruno's favourite abode was Bonn.

When Otto set out a second time for Italy in 961, to be crowned emperor at Rome, the government of the realm and the guardianship of Otto II were confided to Bruno and to William, Archbishop of Mainz. Soon after the kaiser's return, Bruno was summoned again on a mission of peace to France; it was while on this journey that he died, at Reims. His body, at

his own request, was carried back and buried in the monastic church of St. Pantaleon at Cologne. From time immemorial the Diocese of Tournay has had a special office for St. Bruno on June the 18th, and as the day of his death was always celebrated at St. Pantaleon as the anniversary of a saint, the feast of Bruno, Confessor, is now observed throughout the Diocese of Cologne as a double on the 11th day of October.

RUOTGER, *Vita Brunonis* in *Acta SS.*, Oct., V, 698. also found in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, IV, 252, and in *P. L.*, CXXXIV, 938; *Altera Vita Brunonis* (a later life, written in the 12th century at St. Pantaleon), in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, IV, 275; *P. L.*, CXXXIV, 978; VON HEFELE, s. v. in *Kirchenlex.*, II; HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1896), III, 40; ID. in HERZOG-HAUCK *Real-Encyk. für prot. Theol. und Kirche* (Leipzig, 1897); PIELER, *Bruno I* (Arnsberg, 1851); MEYER, *De Brunone I* (Berlin, 1870); PFEIFFER, *Hist.-krit. Beiträge zur Geschichte Bruns I* (Cologne, 1870); STREBITZKI, *Quellenkr. Untersuch.* (Neustadt in Westpreussen, 1875); GIESEBRECHT, *Kaiserzeit* (3d ed., Brunswick, 1863), I, 321; KÖPKE AND DÜMMLER, *Kaiser Otto d. Gr.* (Leipzig, 1876), *passim;* GIESEBRECHT, *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, III, 424; MITTAG, *Die Arbeitsweise Ruotgers in der Vita Brunonis* (Berlin, 1896); *Analecta Bollandiana*, XVI, 202 and XVIII, 57; WATTENBACH, *Gesch.-Quellen* (6th ed., Berlin, 1893), I, 321; KLEINERMANNS, *Die Heiligen auf dem bischöflichen bezw. erzbischöflichen Stuhle von Köln* (Cologne, 1895–98).

GEORGE H. DERRY.

Bruno, SAINT, Bishop of Segni, in Italy, b. at Solero, Piedmont, about 1048; d. 1123. He received his preliminary education in a Benedictine monastery of his native town. After completing his studies at Bologna and receiving ordination, he was made a canon of Sienna. In appreciation of his great learning and eminent piety, he was called to Rome, where, as an able and prudent counsellor, his advice was sought by four successive popes. At a synod held in Rome in 1079 he obliged Berengarius of Tours, who denied the real presence of Our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, to retract his heresy. He enjoyed the personal friendship of Gregory VII, and was consecrated Bishop of Segni by him in the Campagna of Rome, in 1080. His humility caused him to decline the cardinalate. He is called "the brilliant defender of the Church" because of the invincible courage he evinced in aiding Gregory VII and the succeeding popes in their efforts for ecclesiastical reform, and especially in denouncing lay investiture, which he even declared to be heretical.

He accompanied Pope Urban II in 1095, to the Council of Clermont in which the First Crusade was inaugurated. In 1102 he became a monk of Monte Cassino and was elected abbot in 1107, without, however, resigning his episcopal charge. With many bishops of Italy and France, Bruno rejected the treaty known in history as the "Privilegium", which Henry V of Germany had extorted from Pope Paschal II during his imprisonment. In a letter addressed to the pope he very frankly censured him for concluding a convention which conceded to the German king in part the inadmissible claim to the right of investiture of ring and crosier upon bishops and abbots, and demanded that the treaty should be annulled. Irritated by his opposition, Paschal II commanded Bruno to give up his abbey and to return to his episcopal see. With untiring zeal he continued to labour for the welfare of his flock, as well as for the common interest of the Church at large, till his death. He was canonized by Pope Lucius III in 1183. His feast is celebrated on the 18th of July. St. Bruno was the author of numerous works, chiefly Scriptural. Of these are to be mentioned his commentaries on the Pentateuch, the Book of Job, the Psalms, the four Gospels, and the Apocalypse.

HEFELE, *Hist. of the Councils*, tr., V, 281, 299; JUNGMANN, *Diss. Hist. Eccl.*, IV, D, 23, 30; *Chevalier, Bio. bibliogr.* (Paris, 1905, 2nd ed.) s. v.

J. A. BIRKHAEUSER.

Bruno, SAINT, Confessor, ecclesiastical writer, and founder of the Carthusian Order. He was born at Cologne about the year 1030; d. 6 October, 1101. He is usually represented with a death's head in his hands, a book and a cross, or crowned with seven stars; or with a roll bearing the device *O Bonitas*. His feast is kept on the 6th of October. According to tradition, St. Bruno belonged to the family of Hartenfaust, or Hardevüst, one of the principal families of the city, and it is in remembrance of this origin that different members of the family of Hartenfaust have received from the Carthusians either some special prayers for the dead, as in the case of Peter Bruno Hartenfaust in 1714, and Louis Alexander Hartenfaust, Baron of Laach, in 1740; or a personal affiliation with the order, as with Louis Bruno of Hardevüst, Baron of Laach and Burgomaster of the town of Bergues-S. Winnoc, in the Diocese of Cambrai, with whom the Hardevüst family in the male line became extinct on 22 March, 1784.

ST. BRUNÒ (STATUE BY HOUDON IN CHURCH OF S. MARIA DEGLI ANGELI, ROME)

We have little information about the childhood and youth of St. Bruno. Born at Cologne, he would have studied at the city college, or collegial of St. Cunibert. While still quite young (*a pueris*) he went to complete his education at Reims, attracted by the reputation of the episcopal school and of its director, Heriman. There he finished his classical studies and perfected himself in the sacred sciences which at that time consisted principally of the study of Holy Scriptures and of the Fathers. He became there, according to the testimony of his contemporaries, learned both in human and in Divine science. His education completed, St. Bruno returned to Cologne, where he was provided with a canonry at St. Cunibert's, and, according to the most probable opinion, was elevated to the priestly dignity. This was about the year 1055. In 1056 Bishop Gervais recalled him to Reims, to aid his former master Heriman in the direction of the school. The latter was already turning his attention towards a more perfect form of life, and when he at last left the world to enter the religious life, in 1057, St. Bruno found himself head of the episcopal school, or *écolâtre*, a post difficult as it was elevated, for it then included the direction of the public schools and the oversight of all the educational establishments of the diocese. For about twenty years, from 1057 to 1075, he maintained the prestige which the school of Reims had attained under its former masters, Remi of Auxerre, Hucbald of St. Amand, Gerbert, and lastly Heriman. Of the excellence of his teaching we have a proof in the funereal titles composed in his honour, which celebrate his eloquence, his poetic, philosophical, and above all his exegetical and theological, talents; and also in the merits of his pupils, amongst whom were Eudes of Châtillon, afterwards Urban II, Rangier, Cardinal and Bishop of Reggio,

Robert, Bishop of Langres, and a large number of prelates and abbots.

In 1075 St. Bruno was appointed chancellor of the church of Reims, and he had then to give himself especially to the administration of the diocese. Meanwhile the pious Bishop Gervais, friend of St. Bruno, had been succeeded by Manasses de Gournai, who quickly became odious for his impiety and violence. The chancellor and two other canons were commissioned to bear to the papal legate, Hugh of Die, the complaints of the indignant clergy, and at the Council of Autun, 1077, they obtained the suspension of the unworthy prelate. The latter's reply was to raze the houses of his accusers, confiscate their goods, sell their benefices, and appeal to the pope. Bruno then absented himself from Reims for a while, and went probably to Rome to defend the justice of his cause. It was only in 1080 that a definite sentence, confirmed by a rising of the people, compelled Manasses to withdraw and take refuge with the Emperor Henry IV. Free then to choose another bishop, the clergy were on the point of uniting their vote upon the chancellor. He, however, had far different designs in view. According to a tradition preserved in the Carthusian Order, Bruno was persuaded to abandon the world by the sight of a celebrated prodigy, popularized by the brush of Lesueur—the triple resurrection of the Parisian doctor, Raymond Diocres. To this tradition may be opposed the silence of contemporaries, and of the first biographers of the saint; the silence of Bruno himself in his letter to Raoul le Vert, Provost of Reims; and the impossibility of proving that he ever visited Paris. He had no need of such an extraordinary argument to cause him to leave the world. Some time before, when in conversation with two of his friends, Raoul and Fulcius, canons of Reims like himself, they had been so enkindled with the love of God and the desire of eternal goods that they had made a vow to abandon the world and to embrace the religious life. This vow, uttered in 1077, could not be put into execution until 1080, owing to various circumstances.

The first idea of St. Bruno on leaving Reims seems to have been to place himself and his companions under the direction of an eminent solitary, St. Robert, who had recently (1075) settled at Molesme in the Diocese of Langres, together with a band of other solitaries who were later on (1098) to form the Cistercian Order. But he soon found that this was not his vocation, and after a short sojourn at Sèche-Fontaine near Molesme, he left two of his companions, Peter and Lambert, and betook himself with six others to Hugh of Châteauneuf, Bishop of Grenoble, and, according to some authors, one of his pupils. The bishop, to whom God had shown these men in a dream, under the image of seven stars, conducted and installed them himself (1084) in a wild spot on the Alps of Dauphiné named Chartreuse, about four leagues from Grenoble, in the midst of precipitous rocks and mountains almost always covered with snow. With St. Bruno were Landuin, the two Stephens of Bourg and Die, canons of St. Rufus, and Hugh the Chaplain, "all, the most learned men of their time", and two laymen, Andrew and Guerin, who afterwards became the first lay brothers. They built a little monastery where they lived in deep retreat and poverty, entirely occupied in prayer and study, and frequently honoured by the visits of St. Hugh who became like one of themselves. Their manner of life has been recorded by a contemporary, Guibert of Nogent, who visited them in their solitude. (De vitâ suâ, I, ii.)

Meanwhile, another pupil of St. Bruno, Eudes of Châtillon, had become pope under the name of Urban II (1088). Resolved to continue the work of reform commenced by Gregory VII, and being obliged to struggle against the anti-pope, Guibert of Ravenna, and the Emperor Henry IV, he sought to surround himself with devoted allies and called his ancient master *ad Sedis Apostolicæ servitium*. Thus the solitary found himself obliged to leave the spot where he had spent more than six years in retreat, followed by a part of his community, who could not make up their minds to live separated from him (1090). It is difficult to assign the place which he then occupied at the pontifical court, or his influence in contemporary events, which was entirely hidden and confidential. Lodged in the palace of the pope himself and admitted to his councils, and charged, moreover, with other collaborators, in preparing matters for the numerous councils of this period, we must give him some credit for their results. But he took care always to keep himself in the background, and although he seems to have assisted at the Council of Benevento (March, 1091), we find no evidence of his having been present at the Councils of Troja (March, 1093), of Piacenza (March, 1095), or of Clermont (November, 1095). His part in history is effaced. All that we can say with certainty is that he seconded with all his power the sovereign pontiff in his efforts for the reform of the clergy, efforts inaugurated at the Council of Melfi (1089) and continued at that of Benevento. A short time after the arrival of St. Bruno, the pope had been obliged to abandon Rome before the victorious forces of the emperor and the anti-pope. He withdrew with all his court to the south of Italy.

During the voyage, the former professor of Reims attracted the attention of the clergy of Reggio in further Calabria, which had just lost its archbishop, Arnulph (1090), and their votes were given to him. The pope and the Norman prince, Roger, Duke of Apulia, strongly approved of the election and pressed St. Bruno to accept it. In a similar juncture at Reims he had escaped by flight; this time he again escaped by causing Rangier, one of his former pupils, to be elected, who was fortunately near by at the Benedictine Abbey of La Cava near Salerno. But he feared that such attempts would be renewed; moreover he was weary of the agitated life imposed upon him, and solitude ever invited him. He begged, therefore, and after much trouble obtained, the pope's permission to return again to his solitary life. His intention was to rejoin his brethren in Dauphiné, as a letter addressed to them makes clear. But the will of Urban II kept him in Italy, near the papal court, to which he could be called at need. The place chosen for his new retreat by St. Bruno and some followers who had joined him was in the Diocese of Squillace, on the eastern slope of the great chain which crosses Calabria from north to south, and in a high valley three miles long and two in width, covered with forest. The new solitaries constructed a little chapel of planks for their pious reunions and, in the depths of the woods, cabins covered with mud for their habitations. A legend says that St. Bruno whilst at prayer was discovered by the hounds of Roger, Great Count of Sicily and Calabria and uncle of the Duke of Apulia, who was then hunting in the neighbourhood, and who thus learnt to know and venerate him; but the count had no need to wait for that occasion to know him, for it was probably upon his invitation that the new solitaries settled upon his domains. That same year (1091) he visited them, made them a grant of the lands they occupied, and a close friendship was formed between them. More than once St. Bruno went to Mileto to take part in the joys and sorrows of the noble family, to visit the count when sick (1098 and 1101), and to baptize his son Roger (1097), the future King of Sicily. But more often it was Roger who went into the desert to visit his friends, and when, through his generosity, the monastery of St. Stephen was built, in 1095, near

the hermitage of St. Mary, there was erected adjoining it a little country house at which he loved to pass the time left free from governing his State.

Meanwhile the friends of St. Bruno died one after the other: Urban II in 1099; Landuin, the prior of the Grande Chartreuse, his first companion, in 1100; Count Roger in 1101. His own time was near at hand. Before his death he gathered for the last time his brethren round him and made in their presence a profession of the Catholic Faith, the words of which have been preserved. He affirms with special emphasis his faith in the mystery of the Holy Trinity, and in the real presence of Our Saviour in the Holy Eucharist—a protestation against the two heresies which had troubled that century, the tri-theism of Roscelin, and the impanation of Berengarius. After his death, the Carthusians of Calabria, following a frequent custom of the Middle Ages by which the Christian world was associated with the death of its saints, dispatched a *rolliger*, a servant of the convent laden with a long roll of parchment, hung round his neck, who passed through Italy, France, Germany, and England. He stopped at the principal churches and communities to announce the death, and in return, the churches, communities, or chapters inscribed upon his roll, in prose or verse, the expression of their regrets, with promises of prayers. Many of these rolls have been preserved, but few are so extensive or so full of praise as that about St. Bruno. A hundred and seventy-eight witnesses, of whom many had known the deceased, celebrated the extent of his knowledge and the fruitfulness of his instruction. Strangers to him were above all struck by his great knowledge and talents. But his disciples praised his three chief virtues—his great spirit of prayer, an extreme mortification, and a filial devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Both the churches built by him in the desert were dedicated to the Blessed Virgin: Our Lady of Casalibus in Dauphiné, Our Lady Della Torre in Calabria; and, faithful to his inspirations, the Carthusian Statutes proclaim the Mother of God the first and chief patron of all the houses of the order, whoever may be their particular patron.

St. Bruno was buried in the little cemetery of the hermitage of St. Mary, and many miracles were worked at his tomb. He has never been formally canonized. His cult, authorized for the Carthusian Order by Leo X in 1514, was extended to the whole Church by Gregory XV, 17 February, 1623, as a semi-double feast, and elevated to the class of doubles by Clement X, 14 March, 1674. St. Bruno is the popular saint of Calabria; every year a great multitude resort to the Charterhouse of St. Stephen, on the Monday and Tuesday of Pentecost, when his relics are borne in procession to the hermitage of St. Mary, where he lived, and the people visit the spots sanctified by his presence. An immense number of medals are struck in his honour and distributed to the crowd, and the little Carthusian habits, which so many children of the neighbourhood wear, are blessed. He is especially invoked, and successfully, for the deliverance of those possessed.

As a writer and founder of an order, St. Bruno occupies an important place in the history of the eleventh century. He composed commentaries on the Psalms and on the Epistles of St. Paul, the former written probably during his professorship at Reims, the latter during his stay at the Grande Chartreuse if we may believe an old manuscript seen by Mabillon—"Explicit glosarius Brunonis heremitæ super Epistolas B. Pauli." Two letters of his still remain, also his profession of faith, and a short elegy on contempt for the world which shows that he cultivated poetry. The "Commentaries" disclose to us a man of learning; he knows a little Hebrew and Greek and uses it to explain, or if need be, to rectify the Vulgate; he is familiar with the Fathers, especially St. Augustine and St. Ambrose, his favourites. "His style", says Dom Rivet, "is concise, clear, nervous and simple, and his Latin as good as could be expected of that century: it would be difficult to find a composition of this kind at once more solid and more luminous, more concise and more clear". His writings have been published several times: at Paris, 1509–24; Cologne, 1611–40; Migne, Latin Patrology, CLII, CLIII, Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1891. The Paris edition of 1524 and those of Cologne include also some sermons and homilies which may be more justly attributed to St. Bruno, Bishop of Segni. The Preface of the Blessed Virgin has also been wrongly ascribed to him; it is long anterior, though he may have contributed to introduce it into the liturgy.

St. Bruno's distinction as the founder of an order was that he introduced into the religious life the mixed form, or union of the eremitical and cenobite modes of monasticism, a medium between the Camaldolese Rule and that of St. Benedict. He wrote no rule, but he left behind him two institutions which had little connexion with each other—that of Dauphiné and that of Calabria. The foundation of Calabria, somewhat like the Camaldolese, comprised two classes of religious: hermits, who had the direction of the order, and cenobites who did not feel called to the solitary life; it only lasted a century, did not rise to more than five houses, and finally, in 1191, united with the Cistercian Order. The foundation of Grenoble, more like the rule of St. Benedict, comprised only one kind of religious, subject to a uniform discipline, and the greater part of whose life was spent in solitude, without, however, the complete exclusion of the conventual life. This life spread throughout Europe, numbered 250 monasteries, and in spite of many trials continues to this day.

The great figure of St. Bruno has been often sketched by artists and has inspired more than one masterpiece: in sculpture, for example, the famous statue by Houdon, at St. Mary of the Angels in Rome. "which would speak if his rule did not compel him to silence"; in painting, the fine picture by Zurbaran, in the Seville Museum, representing Urban II and St. Bruno in conference; the Apparition of the Blessed Virgin to St. Bruno, by Guercino at Bologna; and above all the twenty-two pictures forming the gallery of St. Bruno in the museum of the Louvre, "a masterpiece of Le Sueur and of the French school".

Le Couteulx, *Annales Ord. Cart.*, I; Tromby, *Storia del Sto Patriarca S. Brunone*, I, II; *Acta SS.*, 6 October; Zanotti, *Storia di S. Brunone* (Bologna, 1741); Lefebvre, *Saint Bruno et L'Ordre des Chartreux* (Paris, 1883); *Vie de Saint Bruno, par un religieux de la Grande Chartreuse* (Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1898); Tappert, *Der heilige Bruno* (Luxemburg, 1872); Löbbel, *Der Stifter des Carthäuser Ordens* (Münster, 1899); *La Grande Chartreuse par un Chartreux* (1896).

Ambrose Mougel.

Bruno, Giordano, Italian philosopher, b. at Nola in Campania, in the Kingdom of Naples, in 1548; d. at Rome, 1600. At the age of eleven he went to Naples, to study "humanity, logic, and dialectic", and, four years later, he entered the Order of St. Dominic, giving up his worldly name of Filippo and taking that of Giordano. He made his novitiate at Naples and continued to study there. In 1572 he was ordained priest. It seems, however, that, even as a novice, he attracted attention by the originality of his views and by his outspoken criticism of accepted theological doctrines. After his ordination things reached such a pass that, in 1576, formal accusation of heresy was brought against him. Thereupon he went to Rome, but, apparently, did not mend his manner of speaking of the mysteries of faith; for the accusations were renewed against him at the convent of the Minerva. Within a few months of

his arrival he fled the city and cast off all allegiance to his order. From this point on, his life-story is the tale of his wanderings from one country to another and of his failure to find peace anywhere. He tarried awhile in several Italian cities, and in 1579 went to Geneva, where he seems to have adopted the Calvinist faith, although afterwards, before the ecclesiastical tribunal at Venice, he steadfastly denied that he had ever joined the Reformed Church. This much at least is certain; he was excommunicated by the Calvinist Council on account of his disrespectful attitude towards the heads of that Church and was obliged to leave the city. Thence he went to Toulouse, Lyons, and (in 1581) to Paris.

At Lyons he completed his "Clavis Magna", or "Great Key" to the art of remembering. In Paris he published several works which further developed his art of memory-training and revealed the two-fold influence of Raymond Lully and the neo-Platonists. In 1582 he published a characteristic work, "Il candelaio", or "The Torchbearer", a satire in which he exhibits in a marked degree the false taste then in vogue among the humanists, many of whom mistook obscenity for humour. While at Paris he lectured publicly on philosophy, under the auspices, as it seems, of the College of Cambrai, the forerunner of the College of France. In 1583 he crossed over to England, and, for a time at least, enjoyed the favour of Queen Elizabeth and the friendship of Sir Philip Sidney. To the latter he dedicated the most bitter of his attacks on the Catholic Church, "Il spaccio della bestia trionfante", "The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast", published in 1584. He visited Oxford, and, on being refused the privilege of lecturing there, he published (1584) his "Cena delle ceneri", or "Ash-Wednesday Supper", in which he attacked the Oxford professors, saying that they knew more about beer than about Greek. In 1585 he returned to France, and during the year which he spent in Paris at this time made several attempts to become reconciled to the Catholic Church, all of which failed because of his refusal to accept the condition imposed, namely, that he should return to his order.

In Germany, whither he went in 1587, he showed the same spirit of insolent self-assertion as at Oxford. In Helmstadt he was excommunicated by the Lutherans. After some time spent in literary activity at Frankfort, he went, in 1591, to Venice at the invitation of Mocenigo, who professed to be interested in his system of memory-training. Failing to obtain from Bruno the secret of his "natural magic", Mocenigo denounced him to the Inquisition. Bruno was arrested, and in his trial before the Venetian inquisitors first took refuge in the principle of "two-fold truth", saying that the errors imputed to him were held by him "as a philosopher, and not as an honest Christian"; later, however, he solemnly abjured all his errors and doubts in the matter of Catholic doctrine and practice (Berti, Docum., XII, 22 and XIII, 45). At this point the Roman Inquisition intervened and requested his extradition. After some hesitation the Venetian authorities agreed, and in February, 1593, Bruno was sent to Rome, and for six years was kept in the prison of the Inquisition. Historians have striven in vain to discover the explanation of this long delay on the part of the Roman authorities. In the spring of 1599, the trial was begun before a commission of the Roman Inquisition, and, after the accused had been granted several terms of respite in which to retract his errors, he was finally condemned (January, 1600), handed over to the secular power (8 February), and burned at the stake in the Campo dei Fiori in Rome (17 February). Bruno was not condemned for his defence of the Copernican system of astronomy, nor for his doctrine of the plurality of inhabited worlds, but for his theological errors, among which were the following: that Christ was not God but merely an unusually skilful magician, that the Holy Ghost is the soul of the world, that the Devil will be saved, etc.

To the works of Bruno already mentioned the following are to be added: "Della causa, principio ed uno"; "Dell' infinito universo e dei mondi"; "De Compendiosâ Architecturâ"; "De Triplici Minimo"; "De Monade, Numero et Figurâ". In these "the Nolan" expounds a system of philosophy in which the principal elements are neo-Platonism, materialistic monism, rational mysticism (after the manner of Raymond Lully), and the naturalistic concept of the unity of the material world (inspired by the Copernican astronomy). His attitude towards Aristotle is best illustrated by his reiterated assertion that the natural philosophy of the Stagirite is vitiated by the predominance of the dialectical over the mathematical mode of conceiving natural phenomena. Towards the Scholastics in general his feeling was one of undisguised contempt; he excepted, however, Albert the Great and St. Thomas, for whom he always maintained a high degree of respect. He wished to reform the Aristotelean philosophy, and yet he was bitterly opposed to his contemporaries, Ramus and Patrizzi, whose efforts were directed towards the same object. He was acquainted, though only in a superficial way, with the writings of the pre-Socratic philosophers of Greece, and with the works of the neo-Platonists, especially with the books falsely attributed to Iamblichus and Plotinus. From the neo-Platonists he derived the tendency of his thought towards monism. From the pre-Socratic philosophers he borrowed the materialistic interpretation of the One. From the Copernican doctrine, which was attracting so much attention in the century in which he lived, he learned to identify the material One with the visible, infinite, heliocentric universe.

Thus, his system of thought is an incoherent materialistic pantheism. God and the world are one; matter and spirit, body and soul, are two phases of the same substance; the universe is infinite; beyond the visible world there is an infinity of other worlds, each of which is inhabited; this terrestrial globe has a soul; in fact, each and every part of it, mineral as well as plant and animal, is animated; all matter is made up of the same elements (no distinction between terrestrial and celestial matter); all souls are akin (transmigration is, therefore, not impossible). This unitary point of view is Bruno's justification of "natural magic". No doubt, the attempt to establish a scientific continuity among all the phenomena of nature is an important manifestation of the modern spirit, and interesting, especially on account of its appearance at the moment when the medieval point of view was being abandoned. And one can readily understand how Bruno's effort to establish a unitary concept of nature commanded the admiration of such men as Spinoza, Jacobi, and Hegel. On the other hand, the exaggerations, the limitations, and the positive errors of his scientific system; his intolerance of even those who were working for the reforms to which he was devoted; the false analogies, fantastic allegories, and sophistical reasonings into which his emotional fervour often betrayed him have justified, in the eyes of many, Bayle's characterization of him as "the knight-errant of philosophy". His attitude of mind towards religious truth was that of a rationalist. Personally, he failed to feel any of the vital significance of Christianity as a religious system. It was not a Roman Inquisitor, but a Protestant divine, who said of him that he was "a man of great capacity, with infinite knowledge, but not a trace of religion".

The latest edition of Bruno's works is by Tocco, *Opere latine di G. B.* (Florence, 1889); *Opere inedite* (Naples, 1891); (Leipzig, 1829, 1830). See also: McIntyre, *Giordano Bruno* (London and New York, 1903); Frith, *Life of G. B.* (London and Boston, 1887); Adamson in *Development of Modern Philosophy* (London, 1903), II, 23–44; Höffding, *Hist. of Modern Philosophy*, tr. Meyer (London, 1900), I, 110 sqq.; Stöckl, *Gesch. der Phil. des Mittelalters* (Mainz, 1866), III, 106 sqq.; Turner, *Hist. of Phil.* (Boston, 1903), 429 sqq.

William Turner.

Bruno of Querfurt (also called Brun and Boniface), Saint, second Apostle of the Prussians and martyr, b. about 970; d. 14 February, 1009. He is generally represented with a hand cut off, and is commemorated on 15 October. Bruno was a member of the noble family of Querfurt and is commonly said to have been a relative of the Emperor Otto III, although Hefele (in Kirchenlex., II, s. v. Bruno) emphatically denies this. When hardly six years old he was sent to Archbishop Adalbert of Magdeburg to be educated and had the learned Geddo as his teacher in the cathedral school. He was a well-behaved, industrious scholar; while still a lad he was made a canon of the cathedral. The fifteen-year-old Otto III became attached to Bruno, made him one of his court, and took him to Rome when the young emperor went there in 996 to be crowned. At Rome Bruno became acquainted with St. Adalbert, Archbishop of Prague, who was murdered a year later by the pagan Prussians to whom he had gone as a missionary. After Adalbert's death Bruno was filled with an intense desire for martyrdom. He spent much of his time in the monastery on the Aventine where Adalbert had become a monk, and where Abbot Johannes Canaparius wrote a life of Adalbert. Bruno, however, did not enter the monastic life here, but in the monastery of Pereum, an island in the swamps near Ravenna.

Pereum was under the rule of the founder of the Camaldoli reform, St. Romuald, a saint who had great influence over the Emperor Otto III. Under the guidance of St. Romuald Bruno underwent a severe ascetic training; it included manual work, fasting all the week except Sunday and Thursday, night vigils, and scourging on the bare back; in addition Bruno suffered greatly from fever. He found much pleasure in the friendship of a brother of the same age as himself, Benedict of Benevento, who shared his cell and who was one with him in mind and spirit. The Emperor Otto III desired to convert the lands between the Elbe and the Oder, which were occupied by Slavs, to Christianity, and to plant colonies there. He hoped to attain these ends through the aid of a monastery to be founded in this region by some of the most zealous of Romuald's pupils. In 1001, therefore, Benedict and another brother of the same monastery, Johannes, went, laden with gifts from the emperor, to Poland, where they were well received by the Christian Duke Boleslas, who taught them the language of his people. During this time Bruno studied the language in Italy, where he remained with Otto and awaited the Apostolic appointment by the pope. Sylvester II made him archbishop over the heathen and gave him the pallium, but left the consecration to the Archbishop of Magdeburg, who had the supervision of the mission to the Slavs. Quitting Rome in 1003, Bruno was consecrated in February, 1004, by Archbishop Tagino of Magdeburg and gave his property for the founding of a monastery. As war had broken out between the Emperor Henry II and the Polish Duke, Bruno was not able to go at once to Poland; so, starting from Ratisbon on the Danube, he went into Hungary, where St. Adalbert had also laboured. Here he finished his life of St. Adalbert, a literary memorial of much worth.

Bruno sought to convert the Hungarian ruler Achtum and his principality of "Black-Hungary", but he met with so much opposition, including that of the Greek monks, that success was impossible. In December, 1007, he went to Russia. Here the Grand duke Vladimir entertained him for a month and then gave him a territory extending to the possessions of the Petschenegen, who lived on the Black Sea between the Danube and the Don. This was considered the fiercest and most cruel of the heathen tribes. Bruno spent five months among them, baptized some thirty adults, aided in bringing about a treaty of peace with Russia, and left in that country one of his companions whom he had consecrated bishop. About the middle of the year 1008 he returned to Poland and there consecrated a bishop for Sweden. While in Poland he heard that his friend Benedict and four companions had been killed by robbers on 11 May, 1003. Making use of the accounts of eyewitnesses, he wrote the touching history of the lives and death of the so-called five Polish brothers. Towards the end of 1008 he wrote a memorable, but ineffectual, letter to the Emperor Henry II, exhorting him to show clemency and to conclude a peace with Boleslas of Poland. Near the close of this same year, accompanied by eighteen companions, he went to found a mission among the Prussians; but the soil was not fruitful, and Bruno and his companions travelled towards the borders of Russia, preaching courageously as they went. On the borders of Russia they were attacked by the heathen, and the whole company were murdered, Bruno with great composure meeting death by decapitation. Duke Boleslas bought the bodies of the slain and had them brought to Poland. It is said that the city of Braunsberg is named after St. Bruno.

Soon after the time of their death St. Bruno and his companions were reverenced as martyrs. Little value is to be attached to a legendary account of the martyrdom by a certain Wipert. Bruno's fellow-pupil, Dithmar, or Thietmar, Bishop of Merseburg, gives a brief account of him in his Chronicle, VI, 58.

The writings, already referred to, of Bruno himself; *Acta SS.*, 14 February; Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 19 June; Giesebrecht, *Deutsche Kaiserzeit*, II; *Histor. Jahrbuch* (1892), XIII; Kolberg, *Der hl. Bruno von Querfurt* (Braunsberg, 1884); *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (Freiburg im Br., 1897), LIII.

Gabriel Meier.

Bruno the Saxon (Saxonicus), a German chronicler of the eleventh century and author of the "Historia de Bello Saxonico". Little is known of his life. He was apparently a Saxon monk belonging to the household of Archbishop Werner, of Magdeburg, who was a vigorous opponent of Henry IV and one of the leaders of the Saxon uprising against the emperor. After the death of the archbishop in 1078 at the hands of peasants, Bruno attached himself to Werner, Bishop of Merseburg, to whom, in 1082, he dedicated the work, "De Bello Saxonico", by which he is chiefly known. As its name indicates, it is a record of the struggles of the Saxons with the Emperor Henry IV. The author begins with an account of the youth of Henry and the evil influence exerted over him by Adalbert of Bremen after he had passed from the stern tutelage of Anno, Archbishop of Cologne. He then traces the relations of the emperor with the Saxons and narrates at length the causes and events of the rebellion, ending with the election of Hermann of Luxemburg as king in 1081.

There has been a difference of opinion regarding the historical value of Bruno's work. It was written during the contentions between Henry and Gregory VII, and the author has been classed with those partisans who, either through ignorance or malice, endeavoured to lower Henry in the esteem of his subjects (Stenzel). Bruno indeed supported the pope's cause, and his Saxon sympathies manifest themselves at times in his writings, but of his sincerity and his expressed purpose to narrate the truth there can be no doubt. He made the most of his

sources of information and, in spite of occasional omissions, gives a vivid picture of the times from the point of view of an interested contemporary. The letters of the Saxon bishops and other original documents which he includes in his history give an added value to the work. The text of the "De Bello Saxonico" is given in the "Monum. Germ. Hist." (Pertz, Hanover, 1848), V, 327–384. A German translation, with an introduction, was published by W. Wattenbach (Berlin, 1853). For an extended, though not unbiased, history of the time, cf. Stenzel, "Geschichte Deutschlands unter den fränkischen Kaisern" (Leipzig, 1827).

WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (6th ed., Berlin, 1893), II, 86–88.

HENRY M. BROCK.

Brunswick (BRAUNSCHWEIG), a duchy situated in the mountainous central part of Northern Germany, comprising the region of the Harz mountains. Territorially the duchy is not a unit, but parcelled into three large, and six smaller, sections. Both in extent of territory and in population it ranks tenth among the confederated states of the German Empire. The inhabitants are of the Lower Saxon race. The census of 1900 enumerated 464,333 inhabitants. Of these 432,570 were Lutherans, 4406 Reformed, 24,175 Catholics, and 1824 Jews. The Government is a constitutional monarchy, hereditary in the male line of the House of Brunswick-Lüneburg. The elder line having become extinct in 1884 by the death of Duke Wilhelm, the younger line, represented by the Duke of Cumberland, should have succeeded to the throne. For political reasons, however, Prussia objected to his taking possession, and by decree of the Bundesrat he was excluded. The present regent, chosen by the legislature, is Duke Johann Albrecht of Mecklenburg. Agriculture, industries, and commerce are highly developed in the duchy. It is stated that the first potatoes raised in Germany were planted in Brunswick from five of the tubers brought to Europe by Francis Drake. The town Brunswick (*Brunonis vicus*, Bruno's village), which has given its name to the duchy, was founded in the second half of the ninth century. The country was part of the allodial lands of Henry the Lion. After his defeat and exile in 1180, he lost all his possessions. Brunswick, however, was restored to his grandson Otto, who was made first Duke of Brunswick by Frederick II. In the fourteenth century the town became a centre of the Hanseatic League, as well as of the confederation of the Lower Saxon towns.

Christianity dates from Charlemagne's conquest of the Saxon country of which Brunswick is a part. Charlemagne found and destroyed an ancient German idol in the place where now Brunswick stands. At Kissenbrück many of the conquered Saxons were baptized. During the Middle Ages the country was partly under the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Halberstadt, partly under that of Hildesheim. At the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century St. Ludger laboured in the neighbourhood of Helmstedt, where he founded a monastery. The pious Duke of Eastphalia and his devout wife founded, in 852, the monastery of Brunshausen, near Gandersheim, for Benedictine nuns, where his daughter Hathumod was first abbess. It was her brother Bruno who some years later founded the town of Brunswick. When, in 881, the church and monastery of Gandersheim were completed, the community was transferred thither, under the abbess Gerberga, sister of Hathumod. This monastery reached its highest point of prosperity in the tenth century, as is shown by the life of Hrotswitha, the celebrated "nun of Gandersheim", who sang the praises of Otto the Great and wrote Latin comedies after the manner of Terence. Other Benedictine monasteries founded in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were Steterburg, Lutter, and Clus. The great Cistercian Order also flourished in Brunswick. The three monasteries of Amelungsborn, Marienthal, and Riddaghausen were founded in the twelfth century. The Augustinians also had a monastery for men and one for women at Helmstedt.

In the town of Brunswick religion flourished from an early period. Among the older monasteries should be mentioned St. Blasius and St. Cyriacus, also the Benedictine monastery built in honour of St. Autor, whose relics were brought from Trier, and who became the patron saint of the town. In the twelfth century Henry the Lion did much for his town of Brunswick. He rebuilt some monasteries and erected several churches. The Franciscans made a foundation in the town in the thirteenth, the Dominicans, early in the fourteenth, century. The town also possessed several hospitals and Beguinages. Mention must here be made of the great reform of monasteries which was wrought in North Germany in the fifteenth century. The celebrated reformer of monasteries, Johannes Busch, canon regular of Windesheim, extended his beneficent labours to Brunswick. The Benedictine Congregation of Bursfeld, which at the end of the fifteenth century counted 142 monasteries, may be said to have sprung from the monastery of Clus near Gandersheim. (See BURSFELD.)

With regard to the religious revolution of the sixteenth century it will be necessary to consider the town of Brunswick separately. It was a proud and rich town and had long sought to make itself independent of the authority of its dukes. Hence the revolutionary doctrines of the Reformers were readily accepted by the townsmen. Lutheranism was introduced as early as 1521, and firmly established by Bugenhagen in 1528, not without ruthless fanaticism. In the country, however, Duke Henry's authority prevailed, and the Reformers gained no foothold until 1542, when, owing to the victory of the Smalkaldic League, the duke fell into captivity, Bugenhagen was recalled, and the external observance of the new religion was forced upon the people with much violence and cruelty. When Henry recovered his duchy, in 1547, he re-established the Catholic religion. His son and successor made the whole district Lutheran, and it has since remained a Protestant stronghold. Duke Julius did not destroy all the monasteries, but allowed many of them to persist as so-called Protestant convents. Among these was the once celebrated Gandersheim which was only suppressed during the general spoliation and secularization of 1802. Prominent among the Dukes of Brunswick in post-Reformation times is Anton Ulrich, said to have been the most learned prince of his time, a patron of the arts and sciences, himself a poet, and a student of the early Fathers. He took a lively interest in the movement for the reconciliation of the Protestant sects with the Church, the same movement with which Leibniz was identified. Early in 1710 the duke abjured Protestantism and a few months later published his "Fifty Reasons Why the Catholic Church is Preferable to Protestantism". (See Räss, Convertiten, IX.) Two of his daughters followed him into the Catholic Church. The only result of his conversion so far as the duchy was concerned was his erection of two Catholic churches, one in Brunswick, the other in Wolfenbüttel, to which according to his desire Franciscan Fathers were appointed.

Pope Gregory XVI placed the Catholics of the Duchy of Brunswick under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Hildesheim. They are merely tolerated in the duchy. The Constitution of 1832, it is true, granted liberty of conscience and the right of public worship, but subjected all churches to the "super-

vision of the Government", that is to say, of the Lutheran church authorities. The Law of 1848 brought little relief to the Catholics. No ecclesiastical ordinance or pontifical constitution may be published without the government's *placet;* all Catholic congregations were incorporated in Protestant parishes. This last intolerable law was abolished in 1867 for three Catholic parishes, henceforth recognized as such by the State, viz., Brunswick, Wolfenbüttel, and Helmstedt, all the others remaining parts of Protestant parishes. Catholic priests (with the three aforesaid exceptions) may not perform baptisms, marriages, or hold funeral services without giving previous notice to the Protestant pastor and obtaining his leave. And no priest, unless duly recognized by the State, may perform any ecclesiastical function without falling under the penalty of the law. Non-recognized priests are even fined for conferring baptism in case of necessity, and for administering the last sacraments. The same intolerance prevails with regard to schools and the education of children of mixed marriages. The State contributes nothing towards the support of Catholic worship. In the year 1864 a law was passed abolishing *Stolgebühren*, i. e. all perquisites and fees received by the priest for certain ecclesiastical functions, such as marriages and funerals, which had previously to be handed over to the Protestant pastor. The general statement, therefore, in the "Kirchenlexicon", that the law of 1867 has rendered the condition of the Catholics in the Duchy of Brunswick "wholly satisfactory", needs recension; it must be restricted to the three above-named parishes; in the rest of the duchy the condition of Catholics is far from satisfactory. It is for this reason that the Centre Party in the Reichstag has brought in the Toleration Bill, which, if carried, would sweep away all Catholic disabilities throughout the empire, in Brunswick as well as in Mecklenburg, and in the Kingdom of Saxony.

DANIEL, *Handbuch der Geographie* (5th ed., Leipzig), IV, 568–82; BRÜCK, *Geschichte der kath. Kirche in Deutschland im 19. Jahrh.* (Mainz and Kirchheim), III; WOKER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; JANSSEN-PASTOR, *Gesch. des deutsch. Volkes* (18th ed., Freiburg), III, Bk. II, xvii; IV, Bk. II, viii, Bk. III, xi; *Staatslexikon* (2nd ed.), I, s. v. *Konversations-Lex.* (3d ed., Freiburg), s. v.

B. GULDNER.

Brus, ANTON, Archbishop of Prague, b. at Müglitz in Moravia, 13 February, 1518; d. 28 August, 1580. After receiving his education at Prague he joined the Knights of the Cross with the Red Star, an ecclesiastical order established in Bohemia in the thirteenth century. After his ordination to the priesthood Emperor Ferdinand appointed him chaplain of the Austrian army, in which capacity he served during the Turkish war (1542–45). He was elected Grand Master General of his order in 1552, when he was only 34 years of age. In 1558 he became Bishop of Vienna; in 1561 the emperor made him Archbishop of Prague, a see which had remained vacant since 1421 when Archbishop Conrad abandoned his flock and entered the Hussite camp. During the intervening years the archdiocese was governed by administrators elected by the cathedral chapter. Before Archbishop Brus took possession of his see, Emperor Ferdinand I, who was also King of Bohemia, sent him as Bohemian legate to the Council of Trent (1562). Besides other ecclesiastical reforms, he urged the archbishop to advocate the expediency of permitting the Utraquists, or Calixtines, of Bohemia and adjoining countries to receive the Holy Eucharist under both species; he hoped that after this concession many of the Utraquists would return to the Catholic Church. The archbishop was ably assisted in his endeavours by the imperial delegate from Hungary, Bishop George Draskovich of Fünfkirchen (Pécs), and by Baumgärtner, the delegate of Duke Albrecht V of Bavaria. Brus could not be present at the twenty-first and the twenty-second sessions of the Council, during which this petition of the emperor was discussed. The majority of the fathers of Trent considered it beyond their power to grant the privilege of lay communion under both kinds and referred the matter to Pope Pius IV, who, in a Brief dated 16 April, 1564, granted the petition, with certain restrictions, to the subjects of the emperor and of Duke Albrecht of Bavaria. The Archbishop of Prague was to empower certain priests to administer the Holy Eucharist in both kinds to such of the laity as desired it. The faithful who wished to take advantage of this privilege were obliged to profess their belief in the Real Presence of the whole Christ in each species, while the priest at the administration of each species pronounced the formula: "Corpus *et sanguis* Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiant animam tuam in vitam æternam. Amen." in stead of the customary formula: "Corpus Domini nostri," etc.

The emperor and the archbishop expected great results from this papal concession. Thinking that the Utraquist consistory at Prague would at once accept all Catholic doctrine, the emperor put it under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. Both, however, were soon undeceived. The Utraquist consistory was ready to present its sacerdotal candidates to the archbishop for ordination, but there his authority was to end. They refused to permit their candidates for the priesthood to undergo an examination on Catholic theology or to give proof of their orthodoxy, and complained to the emperor that the archbishop was infringing upon their rights.

Had Ferdinand not died at this critical moment, the papal concession would perhaps have produced some salutary effects, but under the weak rule of his son Maximilian, who became emperor in 1564, the gulf that separated the Catholics from the Utraquists was continually widening. In order to publish and put into execution the decrees of the Council of Trent, the archbishop intended to convene a provincial synod at Prague; but Maximilian, fearing to offend the Bohemian nobility, of whom the majority were Protestants, withheld his consent. Hampered on all sides, the archbishop and the small body of Catholic nobles, despite their almost superhuman efforts, could only postpone the impending crisis. The Utraquists no longer heeded the archbishop's commands, continued to administer the Holy Eucharist to infants, disregarded many decrees of the Council of Trent, neglected sacramental confession—in a word, were steering straight towards Protestantism. After 1572, the archbishop refused to ordain Utraquist candidates, despite the expostulations of Emperor Maximilian. The death of Maximilian (12 October, 1576) brought no relief to the archbishop and his ever-decreasing flock of Catholics. His successor, Emperor Rudolph II, though a good Catholic at heart, was as weak as his predecessor. After the death of Brus the Catholics of Bohemia continued on their downward course until the victory of Ferdinand II over the *Winterkönig* Frederick V at the White Mountain near Prague (8 November, 1620).

FRIND, *Geschichte der Bischöfe und Erzbischöfe von Prag* (Prague, 1873), 182–189; BOROWÝ in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; biography in *Oesterreichische Vierteljahrschrift für kath. Theologie* (Vienna, 1874).

MICHAEL OTT.

Brusa, a titular see of Bithynia in Asia Minor. According to Strabo, XII, iv, the city was founded by King Prusias, who carried on war with Crœsus; according to Stephanus Byzantius, by another Prusias, contemporary of Cyrus, so that it would have been founded in the sixth century B. C. It is more probable that it was founded by, and was named after, Prusias, King of Bithynia and Hannibal's friend, 237–192 B. C. Situated in a beautiful, well-watered,

fertile plain at the foot of Mount Olympus, it became one of the chief cities of Roman Bithynia and received at an early date the Christian teaching. At least three of its bishops, Sts. Alexander, Patritius, and Timothy, suffered martyrdom during the persecutions (Lequien, I, 615–620, numbers only twenty-two bishops to 1721, but this list might be increased easily). The see was first subject to Nicomedia, metropolis of Bithynia Prima; later, as early at least as the thirteenth century, it became an exempt archbishopric. In the neighbouring country and at the foot of Mount Olympus stood many monasteries; from the eighth to the fourteenth century it shared with Mount Athos the honour of being a principal centre of Greek monachism. In 1327 it was taken by Sultan Orkhan after a siege of ten years and remained the capital of the Ottoman Empire till 1453. Brusa is to-day the chief town of the Vilayet of Khodavendighiar. It is celebrated for its numerous and beautiful mosques and tombs of the Sultans. Its mineral and thermal waters are still renowned. The silk-worm is cultivated throughout the neighbouring territory; there are in the town more than fifty silk-mills. Brusa has about 80,000 inhabitants, of whom 6000 are Greeks, 9000 Gregorian Armenians, 2500 Jews, 800 Catholic Armenians, 200 Latins, and a few Protestants. The Assumptionists conduct the Latin parish and a college. The Sisters of Charity have a hospital, an orphans' institute, and a school. Brusa is still a metropolis for the Greeks. It is also a bishopric for Gregorian and Catholic Armenians; the latter number about 4000. S. Vailhé.

Brussels (from *Bruk Sel*, marsh-castle; Flem. *Brussel*, Ger. *Brüssel*, Fr. *Bruxelles*), capital of the Kingdom of Belgium. Its population at the end of 1905 (including the eight distinct communes that make up its faubourgs or suburbs) was 612,401. The city grew up on the banks of the little River Senne, one of the affluents of the Scheldt, whose course through the old town is now arched over and covered by the inner boulevards. The medieval city gained steadily in importance, owing to its position on the main inland commercial highway between the chief commercial centres of the Low Countries and Cologne. It is now connected with the Sambre by the Charleroi Canal, and with the Scheldt by the Willebroek Canal which has been considerably enlarged since 1901 and is destined to justify the title of "seaport" that Brussels has borne since 1895.

History.—The earliest settlement of Brussels is attributed by tradition to S. Géry (*Gaugericus*), Bishop of Cambrai at the end of the sixth century; he is said to have built a village on an island in the Senne (Place Saint-Géry), also a small chapel ("Analecta Bollandiana" 1888, VII, 387–398; L. Van der Essen, "Les 'Vitæ' des saints mérovingiens", Louvain, 1907; R. Flahault, "Notes et documents relatifs au culte de S. Géry", Dunkerque, 1890). From the eighth century it was one of the villas or temporary residences of the Frankish kings, but is first mentioned in history towards the end of the ninth century as *Brosella* (dwelling on the marsh). It was later a part of the dower of Gerberga, sister of Emperor Otto the Great (936–973) on her marriage to Giselbert of Lorraine. Duke Charles of Lorraine, the last of Charlemagne's descendants in the direct line, is said to have been born at Brussels. He certainly made it his chief place of abode, and brought thither from the Abbey of Mortzelle, which had fallen into the hands of a robber chief, the bones of his kinswoman, St. Gudule (979), who has ever since been regarded as the patron saint of the town.

Upon the death of Charles' only son Otto (1012) without direct heirs, the castles of Brussels, Vilvord, Louvain, and all the adjoining estates, the nucleus of the territory which later on formed the Duchy of Brabant, fell to his brother-in-law Lambert Balderic, who sometimes in his charters styles himself Count of Brussels and sometimes Count of Louvain, the man to whom the Dukes of Brabant traced their descent. There remain of the Brussels of this period the nave and aisles of the old parish church of St. Nicholas, the chapel of the Holy Cross in the church of Notre-Dame de La Chapelle, some fragments of the fortifications with which Lambert Balderic surrounded the city in 1040, and, most important of all, the subterranean church of St. Guy at Anderlecht which remains to-day as the builder planned it.

From the twelfth century the Dukes of Lower Lorraine and Brabant, and later the Counts of Louvain, made Brussels their residence and though it suffered, like most medieval cities, from pestilence, fire, and pillage, it grew to be a populous centre of life and commerce and followed all the vicissitudes of medieval Brabant, with which it fell to the Dukes of Burgundy, and on the death of Charles the Bold (1477) to his heirs, the Austrian Hapsburgs. In the fifteenth century the Dukes of Burgundy, heirs of both Brabant and Flanders, held court at Brussels, and being French in speech and habits and surrounded by French knights, courtiers, and civil servants, gradually introduced at Brussels and elsewhere the French language until it became the speech of the local nobility and the upper classes, much to the detriment of the native Flemish. The latter, however, held its own among the common people and the burghers, and remains yet the speech of the majority of the citizens. Charles V made Brussels the capital of the Low Countries, but under Philip II, it was always a centre of patriotic opposition to Spanish rule. In 1577 was signed the peace known as the "Brussels Union" between the Spanish authority and the rebellious Belgians; in 1585 the city was besieged and captured by the Spanish general Alessandro Farnese.

In 1695 it was almost entirely consumed by fire on occasion of the siege by Marêchal Villeroi. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was under Austrian rule, with brief exceptions. From 1794 to 1814 it was incorporated with France by Napoleon, as head of the department of the Dyle. In the latter year it became with The Hague a capital of the new Kingdom of the Netherlands. In 1830 it was the seat of the Belgian Revolution against Dutch misrule, and in the same year was made the capital of the new Kingdom of Belgium. (See Belgium.)

Government.—The municipal organization of Brussels was at first of a very simple character. It consisted of an unpaid magistracy, a College of Aldermen appointed by the sovereign for life from among the chief freeholders of the city, of which they were held to be representatives. It was presided over by a paid officer who bore the title of *Amman*, was the direct delegate of the sovereign and in all things the representative of his authority. Alongside the College of Aldermen was the Merchants' Guild. Probably this corporation had legal existence before the institution of the magistracy; it is certain that by the end of the twelfth century it was firmly established. It exercised from the first much influence on public affairs, and contributed in great measure to the full expansion of municipal self-rule. With the increase of the population, the old machinery no longer sufficed for the maintenance of public peace and the regulation of trade, and the burghers, united as they were in the powerful organization of their guild, were strong enough to take the matter into their own hands. Hence was formed the Council of Jurors, a subsidiary body annually elected by the people for policing the city and managing municipal affairs. The members also participated with the College of Aldermen in the administration of justice. Though there is no record of the Council of Jurors be-

fore 1229, it is almost certain that it dates from a much earlier period. Its existence, however, as a body distinct from the higher magistracy, was not of long duration. It disappeared at a very early period. From the first the relations between the two corporations had been strained, as they were the embodiment of hostile ideals, oligarchy, and popular rule.

For a long period after the municipal organization of Brussels had been definitely determined, all administration and legislative power was in the hands of a narrow oligarchy of capitalists, headed by the patrician families which from time immemorial had furnished the members of the magistracy. The source of their title to distinction was the ownership of land. Together they formed a class apart, distinct alike from the feudal nobility and from the general body of townsmen. They were divided into seven groups, or *Lignages*, but it is certain that many patricians were not the direct lineal descendants of the houses whose names and arms they bore. Admission to the aristocracy and to different *lignages* was to be obtained in various ways. Indeed, the *lignages* of Brussels were to a certain extent voluntary associations of aristocratic families banded together for the sake of mutual protection, and with a view to securing the election of their own nominees to the magistracy. What the trade companies were to the plebeians, the *lignages* were to the patricians.

The patricians were not all rich men, but the wealth of the patrician body was being constantly augmented by the new members who gained admission into its ranks, and with the increasing prosperity of the town land was becoming daily more valuable for building purposes. Many were thus able to live in luxury on the rents produced by their property; others increased their revenues by farming the state taxes; others were engaged in banking operations; others again in commerce, in which case they became members of the Merchants' Guild, the members of which were constantly being enrolled in the *lignages*. Thus the Guild was growing daily more aristocratic, until at last nearly all its members were patricians by birth or by adoption. Embracing as it did at first traders of every kind, it now became an exceedingly close corporation and admitted to its membership only the sellers of cloth and the sellers of wool, the cream of the commercial world. Such were the men who owned the soil of Brussels, who had endowed the city, often at their own cost, with magnificent public buildings, who had won for themselves free institutions, and who for the best part of 200 years tyrannized over everyone else. They wrested from religious houses their right of appointment to city livings; they withdrew the management of schools from the clergy and placed them under municipal control. By a special privilege of the Holy See no new monastery could be founded in Brussels without the authorization of the municipality. The tyranny aroused discontent.

The people first attempted to obtain a share in the government during the troublous times which followed the death of Duke Henry III (1260), and it seems to have been for the moment successful, for the Council of Jurors was re-established, only however to be suppressed again a few years later, and that was doubtless the cause of the rising which took place in 1302. It was not a very serious affair, and the ruling class with the aid of the sovereign had little difficulty in suppressing it. The riot which occurred on the eve of Candlemas, 1306, during the absence of Duke John II, though it rose out of a small matter, became a revolution. The party which triumphed showed singular moderation; it was decided that the magistracy should consist as heretofore of seven members, but that henceforth the people should name them; that two financial assessors should be added to the city council, and that the Council of Jurors should be re-established; the new aldermen were all members of the old ruling class chosen from among the little band of patricians whose sympathies were sure to be with the popular cause. The new constitution did not, however, last six months. Duke John II on his return to Brussels refused to ratify it, and in spite of the energetic resistance of the craftsmen, the old order of things was re-established. The duke, however, gave discretionary powers to the College of Aldermen to admit individual craftsmen to the freedom of the city, no doubt to purchase the good will of leading plebeians. Fifty years later Duke Wenceslaus, to reward the plebeians for driving the Flemings out of Brussels, and to mark his displeasure at the conduct of the patricians who had welcomed them with open arms, granted to the trade companies by charter an equal share with the *lignages* in the government of the city. But the ink of the new charter was hardly dry when he revoked it. It is not known why, but as Duke Wenceslaus throughout his reign was always in financial straits and considering his shifty conduct in his dealings with the opposing factions at Louvain it is not unlikely that he had been purchased by the patricians. The riot which followed was suppressed without much difficulty.

Though the College of Aldermen was annually renewed for more than 100 years, there had been no election, the outgoing aldermen having obtained a prescriptive right to name their successors; the magistracy was notoriously corrupt and the city was honeycombed with debt, the outcome of so many years of extravagance and thieving. In addition to this, the plebeian triumph at Louvain had inflamed the people with an unquenchable thirst for liberty, and they were only awaiting a favourable moment to try their luck again. It was not, however, till 1368, when Brussels was on the verge of revolution, that the patricians made up their minds to set their house in order. They were not yet prepared to give the people any voice in the magistracy, but they were determined that when their work was done, no man should be able to say that Brussels was ill governed. By the advice of a committee composed of four patricians and four plebeians stringent measures were taken to ensure the even administration of justice; a permanent board was appointed for the administration of finance, on which several seats were allotted to the representatives of the trade companies. This measure proved so successful that the following year revenue covered expenditure and the interest on the debt; the year after that payments were made on the principal, and by 1386, the whole debt was wiped out. In 1368 the Guild was thoroughly reorganized on popular lines, and about the same time it became customary to bestow a certain number of government appointments on burghers of the middle class; lastly, in 1375, the old system of electing the magistracy was revived. The franchise was restricted to patricians of twenty-seven years of age and upwards, and if any man failed to take part in the election, he thereby lost all his civil rights and privileges. The method of election was exceedingly long and complicated. Thanks to this important measure and to the other reforms which had preceded it, Brussels was now honestly and capably governed and for something like fifty years patricians and plebeians lived, if not on terms of affection, at all events without quarrelling.

No doubt the greater material prosperity which the city at this time enjoyed, was conducive in no small measure to the maintenance of peace. Brussels was not dependent on cloth to anything like the same extent as most of the other great towns of the Netherlands, and the loss which she had sustained on this head from English competition was probably made good by the profit arising from trade which formerly went to Louvain, but which was now, owing to the

disturbed state of that city, directed to the markets of Brussels. For the same reason Brussels had now become the seat of the court, and she devoted her attention to the manufacture of articles of luxury. Thanks to these new industries the diminution, if any, of her cloth trade was a matter of little concern to the people.

Headed by Count Philip of St. Pol, brother of the duke, the best members of the three estates of Brabant had joined hands against Duke John IV, who had been led astray by evil counsellors. When all seemed lost, when Brussels was filled with foreign mercenaries, the craftsmen had saved the situation, and received as guerdon an equal share with the patricians in the government and administration of their city. The articles of the new charter were agreed upon in a great assembly of barons and of deputies of the towns of Brussels, Antwerp, and Louvain, 6 February, 1421. The charter itself was signed and sealed by Count Philip who had been appointed regent and its provisions were immediately put into execution. The constitution of 1421 continued to be the legal constitution of the city of Brussels until the close of the eighteenth century. The great struggle between the patricians and the craftsmen was never again to be renewed. The former dissociated themselves more and more from trade and from municipal affairs, and were gradually absorbed in the ranks of the old feudal aristocracy. The dissensions in the centuries which followed were not the outcome of class hatred, but of difference of opinion in religious matters, and of the impolitic measures taken to restore religious unity by alien rulers, who had no sympathy with the customs and traditions of the Netherlands.

Chief Buildings.—There is probably no city in Europe which contains grander medieval municipal buildings than those of Brussels, and the greatest of them were built after the craftsmen obtained emancipation. The foundation stone of the town hall was laid at the beginning of the fifteenth century, but very little progress was made till after 1421, and it was not completed till 1486; the beautiful Hall of the Bakers opposite, now called *La Maison du Roi*, dated from the following century; the grand old church of Notre-Dame du Sablon, where most of the trade companies had their chapels, was built in the course of the fourteenth century, the greater portion of it probably after 1421. The church of St. Gudule, dedicated to St. Michael, the grandest church in Brussels, is rather a monument of the Dukes of Brabant, than of the burghers. The foundation stone was probably laid towards the close of the twelfth century, but it was not completed till 1653. Its stained glass (sixteenth to nineteenth century) is famous, especially that in the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, donated (1540–47) by several Catholic kings and queens in honour of the Miraculous Hosts preserved in St. Gudule since 1370 when (on Good Friday) several Jews stole from the tabernacle of the church of St. Catherine a number of consecrated Hosts and sacrilegiously transfixed them in their synagogue. The Hosts, it is said, bled miraculously; eventually some of them were deposited in the church of St. Gudule, while others were kept at Notre-Dame de La Chapelle, whence they disappeared in 1579. But the guilty parties were discovered, some were burned alive, and others were banished from Brabant for ever. An annual procession on the Sunday after 15 July, perpetuates the memory of this event, and on this occasion the identical Hosts are exposed in St. Gudule for the veneration of the faithful (Corblet, "Hist. de l'Eucharistie", Paris, 1885, II, 485–486; Balleydie, "Hist. de Ste-Gudule et du St-Sacrement de Miracle", Brussels, 1859; Matagne, "Précis historiques", Paris, 1870). Other noteworthy churches are: the Chapelle de l'Expiation built in 1436 on the site of the above-mentioned synagogue, in expiation of the sacrilege; Notre-Dame de La Chapelle (1216–1485), a Gothic and Romanesque building, after St. Gudule the finest of the medieval churches of Brussels; Notre-Dame-des-Victoires or du Sablon, Flemish Gothic, founded in 1304 by the Guild of Crossbowmen; the barocco church of the Beguines (1657–76). The other churches of the city proper are: St. Catherine, Sts. Jean et Etienne, Notre-Dame du Finistère, St. Jacques sur Caudenberg, St. Nicholas, Riches-Claires, Notre-Dame de Bon Secours, St. Josse-ten-Noode (Bruyn, Trésor artistique des églises de Bruxelles, Louvain, 1882). The famous guild houses in the market place, of which there are no less than seventeen, were not erected until after the bombardment of 1695, when the old guild houses were all destroyed, which proves, that at the close of the seventeenth century the masons of Brussels were still cunning workers.

Brussels is noted for its magnificent system of boulevards. The Place Royale is one of the noblest squares in modern Europe, while the Grand Place in the heart of the old town is equally remarkable as a medieval square. Around it are gathered the Hôtel de Ville, said to be the noblest piece of civil architecture in Europe, the Maison du Roi, or former government-house, and the seventeen famous guild houses or halls of the industrial corporations (butchers, brewers, tailors, carpenters, painters, etc.). These guild houses were erected after the bombardment of 1695, when the old buildings were destroyed. The modern Palais de Justice is the largest architectural work of the nineteenth century, it rises on a massive basis that measures 590 by 560 feet, and recalls by its imposing bulk some vast Egyptian or Assyrian structure.

Hôtel de Ville, Brussels

Religious Life.—There are three episcopal educational institutes, among them the Institut Saint-Louis (about 100 teachers), with departments of philosophy, letters, natural sciences, and a commercial school. The city is divided into four deaneries, St. Gudule and three in the faubourgs. There are 37 parishes in the city and faubourgs, and in the city proper 72 priests, 11 parishes, and 16 churches. The religious orders are numerous, among them Dominicans, Capuchins, Minor Conventuals, Jesuits, Redemptorists, Carmelites, Servites, Barnabites, Alexians, etc. There are also several communities of teaching brothers, principally Christian Brothers. The religious houses of women in 1906 numbered about 80, divided among many orders and congregations, and devoted to various educational and charitable works. The Hospital Saint-Jean (1900) has 600 beds, that of Saint-Pierre 635. There are 11 hospices and refuges for the aged, poor, and insane,

and 27 other institutions for the care of the sick and needy.

UNIVERSITY OF BRUSSELS, known as the *Université libre* (Free University), was founded in 1834 by the Belgian Liberals as a rival of the Catholic University of Louvain. It occupies the former palace of Cardinal Granvelle. In 1904 it numbered 1054 students. It has faculties of philosophy, the exact sciences, jurisprudence, and medicine. The last faculty, located in the picturesque Parc Léopold, possesses there a Physiological Institute founded in 1895, an Institute of Hygiene, Bacteriology, and Therapeutics, an Institute of Anatomy founded 1896–97, and a Commercial Institute (1904). Close by is the valuable Musée d'Histoire Naturelle; connected with it is the Ecole Polytechnique (1873) or school of applied sciences, with six departments: mining, metallurgy, practical chemistry, civil and mechanical engineering, and architecture. Similarly related to the university are the School of Political and Social Sciences and the School of Commerce founded by Ernest Solvay; also the Instituts Solvay (Physiology, 1894; Sociology, 1901). Since 1901 several universities for the people have been founded in the faubourgs. There are in addition the important museums of Brussels, military, ethnographic, commercial, pedagogic, natural history, decorative arts, communal, Wiertz (at Ixelles), etc. The Palais des Beaux Arts houses a unique and valuable gallery of Old Flemish Masters. The Bibliothèque Royale contains a collection of some 500,000 volumes, and has also inherited the famous Bibliothèque de Bourgogne, (27,000 manuscripts) founded by Philippe le Bon, Duke of Burgundy (1419–67) and one of the largest and most important collections of its kind in Europe (De la Serna, Mém. hist. sur la bibliothèque dite de Bourgogne, Brussels, 1809; Namur, Hist. des bibliothèques publiques de Bruxelles, ibid., 1840).

Among the learned bodies of Brussels are the Académie Royale des Sciences (1772), Académie de Médecine (1841), Académie des Beaux Arts, with a school, the Société Scientifique (1876), an important and unique International Institute of Bibliography (1895). In 1905 the Conservatory of Music (1899) numbered 1229 pupils. The Jesuit College of Saint-Michel at Brussels is the actual seat of the famous publication known as the "Acta Sanctorum" (see BOLLANDISTS), and here are now kept the library and the archives of this enterprise, originally begun and long conducted at Antwerp.

HENNE AND WAUTERS, *Histoire de Bruxelles* (Brussels, 1845); WAUTERS, *Bruxelles et ses environs* (ibid, 1852–56); PIRIENNE, *Histoire de la Belgique* (Brussels, 1907); GILLIAT-SMITH, *The Story of Brussels.*

ERNEST GILLIAT-SMITH.

Bruté de Rémur, SIMON WILLIAM GABRIEL, first Bishop of Vincennes, Indiana, U. S. A. (now Indianapolis), b. at Rennes, France, 20 March, 1779; d. at Vincennes, 26 June, 1839. His father was Simon-Guillaume-Gabriel Bruté de Rémur, of an ancient and respectable family, and Superintendent of the Royal Domains in Brittany; and his mother, Jeanne-Renée Le Saulnier de Vauhelle Vatar, widow of Francis Vatar, printer to the King and Parliament at Rennes. Young Bruté had attended the schools of his native city several years when the Revolution interrupted his studies. He then learned and practised the business of a compositor in the printing establishment of his mother, where she placed him to avoid his enrolment in a regiment of children who took part in the fusilades of the Reign of Terror. This did not prevent his witnessing many horrible and exciting scenes, and in his diary he mentions having been present at the trial and precipitate execution of priests and nobles in the cause of their religion. He frequented the prisons and made friends of the guards, who admitted him to the cells, where he received and delivered letters for the clergy incarcerated there. More than once he bore in his bosom to these suffering heroes the Blessed Sacrament.

In 1796 Bruté began the study of medicine, and in spite of the avowed infidelity then prevalent in the schools, he remained proof against sophistry and ridicule. He was graduated in 1803, but did not practise medicine, as he immediately entered upon his ecclesiastical studies, which he pursued for four years at the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice, Paris. Ordained priest on the 11th of June, 1808, he joined the Society of Saint-Sulpice and, after teaching theology for two years, he sailed for the United States with Bishop-elect Flaget (1810). At St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, he taught philosophy for two years and then was sent for a short time to the Eastern Shore of Maryland. He was transferred thence to Mt. St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, where he taught and at the same time performed the duties of pastor for the Catholics of that vicinity with such devotion that he became known as the "Angel of the Mount". During this period he became the spiritual director of Mother Seton, foundress of the Sisters of Charity in the United States, with whom he maintained a lifelong friendship.

BISHOP BRUTÉ DE RÉMUR

In 1815 he was appointed President of St. Mary's College, Baltimore, but after three years (1818) he returned to Emmitsburg. In 1826, Mt. St. Mary's College being no longer dependent upon the Fathers of Saint-Sulpice, its founders, Father Bruté ceased to belong to that society, but continued his duties at the "Mountain" until 1834, when he was appointed to the newly created See of Vincennes. He was consecrated in St. Louis, October the 28th, 1834, by the Right Rev. Benedict J. Flaget, Bishops Rosati and Purcell assisting. After travelling over his vast diocese, comprising the whole State of Indiana and eastern Illinois, Bishop Bruté visited France, where he secured priests and funds for the erection of churches and schools in his needy diocese.

Bishop Bruté left no published work except some ephemeral contributions, which, over the pseudonym "Vincennes", appeared in various journals, notably the Cincinnati "Catholic Telegraph". It is to be regretted that he did not write an autobiography, for which his Memoranda, Notes, and Diary seem a preparation. They teem with interest, and show him to have been the friend of famous men in France. Conspicuous among the number was de Lamennais, whom he tried to reconcile with the Church both by his letters from this country, as well as by conferring with him personally during one of his visits to France, but without success.

BAYLEY, *Memoirs of Bishop Bruté* (New York, 1865); WHITE, *Life of Mother Seton* (Baltimore, 1879), VIII, 314; O'GORMAN, *American Church History* (New York, 1895), IX, xxiv, 394; SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1890), III, xv, 640; ALERDING, *History of the Catholic Church in the Diocese of Vincennes* (Indianapolis, 1888), 124; BRUTÉ DE RÉMUR, *Vie de Mgr. Bruté de Rémur, premier évêque de Vincennes* (Rennes, 1887).

MICHAEL F. DINNEEN.

Bruyas, JACQUES, b. at Lyons, France, 13 July, 1635; d. at Sault St. Louis, Canada, 15 June, 1712.

He entered the Society of Jesus, 11 November, 1651, joined the Mission of Canada in 1666, and laboured there for forty-six years among the Iroquois. From 1693 to 1698 Bruyas was Superior General of the Canadian missions, and in 1700, 1701, actively helped to secure for the French a general peace with the Iroquois tribes. Besides writing a catechism, prayers for the sick, and similar works, he is the author of the oldest known Iroquois grammar. It was published from the original MS. by the Regents of the University of the State of New York in their Sixteenth Annual Report of the State Cabinet of Natural History (Albany, 1863). Father Bruyas is considered to be the author of the "Iroquois Dictionary" preserved in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal of Paris.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II, 296; *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1899), L, 323.

JOSEPH M. WOODS.

Bruys, PIERRE DE. See PETROBRUSIANS.

Bryanites. See METHODISM.

Bryant, JOHN DELAVAU, physician, poet, author, and editor, b. in Philadelphia, U. S. A., 1811; d. 1877. He was the son of an Episcopalian minister, the Rev. Wm. Bryant. His mother, was a daughter of John Delavau, a shipbuilder of Philadelphia. His early education was under his father and in the Episcopalian Academy. He received the degree of A. B. in 1839, and A. M. in 1842, from the University of Pennsylvania, and entered the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New York in 1839. After one year he left the seminary to travel in Europe. On his return he was received into the Catholic Church at St. John's Church, Philadelphia, 12 February, 1842. He graduated in medicine at the University of Pennsylvania in 1848. In 1855, during the yellow fever epidemic in Portsmouth and Norfolk, Virginia, he volunteered for duty and returned only after the epidemic had subsided. In 1857, he married Miss Mary Harriet Riston, daughter of George Riston.

For two years in the early sixties he was editor of the "Catholic Herald." His principal work, published in 1859 by subscription, is an epic poem entitled "The Redemption", apparently inspired by a visit to Jerusalem. It is founded on the Bible and Catholic tradition, and, when it was first published, attracted some attention and received many favourable reviews. He also published, about 1852, a controversial novel entitled "Pauline Seward" which had considerable vogue at the time, especially among Catholics, and ran through ten editions. In 1855 he published "The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God", an exposition of the dogma recently promulgated. All of his works are now out of print and can be found practically only in reference libraries.

Records of the Amer. Catholic Hist. Soc., September, 1904.

JOSEPH WALSH.

Bubastis, a titular see of Lower Egypt, on the right bank of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, near the modern Zagâzig, where its ruins are shown under the name of Tell Bastah. Its true name was Bast owing to the name of the local goddess Bastet; it became in Old-Egyptian *Pĕr-bástet* (Coptic *Boubasti*, Hebrew *Pi-beseth*, Greek Βούβαστις or more commonly Βούβαστος, i. e. House of Bastet). It was a place of importance under the twenty-third dynasty about 950–750 B. C. When the eastern part of Lower Egypt was divided into Augustamnica Prima in the north and Augustamnica Secunda in the south, Bubastis was included in the latter, whose capital was Leontopolis (Hierocles, Synecdemos, 728, 4), as the chief town of the Bubastites *nomos*, and like every Egyptian *nomos* was the seat of a bishopric. Its bishop, Harpocration, was mentioned at Nicæa by Meletius among his well-wishers (Athan. Apol. c. Arianos, 71). About 340 the see was occupied by Hermon (Acta SS., May, III, 61). Julianus was present at the Latrocinium of Ephesus, 449. The see is mentioned in Georgius Cyprius (ed. Gelzer, 705). In the Middle Ages its fate is blended with that of Khandek, a Jacobite see near Cairo, to which it had been united. Thus in 1078 Gabriel, *ep. Basta, quæ et Khandek*, interfered in the election of the Patriarch Cyrillus (Renaudot, Hist. patriarch. Alexandr. 450, 458, 465), and in 1102 John took a share in the consecration of the Patriarch Macarius II (ibid., 482). Under the Patriarch Cyrillus III (1235–43), the see is often mentioned, but without the name of its titular.

LEQUIEN, *Or. Christ.*, II, 559–562; GAMS, *Series episcop.*, 461.

L. PETIT.

Bucelin (BUZLIN), GABRIEL, Benedictine historical writer, b. at Diessenhofen in Thurgau, 29 December, 1599; d. at Weingarten, 9 June, 1681. A scion of the distinguished line of Bucellini counts, Gabriel, at the age of thirteen, entered the Benedictine monastery at Weingarten. After a course in philosophy and theology at Dillingen he was ordained priest 23 April, 1624, and in the same year sent, as master of novices, to restore the primitive fervour and raise the standard of studies in the monastery of St. Trudpert in the Black Forest. Having filled the position of master of novices at Weingarten and professor of humanities at Feldkirch (1635), whence on the approach of the Swedish army he was forced to flee to Admont (1646), he was appointed prior of St. John's monastery, Feldkirch (1651), where he remained until a few months before his death. Bucelin was a very prolific writer, being the author of some fifty-three works, a large number of which are still in manuscript in the royal library at Stuttgart. His chief claim to the gratitude of posterity lies in the fact that he was, if not the very first, at least among the first authors to deal with the ecclesiastical history of Germany. Of his published works the most important are: "Germania sacra" (Augsburg, 1655), containing accounts of the principal ecclesiastics, archbishops, abbots, etc., as well as a list of the most important monasteries of Germany; "Germaniæ topo-chrono-stemmatographia sacra et profana" (1655–78), treating, as its name implies, of the genealogy of the most distinguished members of the clergy and the nobility; "Constantia sacra et profana" (Frankfort, 1667); "Rhætia etrusca, romana, gallica, germanica" (Augsburg, 1661); "Nucleus historiæ universalis" (Ulm, 1650, 1654; carried from 1650 to 1735 by Schmier, "Apparatum ad theologiam scholastico-polemico-practicam"), of great importance to scholars interested in ancient charts, bulls, diplomata, etc. Bucelin was also the author of many works on the Benedictine Order and its most illustrious members, among them "Aquila imperii benedictina" (Venice, 1651); "Menologium benedictinum" (Feldkirch, 1655).

ZIEGELBAUER, *Hist. rei lit. O. S. B.* (Augsburg, 1754), IV; LINDNER, *Stud. u. Mittheil. aus dem Benedictiner-Orden*, VII, 84 sqq.; WOLFSGRUBER in *Kirchenlex.*; HURTER, *Nomenclator*; BERGMANN, *Der Genealog Bucelin* in *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie*, XXXVIII, 47 sqq.

F. M. RUDGE.

Bucer, MARTIN (also called BUTZER), one of the leaders in the South German Reformation movement, b. 11 November, 1491, at Schlettstadt, Alsace; d. 28 February, 1551, at Cambridge, England. He received his early education at the Latin School of his native place, where at the age of fifteen (1506) he also entered the Order of St. Dominic. Later he was sent to the University of Heidelberg to prosecute his studies, and matriculated, 31 January, 1517. He became an ardent admirer of Erasmus, and soon an

enthusiastic disciple of Luther. He heard the Saxon monk at a public disputation, held at Heidelberg in 1518, on the occasion of a meeting of the Augustinian order, became personally acquainted with him, and was immediately won over to his ideas. Having openly adopted the new doctrine he withdrew from the Dominican order, in 1521, became court chaplain of Frederick, the Elector Palatine, and laboured as secular priest at Landstuhl, in the Palatinate (1522), and as a member of the household of Count Sickengen and at Weissenburg, Lower Alsace (1522–23). During his incumbency at Landstuhl he married Elizabeth Silbereisen, a former nun. When, in 1523, his position became untenable at Weissenburg, he proceeded to Strasburg. Here his activity was soon exercised over a large field; he became the chief reformer of the city and was connected with many important religio-political events of the period. His doctrinal views on points controverted between Luther and Zwingli at first harmonized completely with the ideas of the Swiss Reformer. Subsequently he sought to mediate between Lutherans and Zwinglians. The highly questionable methods to which he resorted in the interest of peace drew upon him the denunciation of both parties. In spite of the efforts of Bucer, the Conference of Marburg (1529), at which the divergent views of Luther and Zwingli, especially the doctrine regarding the Eucharist, were discussed, failed to bring about a reconciliation. At the Diet of Augsburg, in the following year, he drew up with Capito the "Confessio Tetrapolitana", or Confession of the Four Cities (Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau). Later on, moved by political considerations, he abandoned this for the Augsburg Confession. In 1536, he brought about the more nominal than real "Concordia of Wittenberg" among German Protestants. He gave his own, and obtained Luther's and Melanchthon's approbation for the bigamy of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, attended in 1540 the religious conference between Catholics and Protestants at Hagenau, Lower Alsace, and in 1541 the Diet of Ratisbon. The combined attempt of Bucer and Melanchthon to introduce the Reformation into the Archdiocese of Cologne ended in failure (1542). Political troubles and the resistance of Bucer to the agreement arrived at by Catholics and Protestants in 1548, and known as the "Augsburg Interim", made his stay in Strasburg impossible. At the invitation of Archbishop Cranmer, he proceeded to England in 1549. After a short stay in London, during which he was received by King Edward VI (1547–53), he was called to Cambridge as Regius Professor of Divinity. His opinion was frequently asked by Cranmer on church matters, notably on the controversy regarding ecclesiastical vestments. But his sojourn was to be of short duration, as he died in February, 1551. Under the reign of Queen Mary (1553–58) his remains were exhumed and burned, and his tomb was demolished (1556), but was reconstructed in 1560 by Queen Elizabeth (1558–1603).

Bucer was, after Luther and Melanchthon, the most influential of German Reformers. For a clear statement of doctrine he was ever ready to substitute vague formulas in the interest of unity, which even his able efforts could not establish among the Reformers. He forms a connecting link between the German and the English Reformation. Of the thirteen children he had by his first marriage, only one, a weak-minded son, survived. Wibrandis Rosenblatt, the successive wife of several Reformers (Cellarius, Œcolampadius, Capito, and Bucer), whom he married after his first wife died from the plague in 1541, bore him three children, of whom a daughter survived. Only one of the ten folio volumes in which his works were to appear was published (Basle, 1577). It is known as "Tomus Anglicanus" because its contents were mostly written in England.

BAUM, *Capito und Butzer* (Elberfeld, 1860); MENTZ AND ERICHSON, *Zur 400 jährigen Geburtsfeier Martin Butzers* (Strasburg, 1891); STERN, *Martin Butzer* (Strasburg, 1891); PAULUS, *Die Strasburger Reformatoren* (Freiburg, 1895); SCHAFF, *History of the Christian Church* (New York, 1904), VI, 571–573 and passim; WARD in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, VII, 172–177.

N. A. WEBER.

Büchlein. See FAGIUS.

Buck, VICTOR DE, Bollandist, b. at Oudenarde, Flanders, 21 April, 1817; d. 28 June, 1876. His family was one of the most distinguished in the city of Oudenarde. After a brilliant course in the humanities, at the municipal college of Soignies and the *petit séminaire* of Roulers and completed in 1835 at the college of the Society of Jesus at Alost, he entered this Society on 11 October of the same year. After two years in the novitiate, then at Nivelles, and a year at Tronchiennes reviewing and finishing his literary studies, he went to Namur in September, 1838, to study philosophy and the natural sciences, closing these courses with a public defence of theses bearing on these subjects.

VICTOR DE BUCK

The work of the Bollandists (q. v.) had just been revived and, in spite of his youth, Victor De Buck was summoned to act as assistant to the hagiographers. He remained at this work in Brussels from September, 1840, to September, 1845. After devoting four years to theological studies at Louvain, where he was ordained priest in 1848, and making his third year of probation in the Society of Jesus, he was permanently assigned to the Bollandist work in 1850, and was engaged upon it until the time of his death. He had already published in part second of Vol. VII of the October "Acta Sanctorum", which appeared in 1845, sixteen commentaries or notices that are easily distinguishable because they are without a signature, unlike those written by the Bollandists. Moreover, during the course of his theological studies which suffered thereby no interruption, and before becoming a priest, he composed, in collaboration with Antoine Tinnebroeck who, like himself was a scholastic, an able refutation of a book published by the professor of canon law at the University of Louvain, in which the rights of the regular clergy were assailed and repudiated. This refutation, which fills an octavo volume of 640 pages, abounding in learned dissertations, was ready for publication within four months. It was to have been supplemented by a second volume that was almost completed but could not be published because of the political disturbances of the year 1847 which were but the prelude to the revolutions of 1848, and the work was never resumed.

Father De Buck's literary activity was extraordinary. Besides the numerous commentaries in Vols. IX, X, XI, XII, and XIII of the October "Acta Sanctorum", which won the praise of those best qualified to judge, he published in Latin, French, and Flemish, a large number of little works of piety and dissertations on devotion to the saints, church history, and Christian archæology, the partial enumeration of which fills two folio columns of his eulogy,

in the fore part of Vol. II of the November "Acta". Because of his extensive learning and investigating turn of mind he was naturally bent upon probing abstruse and perplexing questions; naturally, also, his work was often the result of most urgent requests. Hence it was that, in 1862, he was led to publish in the form of a letter to his brother Remi, then professor of church history at the theological college of Louvain and soon afterwards his colleague on the Bollandist work, a Latin dissertation "De solemnitate præcipue paupertatis religiosæ", which was followed in 1863 and 1864 by two treatises in French, one under the title: "Solution aimable de la question des couvents" and the other "De l'état religieux", treating of the religious life in Belgium in the nineteenth century.

At the solicitation chiefly of prelates and distinguished Catholic savants, he undertook the study of a particularly delicate question. In order to satisfy the many requests made to Rome by churches and religious communities for the relics of saints, it had become customary to take from the Roman catacombs the bodies of unknown personages believed to have been honoured as martyrs in the early Church. The sign by which they were to be recognized was a glass vial sealed up in the plaster outside the *loculus* that contained the body, and bearing traces of a red substance that had been enclosed and was supposed to have been blood. Doubts had arisen as to the correctness of this interpretation and, after careful study, Father De Buck felt convinced that it was false and that what had been taken for blood was probably the sediment of consecrated wine which, owing to misguided piety, had been placed in the tomb near the bodies of the dead. This conclusion, together with its premises, was set forth in a dissertation published in 1855 under the title "De phialis rubricatis quibus martyrum romanorum sepulcra dignosci dicuntur". Naturally it raised lively protestations, particularly on the part of those who were responsible for distributing the bodies of the saints, the more so, as after the discussions on the vials of blood, the cardinal vicar in 1861 strictly forbade any further transportation of these relics. The author of the dissertation, "De phialis rubricatis", had but a few copies of his work struck off, these being intended for the cardinals and prelates particularly interested in the question, and as none were put on the market, it was rumoured that De Buck's superiors had suppressed the publication of the book and that all the copies printed, save five or six, had been destroyed. This, of course, was untrue; not one copy had been destroyed and his superiors had laid no blame upon the author. Then, in 1863, a decree was obtained from the Congregation of Rites, renewing an older decree, whereby it was declared that a vial of blood placed outside of a sepulchral niche in the catacombs was an unmistakable sign by which the tomb of a martyr might be known, and it was proclaimed that Victor De Buck's opinion was formally disapproved and condemned by Rome. This too was false, as Father De Buck had never intimated that the placing of the vial of blood did not indicate the resting-place of a martyr, when it could be proved that the vial contained genuine blood, such as was supposed by the decree of the congregation. Finally, there appeared in Paris in 1867 a large quarto volume written by the Roman prelate, Monsignor Sconamiglio, "Reliquiarum custode". It was filled with caustic criticisms of the author of "De phialis rubricatis" and relegated him to the rank of notorious heretics who had combated devotion to the saints and the veneration of their relics. Father De Buck seemed all but insensible to these attacks and contented himself with opposing to Monsignor Sconamiglio's book a protest in which he rectified the more or less unconscious error of his enemies by proving that neither the decree of 1863 nor any other decision emanating from ecclesiastical authority had affected his thesis.

However, another attack made about the same time touched him more deeply. The gravest and most direct accusations were made against him and reported to the Sovereign Pontiff himself; he was even credited with opinions which, if not formally heretical, at least openly defied the ideas that are universally accepted and held in veneration by Catholics devoted to the Holy See. In a Latin letter addressed to Cardinal Patrizzi, and intended to come to the notice of the Supreme Pontiff, Father De Buck repudiated the calumnies in a manner that betrayed how deeply he had been affected, his protest being supported by the testimony of four of his principal superiors, former provincials, and rectors who eagerly vouched for the sincerity of his declarations and the genuineness of his religious spirit. With the full consent of his superiors he published this letter in order to communicate with those of his friends who might have been disturbed by an echo of these accusations.

What might have invested these accusations with some semblance of truth and what certainly gave rise to them, were the amicable relations established, principally through correspondence, between Father De Buck and such men as Alexander Forbes, the learned Anglican bishop, the celebrated Edward Pusey in England, Montalembert, and Bishop Dupanloup in France and a number of others whose names were distasteful to many ardent Catholics. These relations were brought about by the reputation for deep learning, integrity, and scientific independence that De Buck's works had rapidly earned for him, by his readiness to oblige those who addressed themselves to him in their perplexities, and by his remarkable earnestness and skill in elucidating the most difficult questions. Moreover, he was equipped with all the information that incessant study and a splendid memory could ensure. But it was not only great minds groping outside of the true Faith or weakened by harassing doubts who thus appealed to his knowledge. The different papal nuncios who succeeded one another in Belgium during the course of his career as Bollandist, bishops, political men, members of learned bodies, and journalists, ceased not to importune this gracious scholar whose answers often formed important memoranda which, although the result of several days and sometimes several nights of uninterrupted labour, were read only by those who called them forth or else appeared anonymously in some Belgian or foreign periodical.

Although Father De Buck had an unusually robust constitution and enjoyed exceptionally good health, constant and excessive work at length told upon him and he was greatly fatigued when Father Beckx, Father General of the Society, summoned him to Rome to act as official theologian at the Vatican Council. Father Victor assumed these new duties with his accustomed ardour and, upon his return, showed the first symptoms of the malady arterio-sclerosis that finally carried him off. He struggled for some years longer against a series of painful attacks each of which left him decidedly weaker, until a final attack that lasted almost interruptedly for nearly four years, caused his death.

Elogium P. Victoris De Buck in *Acta SS.*, November, II.

CH. DE SMEDT.

Buckfast Abbey.—The date of the foundation of the monastery of Our Lady of Buckfast, two miles from Ashburton, England, in a beautiful Devonshire valley watered by the Dart, is unknown; but it was certainly long before the Norman Conquest. The earliest authentic document is a grant by King Canute (1015–1035), to the monks of

Buckfast of the manor of Sele, now called Zeal Monachorum. The best authorities assign the foundation to the middle of the tenth century. Early in the twelfth century it was incorporated into the Benedictine Congregation of Savigny, founded in Normandy in 1112. In 1148, five years before the death of St. Bernard, the thirty Savigny houses, including Buckfast (of which Eustace was then abbot) were affiliated to Clairvaux, thus becoming a part of the great Cistercian Order. Buckfast now developed into one of the most important monasteries in the great Diocese of Exeter. It flourished both materially and spiritually, originating the celebrated woollen trade of the district, encouraging other industries, and preserving unimpaired its discipline and the fervour of its observance. The latter, however, became relaxed (as in other Cistercian houses) in the fourteenth century, one result being the rapid diminution in the community. The reputation, however, of the monks for learning was sustained until the dissolution, and they seem to have been generally beloved in the district for their piety, kindliness, and benevolence.

The last legitimately elected Abbot of Buckfast was John Rede, who died about 1535, the year of the Visitation ordered by Henry VIII, which resulted in the intrusion of Gabriel Donne into the vacant chair. Donne surrendered the house to the King in 1538, receiving for himself ample compensation. The buildings were immediately sold, the lead stripped from the roof, and the monastery and church left to decay. In 1882, about three centuries and a half after the suppression of the Cistercian Abbey, the ruined buildings came again into the possession of Benedictine monks, belonging to the French Province of the Cassinese Congregation of the Primitive Observance. Mass was again said and the Divine Office chanted at Buckfast, on 29 October, 1882, and eight months later the abbey was legally conveyed to the monks.

The plan of the buildings at Buckfast followed the conventional Cistercian arrangement, with the cloister south of the church, and grouped round it the chapter-house, calefactory, refectory, and other *loca regularia*. The church was 220 feet long, with short transepts, each with a small eastern chapel. The Benedictines now in possession have built a temporary church, and are proceeding with the work of rebuilding the former one, and the rest of the monastic buildings, on the ancient foundations. The tower which still remains has been carefully restored, and the southern wing of the monastery has been rebuilt in simple twelfth-century style, and was opened in April, 1886. The third abbot since the return of the monks in 1882, Dom Anschar Vouier, formerly one of the professors at the Benedictine University of St. Anselm in Rome, was solemnly blessed by the Bishop of Plymouth in October, 1906.

OLIVER, *Monast. Diœces. Exon.* (1846), 371, 379; WORTHY, *Devonshire Parishes* (1889), II, 207; DUGDALE, *Monast. Anglican.*, V, 384; ROWE, *Cistercian Houses of Devon;* HAMILTON, *Buckfast Abbey* (1892); MABILLON, *Chronologia Cisterciensis.*

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Buckley, SIR PATRICK ALPHONSUS, soldier, lawyer, statesman, judge, b. near Castletownsend, Co. Cork, Ireland, in 1841; d. at Lower Hutt, New Zealand, 18 May, 1896. He was educated at the Mansion House School, Cork; St. Colman's College, Fermoy; the Irish College, Paris; and the Catholic University, Louvain. He was in Louvain when the Piedmontese invaded the States of the Church in 1860, and at the request of Count Carlo MacDonnell, Private Chamberlain to Pius IX, conducted the recruits of the Irish Papal Brigade from Ostend to Vienna, where they were placed in charge of representatives of the Holy See. He served under General Lamoricière, received a medal in recognition of his services, and was taken prisoner at Ancona. After the war he returned to Ireland. Thence he emigrated to Queensland, where he completed his legal studies and was admitted to the Bar. After a short residence in Queensland he settled in New Zealand, and commenced the practice of his profession in Wellington. Soon after his arrival in New Zealand, he became a member of the Wellington Provincial Council, and was Provincial Solicitor in the Executive when the Provincial Parliaments were abolished in 1875. He was called to the Legislative Council in 1878; was Colonial Secretary and leader of the Upper House in the Stout-Vogel Ministry (1884–87); and Attorney-General, Colonial Secretary, and leader of an overwhelmingly Opposition Upper House under the Ballance Administration from 1891 till 1895, when he accepted the position of Judge of the Supreme Court. He was created Knight Commander of St. Michael and St. George in 1892.

MENNELL, *Dictionary of Australasian Biography* (London, 1892); *The New Zealand Tablet*, 22 May, 1896; *The Otago Daily Times*, 19 May, 1896.

HENRY W. CLEARY.

Budæus, GULIELMUS. See BUDÉ.

Buddas. See MANES.

Buddhism, the religious, monastic system, founded c. 500 B. C. on the basis of pantheistic Brahminism. The speculations of the Vedanta school of religious thought, in the eighth and following centuries, B. C., gave rise to several rival schemes of salvation. These movements started with the same morbid view that conscious life is a burden and not worth the living, and that true happiness is to be had only in a state like dreamless sleep, free from all desires, free from conscious action. They took for granted the Upanishad doctrine of the endless chain of births, but they differed from pantheistic Brahminism both in their attitude towards the Vedas and in their plan for securing freedom from rebirth and from conscious existence. In their absolute rejection of Vedic rites, they stamped themselves as heresies. Of these the one destined to win greatest renown was Buddhism.

I. THE FOUNDER.—Of Buddha, the founder of this great movement, legendary tradition has much to say, but very little of historical worth is known. His father seems to have been a petty raja, ruling over a small community on the southern border of the district now known as Nepal. Buddha's family name was Gotama (Skt. *Gautama*), and it was probably by this name that he was known in life. In all likelihood it was after his death that his disciples bestowed on him a number of laudatory names, the most common being Buddha, i. e. "the enlightened". Like the well-born youths of his day, he must have spent some time in the study of the sacred Vedas. After the immemorial custom of the East, he married at an early age, and, if tradition may be trusted, exercised a prince's privilege of maintaining a harem. His principal wife bore him a son. His heart was not at rest. The pleasures of the world soon palled upon him, and abandoning his home he retired to the forest, where as a hermit he spent several years in austere self-discipline, studying, doubtless, the way of salvation as taught in the Upanishads. Even this did not bring peace to his mind. He gave up the rigorous fasts and mortifications, which nearly cost him his life, and devoted himself in his own way to long and earnest meditation, the fruit of which was his firm belief that he had discovered the only true method of escaping from the misery of rebirth and of attaining to Nirvana. He then set out to preach his gospel of deliverance, beginning at Benares. His magnetic personality and his earnest, impressive eloquence soon won over to his cause a number of the warrior caste. Brahmins, too, felt the persuasiveness of his words, and it was not long before he was sur-

rounded by a band of enthusiastic disciples, in whose company he went from place to place, making converts by his preaching. These soon became very numerous and were formed into a great brotherhood of monks. Such was the work to which Buddha gave himself with unsparing zeal for over forty years. At length, worn out by his long life of activity, he fell sick after a meal of dried boar's flesh, and died in the eightieth year of his age. The approximate date of his death is 480 B. C. It is noteworthy that Buddha was a contemporary of two other famous religious philosophers, Pythagoras and Confucius.

In the sacred books of later times Buddha is depicted as a character without flaw, adorned with every grace of mind and heart. There may be some hesitation in taking the highly coloured portrait of Buddhist tradition as the exact representation of the original, but Buddha may be credited with the qualities of a great and good man. The records depict him moving about from place to place, regardless of personal comfort, calm and fearless, mild and compassionate, considerate towards poor and rich alike, absorbed with the one idea of freeing all men from the bonds of misery, and irresistible in his manner of setting forth the way of deliverance. In his mildness, his readiness to overlook insults, his zeal, chastity, and simplicity of life, he reminds one not a little of St. Francis of Assisi. In all pagan antiquity no character has been depicted as so noble and attractive.

II. Buddhist Texts.—The chief sources for early Buddhism are the sacred books comprised in the first two divisions of the *Ti-pitaka* (triple-basket), the threefold Bible of the Southern School of Buddhists. In India, to-day, the Buddhists are found only in the North, in Nepal, and in the extreme South, in the island of Ceylon. They represent two different schools of thought, the Northern worshipping Buddha as supreme personal deity, though at the same time adopting most of the degrading superstitions of Hinduism, the Southern adhering in great measure to the original teachings of Buddha. Each school has a canon of sacred books. The Northern canon is in Sanskrit, the Southern in Pali, a softer tongue, into which Sanskrit was transformed by the people of the South. The Southern canon, *Ti-pitaka*, which reflects more faithfully the teachings of Buddha and his early disciples, embraces (1) the *Vinaya-pitaka*, a collection of books on the disciplinary rules of the order; (2) the *Sutta-pitaka*, didactic tracts consisting in part of alleged discourses of Buddha; and (3) the *Abhidhamma-pitaka*, comprising more detailed treatises on doctrinal subjects. Most of the Vinayas and some of the Suttas have been made accessible to English readers in the "Sacred Books of the East". The Ti-pitaka seems to date back to the second and third centuries B. C., but a few additions were made even after it was committed to writing in the early part of the first century of the Christian Era. While there may be doctrinal and disciplinary parts from the time of Buddha, none of the twenty-nine books comprised in the Ti-pitaka can be proved to be older than 300 B. C. These books, stripped of their tiresome repetitions, would be about equal in size to the Bible, though on the whole they are vastly inferior to the Sacred Scripture in spirituality, depth of thought, variety of subject, and richness of expression. There are also a few extra-canonical books, likewise in Pali, on which the Southern Buddhists set great value, the *Dipavansa* and *Mahavansa*, which give an uncritical history of Buddhism down to about A. D. 300, the "Commentaries of Buddhagosa", and the *Milinda Panha*, ably translated by Rhys Davids under the title "The Questions of King Milinda". These works belong to the fourth and following centuries of our era. In the *Tri-pitaka* of the Northern School are included the well-known *Saddharma-pundarika* (Lotus of the True Law), and the legendary biographies of Buddha, the *Buddha Charita*, and the *Lalita Vistara* (Book of Exploits), which are generally assigned to the last quarter of the first century A. D. Besides the Tri-pitaka, the Northern Buddhists reckon as canonical several writings of more recent times adapted from the abominable Hindu *Tantras*.

III. Primitive Buddhism.—Buddhism was by no means entirely original. It had much in common with the pantheistic Vedanta teaching, from which it sprang—belief in *karma*, whereby the character of the present life is the net product of the good and evil acts of a previous existence; belief in a constant series of rebirths for all who set their heart on preserving their individual existence; the pessimistic view that life at its best is misery and not worth living. And so the great end for which Buddha toiled was the very one which gave colour to the pantheistic scheme of salvation propounded by the Brahmin ascetics, namely, the liberation of men from misery by setting them free from attachment to conscious existence. It was in their conception of the final state of the saved, and of the method by which it was to be attained that they differed. The pantheistic Brahmin said: "Recognize your identity with the great impersonal god, Brahmă, and you thereby cease to be a creature of desires; you are no longer held fast in the chain of rebirths; at death you lose your individuality, your conscious existence, to become absorbed in the all-god Brahmă." In Buddha's system, the all-god Brahmă was entirely ignored. Buddha put abstruse speculation in the background, and, while not ignoring the value of right knowledge, insisted on the saving act of the will as the one thing needful. To obtain deliverance from rebirth, all forms of desire must be absolutely quenched, not simply every wicked craving, but also the desire of such pleasures and comforts as are deemed innocent and lawful, the desire even to preserve one's conscious existence. It was through this extinction of every desire that cessation of misery was to be obtained. This state of absence of desire and pain was known as *Nirvana* (*Nibbana*). The word was not coined by Buddha, but in his teaching, it assumed a new shade of meaning. Nirvana means primarily a "blowing out", and hence the extinction of the fire of desire, ill-will, delusion, of all, in short, that binds the individual to rebirth and misery. It was in the living Buddhist saint a state of calm repose, of indifference to life and death, to pleasure and pain, a state of imperturbable tranquillity, where the sense of freedom from the bonds of rebirth caused the discomforts as well as the joys of life to sink into insignificance. But it was not till after death that Nirvana was realized in its completeness. In its full import, it meant eternal, unconscious repose. Was this repose identical with annihilation? Some scholars have so thought. And, indeed, if the psychological speculations found in the sacred books are part of Buddha's personal teaching, it is hard to see how he could have held aught else as the final end of man. But logical consistency is not to be looked for in an Indian mystic. If we may trust the sacred books, he expressly refused on several occasions to pronounce either on the existence or the non-existence of those who had entered into Nirvana, on the ground that it was irrelevant, not conducive to peace and enlightenment. His intimate disciples held the same view. A monk who interpreted Nirvana to mean annihilation was taken to task by an older monk, and convinced that he had no right to hold such an opinion, since the subject was wrapped in impenetrable mystery. The learned nun Khema gave a similar answer to the King of Kosala, who asked if the deceased Buddha was still in existence. Whether the Perfect One exists after

death, whether he does not exist after death, whether he exists and at the same time does not exist after death, whether he neither exists nor does not exist after death, has not been revealed by Buddha. Since, then, the nature of Nirvana was too mysterious to be grasped by the Hindu mind, too subtle to be expressed in terms either of existence or of non-existence, it would be idle to attempt a positive solution of the question. It suffices to know that it meant a state of unconscious repose, an eternal sleep which knew no awakening. In this respect it was practically one with the ideal of the pantheistic Brahmin.

In the Buddhist conception of Nirvana no account was taken of the all-god Brahmă. And as prayers and offerings to the traditional gods were held to be of no avail for the attainment of this negative state of bliss, Buddha, with greater consistency than was shown in pantheistic Brahminism, rejected both the Vedas and the Vedic rites. It was this attitude which stamped Buddhism as a heresy. For this reason, too, Buddha has been set down by some as an atheist. Buddha, however, was not an atheist in the sense that he denied the existence of the gods. To him the gods were living realities. In his alleged sayings, as in the Buddhist scriptures generally, the gods are often mentioned, and always with respect. But like the pantheistic Brahmin, Buddha did not acknowledge his dependence on them. They were, like men, subject to decay and rebirth. The god of to-day might be reborn in the future in some inferior condition, while a man of great virtue might suceed in raising himself in his next birth to the rank of a god in heaven. The very gods, then, no less than men, had need of that perfect wisdom that leads to Nirvana, and hence it was idle to pray or sacrifice to them in the hope of obtaining the boon which they themselves did not possess. They were inferior to Buddha, since he had already attained to Nirvana. In like manner, they who followed Buddha's footsteps had no need of worshipping the gods by prayers and offerings. Worship of the gods was tolerated, however, in the Buddhist layman who still clung to the delusion of individual existence, and preferred the household to the homeless state. Moreover, Buddha's system conveniently provided for those who accepted in theory the teaching that Nirvana alone was the true end of man, but who still lacked the courage to quench all desires. The various heavens of Brahminic theology, with their positive, even sensual, delights were retained as the reward of virtuous souls not yet ripe for Nirvana. To aspire after such rewards was permitted to the lukewarm monk; it was commended to the layman. Hence the frequent reference, even in the earliest Buddhist writings, to heaven and its positive delights as an encouragement to right conduct. Sufficient prominence is not generally given to this more popular side of Buddha's teaching, without which his followers would have been limited to an insignificant and short-lived band of heroic souls. It was this element, so prominent in the inscriptions of Asoka, that tempered the severity of Buddha's doctrine of Nirvana and made his system acceptable to the masses.

In order to secure that extinction of desire which alone could lead to Nirvana, Buddha prescribed for his followers a life of detachment from the comforts, pleasures, and occupations of the common run of men. To secure this end, he adopted for himself and his disciples the quiet, secluded, contemplative life of the Brahmin ascetics. It was foreign to his plan that his followers should engage in any form of industrial pursuits, lest they might thereby be entangled in worldly cares and desires. Their means of subsistence was alms; hence the name commonly applied to Buddhist monks was *bhikkus*, beggars. Detachment from family life was absolutely necessary. Married life was to be avoided as a pit of hot coals, for it was incompatible with the quenching of desire and the extinction of individual existence. In like manner, worldly possessions and worldly power had to be renounced—everything that might minister to pride, greed, or self-indulgence. Yet in exacting of his followers a life of severe simplicity, Buddha did not go to the extremes of fanaticism that characterized so many of the Brahmin ascetics. He chose the middle path of moderate asceticism, which he compared to a lute, which gives forth the proper tones only when the strings are neither too tight nor too slack. Each member was allowed but one set of garments, of yellowish colour and of cheap quality. These, together with his sleeping-mat, razor, needle, water-strainer, and alms-bowl, constituted the sum of his earthly possessions. His single meal, which had to be taken before noon, consisted chiefly of bread, rice, and curry, which he gathered daily in his alms-bowl by begging. Water or rice-milk was his customary drink, wine and other intoxicants being rigorously forbidden, even as medicine. Meat, fish, and delicacies were rarely eaten except in sickness or when the monk dined by invitation with some patron. The use of perfumes, flowers, ointments, and participation in worldly amusements fell also into the class of things prohibited. In theory, the moral code of Buddhism was little more than a copy of that of Brahminism. Like the latter, it extended to thoughts and desires, no less than to words and deeds. Unchastity in all its forms, drunkenness, lying, stealing, envy, pride, harshness are fittingly condemned. But what, perhaps, brings Buddhism most strikingly in contact with Christianity is its spirit of gentleness and forgiveness of injuries. To cultivate benevolence towards men of all classes, to avoid anger and physical violence, to be patient under insult, to return good for evil—all this was inculcated in Buddhism and helped to make it one of the gentlest of religions. To such an extent was this carried that the Buddhist monk, like the Brahmin ascetic, had to avoid with the greatest care the destruction of any form of animal life.

In course of time, Buddha extended his monastic system to include women. Communities of nuns, while living near the monks, were entirely secluded from them. They had to conform to the same rule of life, to subsist on alms, and spend their days in retirement and contemplation. They were never as numerous as the monks, and later became a very insignificant factor in Buddhism. In thus opening up to his fellow men and women what he felt to be the true path of salvation, Buddha made no discrimination in social condition. Herein lay one of the most striking contrasts between the old religion and the new. Brahminism was inextricably intertwined with caste-distinctions. It was a privilege of birth, from which the Śudras and members of still lower classes were absolutely excluded. Buddha, on the contrary, welcomed men of low as well as high birth and station. Virtue, not blood, was declared to be the test of superiority. In the brotherhood which he built around him, all caste-distinctions were put aside. The despised Śudra stood on a footing of equality with the high-born Brahmin. In this religious democracy of Buddhism lay, doubtless, one of its strongest influences for conversion among the masses. But in thus putting his followers on a plane of equal consideration, Buddha had no intention of acting the part of a social reformer. Not a few scholars have attributed to him the purpose of breaking down caste-distinctions in society and of introducing more democratic conditions. Buddha had no more intention of abolishing caste than he had of abolishing marriage. It was only within the limits of his own order that he insisted on

social equality just as he did on celibacy. Wherever Buddhism has prevailed, the caste-system has remained untouched.

Strictly speaking, Buddha's order was composed only of those who renounced the world to live a life of contemplation as monks and nuns. The very character of their life, however, made them dependent on the charity of men and women who preferred to live in the world and to enjoy the comforts of the household state. Those who thus sympathized with the order and contributed to its support, formed the lay element in Buddhism. Through this friendly association with the order, they could look to a happy reward after death, not Nirvana, but the temporary delights of heaven, with the additional prospect of being able at some future birth to attain to Nirvana if they so desired. The majority, however, did not share the enthusiasm of the Buddhist *Arhat* or saint for Nirvana, being quite content to hope for a life of positive, though impermanent, bliss in heaven.

IV. Later Developments and Spread of Buddhism.—The lack of all religious rites in Buddhism was not keenly felt during the lifetime of its founder. Personal devotion to him took the place of religious fervour. But he was not long dead when this very devotion to him began to assume the form of religious worship. His reputed relics, consisting of his bones, teeth, alms-bowl, cremation-vessel, and ashes from his funeral pyre, were enclosed in dome-shaped mounds called *Dagobas*, or *Topes*, or *Stupas*, and were honoured with offerings of lights, flowers, and incense. Pictures and statues of Buddha were multiplied on every side, and similarly honoured, being carried about on festal days in solemn procession. The places, too, associated with his birth, enlightenment, first preaching, and death were accounted especially sacred, and became the objects of pilgrimage and the occasion of recurring festivals. But as Buddha had entered into Nirvana and could not be sensible of these religious honours, the need was felt of a living personality to whom the people could pray. The later speculations of Buddhist monks brought such a personality to light in Metteyya (Maitreya), the loving one, now happily reigning in heaven as a *bodhisattva*, a divine being destined in the remote future to become a Buddha, and again to set in motion the wheel of the law. To this Metteyya the Buddhists turned as the living object of worship of which they had so long felt the need, and they paid him religious homage as the future saviour of the world.

Such was the character of the religious worship observed by those who departed the least from Buddha's teachings. It is what is found to-day in the so-called Southern Buddhism, held by the inhabitants of Ceylon, Burma, and Siam. Towards the end of the first century A. D., however, a far more radical change took place in the religious views of the great mass of Buddhists in Northern India. Owing, doubtless, to the ever growing popularity of the cults of Vishnu and Śiva, Buddhism was so modified as to allow the worship of an eternal, supreme deity, Adi-Buddha, of whom the historic Buddha was declared to have been an incarnation, an avatar. Around this supreme Buddha dwelling in highest heaven, were grouped a countless number of bodhisattvas, destined in future ages to become human Buddhas for the sake of erring man. To raise oneself to the rank of bodhisattva by meritorious works was the ideal now held out to pious souls. In place of Nirvana, *Sukhavati* became the object of pious longing, the heaven of sensuous pleasures, where *Amitabha*, an emanation of the eternal Buddha, reigned. For the attainment of Sukhavati, the necessity of virtuous conduct was not altogether forgotten, but an extravagant importance was attached to the worship of relics and statues, pilgrimages, and, above all, to the reciting of sacred names and magic formulas. Many other gross forms of Hindu superstition were also adopted. This innovation, completely subversive of the teaching of Buddha, supplanted the older system in the North. It was known as the *Mahayana*, or Great Vehicle, in distinction to the other and earlier form of Buddhism contemptuously styled the *Hinayana* or Little Vehicle, which held its own in the South. It is only by the few millions of Southern Buddhists that the teachings of Buddha have been substantially preserved.

Buddha's order seems to have grown rapidly, and through the good will of rulers, whose inferior origin debarred them from Brahmin privileges, to have become in the next two centuries a formidable rival of the older religion. The interesting rock-edicts of Asoka, a royal convert to Buddhism, who in the second quarter of the third century B. C., held dominion over the greater part of India, give evidence that Buddhism was in a most flourishing condition, while a tolerant and kindly spirit was displayed towards other forms of religion. Under his auspices, missionaries were sent to evangelize Ceylon in the South, and in the North, Kashmer, Kandahar, and the so-called Yavana country, identified by most scholars with the Greek settlements in the Kabul valley and vicinity, and later known as Bactria. In all these places, Buddhism quickly took root and flourished, though in the Northern countries the religion became later on corrupted and transformed into the Mahayana form of worship.

In the first century of the Christian Era, the knowledge of Buddha made its way to China. At the invitation of the Emperor Ming-ti, Buddhist monks came in A. D. 67 with sacred books, pictures, and relics. Conversions multiplied, and during the next few centuries the religious communications between the two countries were very close. Not only did Buddhist missionaries from India labour in China, but many Chinese monks showed their zeal for the newly adopted religion by making pilgrimages to the holy places in India. A few of them wrote interesting accounts, still extant, of what they saw and heard in their travels. Of these pilgrims the most noted are Fahien, who travelled in India and Ceylon in the years A. D. 399–414, and Hiouen-Tsang, who made extensive travels in India two centuries later (A. D. 629–645). The supplanting of the earlier form of Buddhism in the northern countries of India in the second century led to a corresponding change in the Buddhism of China. The later missionaries, being mostly from the North of India, brought with them the new doctrine, and in a short time the Mahayana or Northern Buddhism prevailed. Two of the bodhisattvas of Mahayana theology became the favourite objects of worship with the Chinese—*Amitabha*, lord of the Sukhavati paradise, and *Avalokitesvara*, extravagantly praised in the "Lotus of the True Law" as ready to extricate from every sort of danger those who think of him or cherish his name. The latter, known as *Fousa Kwanyin*, is worshipped, now as a male deity, again as the goddess of mercy, who comes to the relief of the faithful. Amitabha goes by the Chinese name *Amita*, or *Mito*. Offerings of flowers and incense made before his statues and the frequent repetition of his name are believed to ensure a future life of bliss in his distant Western paradise. An excessive devotion to statues and relics, the employment of magic arts to keep off evil spirits, and the observance of many of the gross superstitions of Taoism, complete the picture of Buddhism in China, a sorry representation of what Buddha made known to men. Chinese Buddhism was introduced into Korea in the fourth century, and from there taken to Japan two centuries later. The Buddhism of these countries is in the main like that of China, with the addition of a number of local superstitions. Annam

was also evangelized by Chinese Buddhists at an early period.

Buddhism was first introduced into Tibet in the latter part of the seventh century, but it did not begin to thrive till the ninth century. In 1260, the Buddhist conqueror of Tibet, Kublai Khan, raised the head lama, a monk of the great Sakja monastery, to the position of spiritual and temporal ruler. His modern successors have the title of Dalai Lama. Lamaism is based on the Northern Buddhism of India, after it had become saturated with the disgusting elements of Śiva worship. Its deities are innumerable, its idolatry unlimited. It is also much given to the use of magic formulas and to the endless repetition of sacred names. Its favourite formula is, *Om mani padme hum* (O jewel in the lotus, Amen), which, written on streamers exposed to the wind, and multiplied on paper slips turned by hand or wind or water, in the so-called prayer-wheels, is thought to secure for the agent unspeakable merit. The Dalai Lama, residing in the great monastery at Lhasa, passes for the incarnation of Amitabha, the Buddha of the Sukhavati paradise. Nine months after his death, a newly born babe is selected by divination as the reincarnate Buddha. Catholic missionaries to Tibet in the early part of the last century were struck by the outward resemblances to Catholic liturgy and discipline that were presented by Lamaism—its infallible head, grades of clergy corresponding to bishop and priest, the cross, mitre, dalmatic, cope, censer, holy water, etc. At once voices were raised proclaiming the Lamaistic origin of Catholic rites and practices. Unfortunately for this shallow theory, the Catholic Church was shown to have possessed these features in common with the Christian Oriental Churches long before Lamaism was in existence. The wide propagation of Nestorianism over Central and Eastern Asia as early as A. D. 635 offers a natural explanation for such resemblances as are accretions on Indian Buddhism. The missionary zeal of Tibetan lamas led to the extension of their religion to Tatary in the twelfth and following centuries. While Northern Buddhism was thus exerting a widespread influence over Central and Eastern Asia, the earlier form of Buddhism was making peaceful conquests of the countries and islands in the South. In the fifth century, missionaries from Ceylon evangelized Burma. Within the next two centuries, it spread to Siam, Cambodia, Java, and adjacent islands.

The number of Buddhists throughout the world is commonly estimated at about four hundred and fifty millions, that is, about one-third of the human race. But in this estimate the error is made of classing all the Chinese and Japanese as Buddhists. Professor Legge, whose years of experience in China give special weight to his judgment, declares that the Buddhists in the whole world are not more than one hundred millions, being far outnumbered not only by Christians, but also by the adherents of Confucianism and Hinduism. Professor Monier Williams holds the same view. Even if Buddhism, however, outranked Christianity in the number of adherents, it would be a mistake to attribute to the religion of Buddha, as some do, a more successful propagandism than to the religion of Christ. The latter has made its immense conquests, not by compromising with error and superstition, but by winning souls to the exclusive acceptance of its saving truths. Wherever it has spread, it has maintained its individuality. On the other hand, the vast majority of the adherents of Buddhism cling to forms of creed and worship that Buddha, if alive, would reprobate. Northern Buddhism became the very opposite of what Buddha taught to men, and in spreading to foreign lands accommodated itself to the degrading superstitions of the peoples it sought to win. It is only the Southern Buddhists of Ceylon, Burma, and Siam who deserve to be identified with the order founded by Buddha. They number at most but thirty millions of souls.

V. Buddhism and Christianity.—Between Buddhism and Christianity there are a number of resemblances, at first sight striking. The Buddhist order of monks and nuns offers points of similarity with Christian monastic systems, particularly the mendicant orders. There are moral aphorisms ascribed to Buddha that are not unlike some of the sayings of Christ. Most of all, in the legendary life of Buddha, which in its complete form is the outcome of many centuries of accretion, there are many parallelisms, some more, some less striking, to the Gospel stories of Christ. A few third-rate scholars, taking for granted that all these resemblances are pre-Christian, and led by the fallacious principle that resemblance always implies dependence, have vainly tried to show that Christian monasticism is of Buddhist origin, and that Buddhist thought and legend have been freely incorporated into the Gospels. To give greater speciousness to their theory, they have not scrupled to press into service, besides the few *bona fide* resemblances, many others that were either grossly exaggerated, or fictitious, or drawn from Buddhist sources less ancient than the Gospels. If, from this vast array of alleged Buddhist infiltrations, all these exaggerations, fictions, and anachronisms are eliminated, the points of resemblance that remain are, with perhaps one exception, such as may be explained on the ground of independent origin. The exception is the story of Buddha's conversion from the worldly life of a prince to the life of an ascetic, which was transformed by some Oriental Christian of the seventh century into the popular medieval tale of "Barlaam and Josaphat". (q. v.) Here is historic evidence of the turning of a Buddhist into a Christian legend just as, on the other hand, the fifth-century sculptures of Gospel scenes on the ruined Buddhist monasteries of Jamalgiri, in Northern Panjab, described in the scholarly work of Fergusson and Burgess, "The Cave Temples of India", offer reliable evidence that the Buddhists of that time did not scruple to embellish the Buddha legend with adaptations from Christian sources. But is there any historical basis for the assertion that Buddhist influence was a factor in the formation of Christianity and of the Christian Gospels? The advocates of this theory pretend that the rock-inscriptions of Asoka bear witness to the spread of Buddhism over the Greek-speaking world as early as the third century B. C., since they mention the flourishing existence of Buddhism among the *Yavanas*, i. e. Greeks within the dominion of Antiochus. But in the unanimous judgment of first-rate scholars, the Yavanas here mentioned mean simply and solely the Greek-speaking peoples on the extreme frontier next to India, namely, Bactria and the Kabul valley. Again the statement in the late Buddhist chronicle, *Mahavansa*, that among the Buddhists who came to the dedication of a great *Stupa* in Ceylon in the second century B. C., "were over thirty thousand monks from the vicinity of Alassada, the capital of the Yona country", is taken to prove that long before the time of Christ, Alexandria in Egypt was the centre of flourishing Buddhist communities. It is true that Alassada is the Pali for Alexandria; but the best scholars are agreed that the city here meant is not the ancient capital of Egypt, but as the text indicates, the chief city of the Yona country, the Yavana country of the rock-inscriptions, namely, Bactria and vicinity. And so, the city referred to is most likely Alexandria *ad Caucasum*.

In short, there is nothing in Buddhist records that may be taken as reliable evidence for the spread of Buddhism westward to the Greek world as early as

the foundation of the Christian religion. That Buddhist institutions were at that time unknown in the West may be safely inferred from the fact that Buddhism is absolutely ignored in the literary and archæological remains of Palestine, Egypt, and Greece. There is not a single ruin of a Buddhist monastery or *stupa* in any of these countries; not a single Greek translation of a Buddhist book; not a single reference in all Greek literature to the existence of a Buddhist community in the Greek world. The very name of Buddha is mentioned for the first time only in the writings of Clement of Alexandria (second century). To explain the resemblances in Christianity to a number of pre-Christian features of Buddhism, there is no need of resorting to the hypothesis that they were borrowed. Nothing is more common in the study of comparative ethnology and religion than to find similar social and religious customs practised by peoples too remote to have had any communication with one another. How easily the principle of ascetic detachment from the world may lead to a community life in which celibacy is observed, may be seen in the monastic systems that have prevailed not only among Buddhists, Essenes, and Christians, but also among the early Aztecs and Incas in the New World. Nor is this so strange when it is recalled that men everywhere have, to a large extent, the same daily experiences, the same feelings, the same desires. As the laws of human thought are everywhere the same, it lies in the very nature of things that men, in so far as they have the same experiences, or face the same religious needs, will think the same thoughts, and give expression to them in sayings and customs that strike the unreflecting observer by their similarity. It is only by losing sight of this fundamental truth that one can unwittingly fall into the error of assuming that resemblance always implies dependence.

It is chiefly the legendary features of Buddha's life, many of which are found for the first time only in works of later date than the Gospels, that furnish the most striking resemblances to certain incidents related of Christ in the Gospels, resemblances which might with greater show of reason be traced to a common historic origin. If there has been any borrowing here, it is plainly on the side of Buddhism. That Christianity made its way to Northern India in the first two centuries is not only a matter of respectable tradition, but is supported by weighty archæological evidence. Scholars of recognized ability, beyond the suspicion of undue bias in favour of Christianity—Weber, Goblet d'Alviella, and others—think it very likely that the Gospel stories of Christ circulated by these early Christian communities in India were utilized by the Buddhists to enrich the Buddha legend, just as the Vishnuites built up the legend of Krishna on many striking incidents in the life of Christ.

The fundamental tenets of Buddhism are marked by grave defects that not only betray its inadequacy to become a religion of enlightened humanity, but also bring into bold relief its inferiority to the religion of Jesus Christ. In the first place, the very foundation on which Buddhism rests—the doctrine of *karma* with its implied transmigrations—is gratuitous and false. This pretended law of nature, by which the myriads of gods, demons, men, and animals are but the transient forms of rational beings essentially the same, but forced to this diversity in consequence of varying degrees of merit and demerit in former lives, is a huge superstition in flat contradiction to the recognized laws of nature, and hence ignored by men of science. Another basic defect in primitive Buddhism is its failure to recognize man's dependence on a supreme God. By ignoring God and by making salvation rest solely on personal effort, Buddha substituted for the Brahmin religion a cold and colourless system of philosophy. It is entirely lacking in those powerful motives to right conduct, particularly the motive of love, that spring from the sense of dependence on a personal all-loving God. Hence it is that Buddhist morality is in the last analysis a selfish utilitarianism. There is no sense of duty, as in the religion of Christ, prompted by reverence for a supreme Lawgiver, by love for a merciful Father, by personal allegiance to a Redeemer. *Karma*, the basis of Buddhist morality, is like any other law of nature, the observance of which is prompted by prudential considerations. Not infrequently one meets the assertion that Buddha surpassed Jesus in holding out to struggling humanity an end utterly unselfish. This is a mistake. Not to speak of the popular *Swarga*, or heaven, with its positive, even sensual delights, the fact that Nirvana is a negative ideal of bliss does not make it the less an object of interested desire. Far from being an unselfish end, Nirvana is based wholly on the motive of self-love. It thus stands on a much lower level than the Christian ideal, which, being primarily and essentially a union of friendship with God in heaven, appeals to motives of disinterested as well as interested love.

Another fatal defect of Buddhism is its false pessimism. A strong and healthy mind revolts against the morbid view that life is not worth living, that every form of conscious existence is an evil. Buddhism stands condemned by the voice of nature, the dominant tone of which is hope and joy. It is a protest against nature for possessing the perfection of rational life. The highest ambition of Buddhism is to destroy that perfection by bringing all living beings to the unconscious repose of Nirvana. Buddhism is thus guilty of a capital crime against nature, and in consequence does injustice to the individual. All legitimate desires must be repressed. Innocent recreations are condemned. The cultivation of music is forbidden. Researches in natural science are discountenanced. The development of the mind is limited to the memorizing of Buddhist texts and the study of Buddhist metaphysics, only a minimum of which is of any value. The Buddhist ideal on earth is a state of passive indifference to everything. How different is the teaching of Him who came that men might have life and have it more abundantly. Again Buddhist pessimism is unjust to the family. Marriage is held in contempt and even abhorrence as leading to the procreation of life. In thus branding marriage as a state unworthy of man, Buddhism betrays its inferiority to Christianity, which recommends virginity, but at the same time teaches that marriage is a sacred union and a source of sanctification. Buddhist pessimism likewise does injustice to society. It has set the seal of approval on the Brahmin prejudice against manual labor. Since life is not worth living, to labour for the comforts and refinements of civilized life is a delusion. The perfect man is to subsist not by the labour of his hands, but on the alms of inferior men. In the religion of Christ, "the carpenter's son", a healthier view prevails. The dignity of labour is upheld, and every form of industry is encouraged that tends to promote man's welfare.

Buddhism has accomplished but little for the uplifting of humanity in comparison with Christianity. One of its most attractive features, which, unfortunately, has become wellnigh obsolete, was its practice of benevolence towards the sick and needy. Between Buddhists and Brahmins there was a commendable rivalry in maintaining dispensaries of food and medicine. But this charity did not, like the Christian form, extend to the prolonged nursing of unfortunates stricken with contagious and incurable diseases, to the protection of foundlings, to the bringing up of orphans, to the rescue of fallen women, to the care of the aged and insane. Asylums and hospitals in this sense are unknown to Buddhism.

The consecration of religious men and women to the lifelong service of afflicted humanity is foreign to dreamy Buddhist monasticism. Again, the wonderful efficacy displayed by the religion of Christ in purifying the morals of pagan Europe has no parallel in Buddhist annals. Wherever the religion of Buddha has prevailed, it has proved singularly inefficient to lift society to a high standard of morality. It has not weaned the people of Tibet and Mongolia from the custom of abandoning the aged, nor the Chinese from the practice of infanticide. Outside the establishment of the order of nuns, it has done next to nothing to raise woman from her state of degradation in Oriental lands. It has shown itself utterly helpless to cope with the moral plagues of humanity. The consentient testimony of witnesses above the suspicion of prejudice establishes the fact that at the present day Buddhist monks are everywhere strikingly deficient in that moral earnestness and exemplary conduct which distinguished the early followers of Buddha. In short, Buddhism is all but dead. In its huge organism the faint pulsations of life are still discernible, but its power of activity is gone. The spread of European civilization over the East will inevitably bring about its extinction.

I. Texts.—Davids and Oldenberg, *Vinaya Texts* in *Sacred Books of the East* (Oxford), XIII, XVII, XX; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Suttas, op. cit.*, XI; Idem, *The Mahaparinibbana Sutta, op. cit.*, XI; Idem, *The Questions of King Milinda, op. cit.*, XXXV, XXXVI; Fausböll, *The Sutta-Nipata, op. cit.*, X, Pt. I; Müller, *The Dhammapada, op. cit.*, X, Pt. II; Kern, *The Saddharma-Pundarika, op. cit.*, XXI; Müller, *The Sukhavativyuha, op. cit.*, XLIX, Pt. II; Takahusu, *The Amitayur-Dhyana-Sutra, op. cit.*, XLIX, Pt. II; Warren, *Buddhism* in *Translations* (Cambridge, 1896); Chalmers and Others, *The Jatakas* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1895–97); Bigandet, *The Life or Legend of Gaudama* (2 vols., London, 1880); Cowell, *The Buddha-Charita*, in *Sacred Books of the East*, XLII; Foucaux, *Lalita Vistara*, in *Annales du Musée Guimet* (Paris), VI, XIX.

II. Works on Buddhism.—Barth, *The Religions of India* (London, 1891); Hopkins, *The Religions of India* (Boston, 1895); Williams, *Buddhism in Connection with Brahmanism and Hinduism* (London, 1889); Coppleston, *Buddhism, Primitive and Present* (London, 1892); Davids, *Buddhism, its History and Literature* (New York, 1896); Aiken, *The Dhamma of Gotama the Buddha and the Gospel of Jesus the Christ* (Boston, 1900); Edmunds, *Buddhist and Christian Gospels now first Compared from the Originals* (London, 1904); Kellogg, *The Light of Asia and the Light of the World* (London, 1888); Dahlmann, *Buddha, ein Culturbild des Ostens* (Berlin, 1898); de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte* (2 vols., 3d ed., Freiburg, 1905), II; Poussin, *Bouddhisme. Etudes et Matériaux* (Paris, 1898); Hardy, *Der Buddhismus nach älteren Paliwerken* (Münster, 1890); Oldenberg, *Buddha* (Berlin, 1904; tr., London, 1882).

Charles F. Aiken.

Budé (Budæus), Guillaume, French Hellenist, b. at Paris, 1467; d. there, 22 August, 1540. He studied at Paris and Orléans, but with little success or application. Subsequently, however, he seemed to acquire a sudden passion for learning. After taking lessons in Greek from Hermonymus, and profiting by the advice of Joannes Lascaris, he attained great proficiency in that language. He studied at the same time, philosophy, theology, law, and medicine, in all of which he made rapid progress. Budé's abilities were recognized by Louis XII, whose secretary he became after his return from a successful embassy on occasion of the coronation of Pope Julius II. He was sent to Rome again on a mission to Pope Leo X (1515), but was recalled at his own request and accompanied Francis I in his travels. It was then that he suggested to the king the creation of a college for the study of the three languages (Greek, Hebrew, and Latin), afterwards the "Collège de France". Empowered to ask Erasmus to take charge of it (1517–18), he failed in his mission, and the college was not founded until 1530. At his suggestion, also, Francis declined to prohibit printing, as the Sorbonne had advised (1533). Literary France owes to Budé's efforts the foundation of the "Bibliothèque de Fontainebleau", which was the origin of the "Bibliothèque Nationale". His letters to Erasmus, Thomas More, Sadolet, Rabelais, and others, written in Greek, Latin, or French, were the delight of scholars of the time. Budé was suspected of leanings towards Calvinism, and certain parts of his correspondence with Erasmus seemed to countenance this suspicion. However, it was disproved after his death. Having already translated into Latin many of Plutarch's Lives (1502–05), he published his "Annotationes in XXIV libros Pandectarum" (Paris, 1508), in which, by applying philology and history to the Roman law, he revolutionized the study of jurisprudence. Budé's treatise on Roman coins and weights, "De asse et partibus ejus" (Venice, 1522), was the best book on the subject written up to that time. In 1520 he published a philosophical and moral dissertation, "De contemptu rerum fortuitarum"; in 1527, "De studio litterarum", in which he urges youth not to neglect their literary studies. Greek, however, was his favourite study, and we have from him, "Commentarii linguæ græcæ" (Paris, 1529), which greatly advanced the study of Greek literature in France, "De transitu helenismi ad Christianismum" (Paris, 1534), and various other works of similar scope though of minor importance. His complete works were published at Bâsle in 1557.

Le Roy, *Vita G. Budæi* (Paris, 1540); Nicéron, *Histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Budé* in *Mém.*, VIII, 371–89 (1727–45); E. de Budé, *Vie de Guillaume Budé* (Paris, 1884).

M. de Moreira.

Budweis (Czech, Budejovice; Lat. Budovicium), Diocese of (Bohemo-Budvicensis), situated in Southern Bohemia, suffragan to the Archdiocese of Prague. Although projected since 1630, the diocese was not erected until the reign of Emperor Joseph II, by a papal Bull of 20 September, 1785. By the provisions of this Bull, the civil districts of Budweis, Tabor, Prachatitz, and Klattau were separated from the Archdiocese of Prague and erected into the new Diocese of Budweis, thus giving it an area of 5600 sq. miles with a population of 660,000. The church of St. Nicholas at Budweis was made cathedral, and the Archbishop of Prague contributed 3300 Rhenish marks (present value 10,080 kronen or $2,016) towards its endowment.

The following bishops have occupied the See of Budweis: (1) Johann Prokop, Count von Schaffgotsche (1785–1813), formerly rector of the *Generalseminar* at Brünn, and canon at Olmütz; (2) Ernst Konstantin Ružička (1815–45); (3) Joseph Andreas Lindauer (1845–50); (4) Johann Valerian Jirsík (1851–83), especially noteworthy for the part he took in the development of the diocese; (5) Franz, Count Schönborn (1883–85), later Cardinal and Archbishop of Prague, d. 1899; (6) Martin Joseph Říha (7 July, 1885–6 February, 1907), the first diocesan ecclesiastic to be appointed Bishop of Budweis. The present administrator (1907) is the Vicar Capitular, J. Hulka. In conformity with the decree of the provincial council of Prague (1860) three diocesan synods have been held (1870, 1872, 1875).

Statistics.—According to the organization of 1857 the Diocese of Budweis is divided into the Vicariate-General of Budweis on which depend the archdeaconry of Krummau, the provostship of Neuhaus, and 8 archipresbyterates: Budweis, Klattau, Krummau, Neuhaus, Taus, and Winterberg, with 4 vicariates each, and Strakonitz and Tabor with 5 vicariates each, making a total of 34 vicariates. Among the 432 ecclesiastical divisions for the cure of souls, there are two archdeaconries, 57 deaneries, 366 parishes, 5 expositures, and 1 administrature, with a total population (1907) of 1,123,113. This number is divided as follows: 1,106,729 Roman Catholics (an average of 98.1 per cent, in many vicariates 99.92 per cent of the whole population); 1589 members of the Augsburg Evangelical Church;

2302 members of the Helvetic Evangelical Church; 12,447 Jews; and 46 of no religious persuasion. The population of 282 of the ecclesiastical divisions (68.9 per cent), 761,568 is almost entirely Czech; that of 110 (15.34 per cent), 181,790, purely German; that of 25 (10.66 per cent), 119,830, predominantly Czech; and of 15 (5.1 per cent), 59,925, prevailingly German. The average population of a parish is 2000, the population of the largest, Budweis, being 45,528, and of the smallest, Korkushütten, 414.

The clergy actively engaged in the ministry number 849 secular and 136 regular priests. The latter are thus divided: 59 Cistercians from Hohenfurth, with 4 professed clerics; 18 Brothers of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar, a congregation founded at Budweis in 1888, with 5 clerics, 18 lay brothers, and 11 novices; 14 Premonstratensians; 11 Knights of Malta; 3 Minorites; 4 Reformed Franciscans, with 5 lay brothers; 3 Calced and 4 Discalced Augustinians, with 4 lay brothers; 6 Redemptorists, with 4 lay brothers; 6 Servites with 4 lay brothers; 4 Capuchins, with 4 lay brothers; 3 Piarists. Twenty-nine parishes are attended by members of religious orders; 2 are granted by free collation, i. e. bestowed by the metropolitan; and the rest are subject to patronage, 88 to ecclesiastical patronage. The cathedral chapter consists of a provost, a dean, who is also the urban dean of Budweis, a cantor, and 3 capitular canons to which are added 4 honorary canons; the consistory has 9 members. Young men are trained for the priesthood in the theological seminary at Budweis, which provides for those speaking the different languages found in the diocese; it has 6 professors and 103 students, 3 in the Bohemian College in Rome. There is also in Budweis an episcopal school for boys (*petit séminaire*) without a special gymnasium attached (founded 1853).

Female Religious Orders, Shrines, Churches, etc.—In the diocese there are 7 orders of women, with 362 sisters, 90 novices and lay sisters, and 40 houses; 216 Poor School Sisters of Notre Dame (since 1849); 129 Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo (1842); 93 Sisters of the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar (founded at Budweis in 1887); 2 Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul; 3 Sisters of the Holy Cross; 3 Servites; and 2 Franciscans. The great mass of the people are engaged in agricultural pursuits and are in general religiously inclined. Popular missions (*Volksmissionen*) are frequent, 450 of them being held between 1850 and 1897 in 228 parishes, 334 by Redemptorists and 112 by Jesuits. The chief confraternities are: the Confraternity of the Rosary, in 230 parishes, with 30,000 members; the Confraternity for the Adoration of the Most Blessed Sacrament and the Adornment of Poor Churches, founded in 1859, in 238 parishes, which has 15,000 members and disburses yearly 5,000 kronen ($1,000); the Confraternity of St. Michael in 265 parishes, with 5,000 members, who contribute annually 4,000 kronen ($800) towards Peter's-pence.

The principal places of pilgrimage are: Brünn, founded in 1715, visited yearly by 300 processions; Rimau, built at the end of the seventeenth century, with 100 annual processions; Gojau mentioned as early as 1469; and Křemeschnik, built in 1632. Here, as in the rest of Bohemia, ecclesiastical edifices of earlier centuries were greatly damaged during the religious wars of the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. The prevailing architectural style is baroque. Mention should be made of the Romanesque church of Mühlhausen, built between 1184 and 1250, formerly a Premonstratensian church; the Cistercian abbey-churches of Goldenkron (1263–1300), and Hohenfurth (1259–1350), built in Gothic style; the two-naved church of St. Ægidius in Mühlhausen, originally Romanesque (in the twelfth century), in 1407 rebuilt in the Gothic style; the cathedral at Budweis (1642–49) and the parish church at Prestitz (1748–73) are examples of the baroque style, the latter designed by Kilian Dienzenhofer. Popular Catholic associations are not at present very numerous. There are but two Catholic weekly papers in the diocese. It is only within recent years that any serious attempts have been made to organize the Catholics of the diocese, both on political and non-partisan lines. These efforts have so far met with scant success; in the past, therefore, the territory of the diocese has been represented in the Austrian Parliament by Liberal deputies.

Trajer, *Historisch-statistische Beschreibung der Diözese Budweis* (Budweis, 1862); Mardetschläger-Trajer, *Geschichte des Bistums Budweis* (ibid., 1885); Ladenbauer, *Das soziale Wirken der kathol. Kirche in Oesterreich; Diözese Budweis* (Vienna, 1899); *Catalogus Cleri dioec. Budvicen, 1907* (Budweis, 1907).

Karl Hilgenreiner.

Buenos Aires, the federal capital of the Argentine Republic, and the second city of the Latin races in the world (having a population of 1,100,000), as well as the first in commercial importance among the cities of South America, is situated in latitude 34° 35′ 30″ S., and longitude 58° 22′ 20″ W., on the right bank of the

Cathedral of Buenos Aires

Río de la Plata, at an elevation of about 65 feet. The Río de la Plata (Plate, or Silver, River), the estuary of which has a maximum width of more than 108 miles, is about 43 miles wide at Buenos Aires.

With a mean annual death-rate of 14 per thousand, the city takes rank in respect of sanitation with the most advanced cities of the world. The mean temperature is 62° 6′ F., snow never falls, and hail only rarely, and the thermometer ranges from 59 F. to 82° 4′ F., at times, however, reaching 95°. The north wind, humid and warm, and in summer even suffocating, charges the atmosphere with electricity, causing general debility and nervous troubles; but this wind never lasts for more than three days, and generally changes to a south-east wind, bringing rain or storm, upon which there follows the cold, dry south-west wind called the *Pampero*, which clears the sky. The vicissitudes of weather are extremely abrupt, with changes of temperature amounting sometimes to as much as 36°, with violent winds. The *Pampero*, highly charged with ozone, exercises a disinfecting influence and serves to purify the vitiated atmosphere of the thickly populated sections of the city. The healthiness of Buenos Aires (in English, literally, *Good Airs*) arises from two other most important causes: the supply of running water and the drainage system—as to both of which something will be said later on. The mean annual rainfall recorded in the five years from 1899 to 1903 was a little more than

43.164 inches. The barometer ordinarily ranges from 29.825 inches to 30.03 inches.

At the time of its founding in 1580 this settlement had 300 inhabitants; in 1744 the population was 11,118; 40,000 in 1801 (estimated); 62,228 in 1822; 177,787 in 1869; 404,000 in 1887; 663,854 in 1895; 950,891 in 1904; 1,084,280 in December, 1906; 1,109,202 (estimated) in July, 1907. All of these amounts, except the third and the last, are taken from the official census. Of the total annual increase in population (46.3 per thousand), 19 to 20 per thousand is due to excess of birth-rate over death-rate; the rest being the effect of immigration. In the 950,981 inhabitants reported in the census of 18 September, 1904, the Argentines numbered 523,041; the foreigners, 427,850 (228,556 of the latter number being Italians, and 105,206 Spaniards). Classified by religious beliefs the figures were: 823,926 Catholics; 24,996 Protestants; 6,065 Jews; 8,054 of various other creeds; 13,335 professing no religious belief, and 74,515 unspecified.

The municipality of Buenos Aires is a federal district of 73¾ square miles (19,006 hectares). The governing authority of this district, vested in the president of the republic, is exercised through a minister of the interior and a chief of police, for the maintenance of public order, and in a superintendent (*intendiente de la capital*) and a municipal council, for the construction and management of public works. The police force carry modern firearms. Both the municipal council and the superintendent have been since 1901 appointed by the president with the assent of the senate, though the question of reverting to the former system of popular election was, in 1907, under discussion by the Legislature. The municipal revenue in 1904, was $5,571,840 (5,804,000 *pesos oro*). In the older portions of Buenos Aires the streets are from 30 to 40 feet wide; the few avenues as yet in existence have a width, generally, of about 57 feet, though the Avenida de Mayo, nearly a mile in length, is 99 feet wide. The paving of the city, formerly defective, has gone on improving from year to year until the present time, when 70 per cent of the public thoroughfares is paved with granite over a bed of cement or sand, 15 per cent with macadam, asphalt, or carob block, and the remainder with cobblestone. There are upwards of 300 miles of street railway, mostly electric, the traffic on which for the year 1903 was registered at 133,719,218 passengers.

Since the cholera epidemic of 1867–68, and the yellow fever of 1872, two public engineering achievements have most powerfully co-operated towards the healthfulness of the city: the waterworks and the drainage system. The supply of drinking water is derived from the Río de la Plata by means of a great pumping tower whence the water passes, through a tunnel three and two-thirds miles in length, to the reservoirs, to be filtered, clarified, and then raised by powerful pumps to the monumental structure known as the *Depósito de las aguas corrientes*. In this building twelve iron tanks, each 134½ feet square and 13 feet deep, are arranged in three tiers of four each, at different levels. These twelve tanks have an aggregate capacity of 72,000 tons of water. The drainage system includes an installation in every house, connected scientifically with the *cloaca máxima*, or main sewer of the city, which runs a distance of 19 miles and 7 furlongs (32 km.) and discharges into the Río de la Plata opposite Berasátegui. The rain-drainage pipes are connected with the main system in such a manner that in case of a heavy downpour, the excess of water is turned aside to a special rain-drainage conduit, having a capacity of 1419 cubic feet per second, which, after running a distance of nearly two and three-quarter miles, discharges its contents at a point north of Dársena Norte. The establishment of these two great systems of sanitary works has lowered the death-rate from 30 per thousand, in 1887, to 14 per thousand, in 1904.

Other municipal institutions worthy of mention are the great abattoirs of Liniers, which cover an area of more than 61 acres, and from which 700,000 carcases of beef and 900,000 of mutton, ready for the market, are annually turned out, and the produce-market, an immense depository where the wheat, wool, leather, etc., produced in the country are collected for exportation. The state university of the republic, with faculties of law, medicine, engineering, philosophy, and literature, established in separate buildings, is situated at Buenos Aires; also many institutions of secondary and primary education, both public and private.

From very early times Buenos Aires has been generally known throughout South America by the colloquial name of *El Puerto*, and to this day the natives of the city are called *Porteños*, rather than *Bonaerenses*, or Buenos-Aireans. Nevertheless, until 1885, and even later, *El Puerto*, being only a river port, and as the bottom of the river had gone on rising with the deposits of mud brought down by the stream, the river front could not offer a sufficient depth of water for vessels of even moderate draught; which were, therefore, obliged to anchor many miles away from the bank. The improvements of Puerto Madero, however, effected between 1890 and 1899, have now attracted ocean steamers of the highest tonnage. Vessels of lower tonnage anchor at the little port of Boca del Riachuelo, the mouth of a comparatively small stream which empties into the Plata south of the city. Both these ports are subject to the necessity of constant dredging to counteract the silting-up of the bottom by the action of the stream. The number of entries and clearings at these two ports amounts to 6000 in the year, aggregating more than 28,000,000 tons. The commerce of Buenos Aires is 849 per thousand of the imports, and 515 per thousand of exports of the whole republic.

The first foundation of Buenos Aires took place in the beginning of the year 1536, under Don Pedro de Mendoza, Gentleman of the Bedchamber to the Emperor Charles V and *Adelantado* of the Río de la Plata. In 1541 it was deliberately depopulated by Don Domingo Martínez de Irala, the governor, its inhabitants being transferred to Asunción, in Paraguay. The second founding took place 11 June, 1580, under Juan de Garay, Lieutenant-Governor and Captain-General for the Adelantado Juan Ortiz de Zarate. Since its first foundation the place had been called the Port of Santa María de Buenos Aires, and the city was called Santísima Trinidad, taking its name from the day (Trinity Sunday, 29 May, 1580) on which Garay arrived there with his followers, and erected the Royal Standard in anticipation of the formalities of the founding proper. Hence the name usual in ancient documents: *Ciudad de la Santísima Trinidad, Puerto de Buenos Aires*. Santísima Trinidad is still an alternative title of the archdiocese. Buenos Aires in 1617 was made the capital of the province of Río de la Plata, which was created a viceroyalty in 1776. In 1593 the city was threatened by the expedition under Hawkins sent against the Spanish possessions in South America by Queen Elizabeth of England; in 1627 by the Dutch who had taken possession of Brazil; in 1657 by the French expedition of Timoléon Osmat, a soldier of fortune; in 1698 by another French squadron; in 1700 by a Danish. But on none of these occasions was the city actually attacked. A British expedition under Popham obtained a footing in Buenos Aires (27 June, 1806), but the place was recovered by conquest on the 12th of the following August, and defended against a new and formidable expedition commdaned by Whitelock (2–5 July, 1807) by the country people organized as a militia force, who, on the former occasion, made

prisoners of the invading force and, on the latter, forced a definitive evacuation of the territory. From 1810 to 1824 the city was a principal centre of the uprising which led to the separation of the Spanish-American colonies from the mother country.

ARCHDIOCESE OF BUENOS AIRES (BONAERENSIS), or SANTÍSIMA TRINIDAD.—The Diocese of Buenos Aires was formed upon the dismemberment of the original Diocese of Asunción, in Paraguay, by a Bull of Paul III in 1620. Its first bishop was Pedro Carranza, a Carmelite, who was succeeded by a series of nineteen bishops, ending in 1855, when a Bull of Pius IX created Buenos Aires an archdiocese. This archdiocese comprises, besides the federal district with its 1,100,000 inhabitants, the territories of Río Negro, Chubut, and Santa Cruz, commonly known as Patagonia, or Tierra del Fuego, and containing altogether a population of 41,964. The city itself is divided into 22 parishes and 2 mission (succursal) parishes, each with its church. Besides these parish churches there are 50 churches and public chapels, also 80 other chapels, many of them semi-public, connected with religious and charitable institutions. (For some account of particular churches see ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.) The archbishop is assisted by an auxiliary bishop and two vicars-general. The metropolitan chapter consists of a dean, five other dignitaries, and five canons (a theologian, a penitentiary, a canon of the first class, a canon of the second class, and a secretary). There are in the archdiocese 254 secular priests. The seminary, situated at Villa Devoto, is a fine edifice with a public chapel dedicated to the Immaculate Conception. It is expected that this establishment will be converted into the central seminary of the republic and a Pontifical university of sacred sciences. There are 54 religious communities. Pious associations for seculars, women as well as men, are numerous, particularly those devoted to works of charity, upon which the people of Buenos Aires spend immense sums. Catholic colleges for primary and secondary instruction are numerous. Among those conducted by religious are San José, under the Bayonne Fathers; Salvador, under the Fathers of the Society of Jesus; the Dominican college of Lacordaire; that of the Escolapios, and that of the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine. Active efforts are being made to establish a Catholic university. Among the various periodicals the "Revista Eclesiástica del Arzobispado" and the daily "El Pueblo" deserve special mention. The workingmen have organized themselves into Catholic clubs, the membership of which now exceeds 40,000.

It is to be remarked that the Catholics of this city, like those of the whole republic, whether failing to realize exactly the existing social conditions, or because they have been too much occupied with political contentions, have restricted their efforts to the formation of charitable associations, doing nothing, until very recently, in the direction of socio-political organization. A sectarian persecution which arose during the years 1884–88 aroused the dormant zeal of the faithful, and a Catholic congress was held which produced copious results. A congress of Franciscan Tertiaries was held in 1906, and a second congress of Catholics in general has been convoked for the year 1907, through the initiative of the Congregation of the Immaculate Conception and Saint Aloysius Gonzaga in the College of San Salvador.

PAGE, *La Plata, The Argentine Confederation and Paraguay* (New York, 1859); PARISH, *Buenos Ayres and the Provinces of Río de la Plata* (London, 1839); SALVADORES, *Guía eclesiástica del Arzobispado de Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires, 1907); *Boletín demográfico argentino, publicación oficial* (Buenos Aires, 1906–07); MARTÍNEZ, *L'Argentine au XX^e siècle* (Paris, 1906); MARTÍNEZ, *Estudio topográfico é historia demográfica de Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires, 1899); MARTÍNEZ, *Anuario estadístico de Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires, 1899–1903); MARTÍNEZ, *Censo general de población, edificación, comercio, é industrias de la ciudad de Buenos Aires levantado en los días 11 y 18 de Septiembre de 1904* (Buenos Aires, 1906); HERNAEZ, *Colección de Bulas, Breves, y otros documentos relativos á la Iglesia de América* (Brussels, 1879); LARROUY, *Orígenes de Buenos Aires* (Buenos Aires, 1905); *Razón y Fe* (Madrid, 1903), VI, 364; GAMBÓN, *Manual de instrucción cívica* (Buenos Aires, 1906).

PABLO HERNANDEZ.

Buffalo, DIOCESE OF, established 23 April, 1847, now comprises the counties of Erie, Niagara, Genesee, Orleans, Chautauqua, Wyoming, Cattaraugus, and Allegany, in the State of New York, U. S. A., an area of 6,357 square miles. It was set apart from the great Diocese of New York and the see located at Buffalo on Lake Erie, the territory comprising nearly one-third of the State of New York. In 1868 the Diocese of Rochester was formed from the eastern counties of this territory; and in 1896, after Bishop Ryan's death, four more counties, Steuben, Schuyler, Chemung, and Tioga, were taken from the Diocese of Buffalo and added to the Rochester jurisdiction.

INDIAN MISSIONS.—Two of the nations of the Iroquois League, the Senecas and the Cayugas, dwelt in this region before the advent of the white men. The Senecas had villages in the valley of the Genesee about twenty miles from Lake Ontario, and the Cayugas erected their cabins near the lake which still bears their name. The Seneca was the most populous and warlike nation of the League. In their frequent raids into the country of the Hurons of Northern Canada, they carried off many captives who had been instructed in Christianity by the French missionaries from Quebec. So numerous were these Huron Christian captives that they formed an entire village, which was called St. Michael's, in memory of their old Huron home. Jesuit missionaries visited these towns in 1656, and cheered the Christian captives who had lost all hope of ever again beholding a "Black Robe". In 1669 this village was located in the north-east part of the present town of East Bloomfield. The Rev. Father Fremin, a Jesuit, established his residence in this town in the fall of 1668, built a chapel, and said the first Mass there, 3 November, 1668. Three years later the Rev. James Pierron became the resident missionary at Gannagaro, or St. James, a Seneca town situated on Boughton Hill, south of the present village of Victor. The principal village of the Cayugas was situated about three and one-half miles south of Union Springs, near Great Gully Brook. This was called St. Joseph's by the Jesuits. Father Carheil built a chapel there in November, 1668, and immediately began his work of instructing. There was another town of the Cayugas at the northern extremity of Seneca Lake. Another chapel was built in the large Seneca town of Gandachioragon, or Totiakton, which was called the Immaculate Conception by the Jesuits. This was situated near Lima, about ten miles west of St. James.

The Jesuits had four or five prosperous missions within the territory of the original Diocese of Buffalo, in which they laboured successfully for ten years until English intrigue and subsequent wars with the French forced them from the field. During those years they baptized nearly all the dying; they imparted a general knowledge of Christianity to the two western nations of the League; they strengthened the old Huron Christians in their faith, and added several hundred Iroquois converts to the Church. Many of the Iroquois chiefs sided with the English, in the war of the latter against the French, and the French missionaries were forced from the field of their labours. Many of the Christian Indians had already abandoned their homes in the Iroquois country for the new settlements on the St. Lawrence, under the protection of the French; and many more accompanied the Fathers in their flight, and settled on the St. Regis, or at Caughnawaga, where they still practise the Faith they acquired in their Iroquois homes. In the summer of 1669 the explorer, La

Salle, with two Sulpicians and a party of twenty-five men, started to explore the region of the Great Lakes in search of a north-west passage to India. They skirted along the southern shore of Lake Ontario, crossing the mouth of Niagara River, until they reached Burlington Bay, where the party disbanded. La Salle went again in 1678, with Father Hennepin, in a large vessel which entered the Niagara River on 6th December, to the strains of the *Te Deum*. The next day a party with Father Hennepin ascended the river in a canoe, and landed on the northern shore, near the present suspension bridge on the Canada side. On 11 December, 1678, they landed on the other side of the river where Father Hennepin said Mass. This was probably the first Mass celebrated within the present limits of the Diocese of Buffalo. A little fort was built there as a protection against Indian assault. Then they proceeded up the river, about five miles above the Falls, where the "Griffon" was built. Father Hennepin remained there all winter, holding service for the men in a little chapel until the vessel was towed up the river to the present harbour of Black Rock, where it anchored until it was in readiness to sail as the first vessel on the lakes.

CATHOLIC SETTLERS.—After Denonville had destroyed the Seneca towns in 1687, he sent a detachment of his army to establish a fort at the mouth of the Niagara River. A garrison of one hundred men was left there with a chaplain. Many died the following winter, and the fort was abandoned. It was reoccupied in 1726, and from that date regular services were held in the chapel until 1759, when the fort capitulated to the English. Soon after the Revolutionary War the Government began building military roads, and the State legislature made appropriations for building highways, and these offered intending settlers better facilities for proceeding farther inland. There was a highway through the State before 1820, reaching to Lake Erie. Buffalo and Erie County offered advantages to intending settlers, and about 1820 many Alsatians located in the vicinity. Many of these were Catholics, but they had no priest, and they could only keep alive the religious spirit by family devotions. The Rev. Patrick Kelly, ordained by Bishop Connolly of New York in 1821, was sent to minister to the Catholics of the western part of the State. He visited Buffalo the same year, and held one public service in a little frame building on Pearl Street. The Rev. Stephen Badin was the first priest to remain any length of time in Buffalo. His field of labour was Kentucky, but sickness compelled him to seek rest. He visited Buffalo for six weeks as the guest of Louis Le Couteulx, who then lived at the corner of Main and Exchange Streets. Here he said Mass for the Catholics of the town; and he urged them to organize and form a congregation. Mr. Le Couteulx started the good work by donating a site for church, cemetery, and priest's residence, at the corner of Main and Edward Streets. The deed was sent to Bishop Dubois as a New Year's gift in January, 1829. Bishop Dubois visited Buffalo the same year and concluded that the number of Catholics in the vicinity required the attention of a resident priest, so the Rev. John Nicholas Mertz was sent as the first pastor of Buffalo. On this occasion Bishop Dubois sang a solemn high Mass in the court-house; and in the afternoon a procession composed of different nationalities marched from the court-house to the site for the new church where the ground was blessed by the bishop. Father Mertz rented a little frame building on Pearl Street, back of the old Eagle Tavern; and here he held services until the "Lamb of God", a rough timber church, was erected on the property at Main and Edward Streets. The corner stone of this first church of the diocese was laid 8 July, 1831, but the church was not opened for services until the following year. In the next five years congregations were formed at Lancaster, Williamsville, North Bush, East Eden, and Lockport. Father Mertz, with his assistant, the Rev. Alexander Pax, looked after the spiritual interests of the Catholics of the first four places, and the Rev. Bernard O'Reilly of Rochester attended the Catholics of Lockport.

Buffalo grew quickly after becoming a city. The church on Main Street was too small for the rapidly increasing numbers. The English-speaking members withdrew from the church in 1837 and formed a separate congregation, renting the second floor of a building at the corner of Main Street and the Terrace; where the Rev. Charles Smith said Mass for them once a month. Father Smith was employed on the other Sundays at Java, or in looking after the spiritual well-being of the Catholics employed in the construction of the Genesee Valley Canal. Soon afterwards property was bought at the corner of Ellicott and Batavia Streets, for a church for the English-speaking Catholics of the city. The Rev. John N. Neumann, who was afterwards Bishop of Philadelphia, and who has been proposed for canonization, went to Buffalo in July, 1836, and laboured zealously for four years in the missions of Erie County and vicinity. The missionary then had few of the comforts and conveniences of the present day and Father Neumann was often compelled to tramp many miles over rough roads, or through the forest, carrying his vestments on his back, to say Mass or to administer to the sick. The Rev. Bernard O'Reilly of Rochester, who was afterwards Bishop of Hartford, also did effective work among those engaged in building the Erie Canal and in constructing the locks at Lockport. The Rev. Thomas McEvoy of Java attended to the spiritual wants of the Catholics of three or four counties. He resided at Java, and from this place he frequently visited clusters of Catholics in Allegany, Wyoming, Steuben, and Chautauqua counties. Among the lay people Louis Le Couteulx was the greatest benefactor of the incipient church in Buffalo. He located at Buffalo in 1803, and it was at his house, corner of Main and Exchange Streets, that the Catholics were first assembled and were urged to form a congregation. Besides donating the site for the first church, he also gave the land for the Deaf Mute Institute, the Infant Asylum, the Immaculate Conception church, and the Buffalo Orphan Asylum. Other lay people of that period and later prominent in church work were: Patrick Milton, Maurice Vaughn, Patrick Cannon, John Connolly, Mrs. O'Rourke, Mrs. Rowen, Mrs. Kimmit, and Messrs. Ambrose, Feldman, Fisher, Steffan, Dingens, Lautz, Paul, Diebold, Gittere, Pfohl, Wechter, Doll, Smith, Miller, Hager, Guinther, Vogt, Davis, John Straus, Gerhard Lang, and their families.

The Very Rev. John Timon, a Visitor General of the Congregation of the Mission (Vincentians) was consecrated first Bishop of Buffalo in the cathedral in New York, 17 October, 1847, by Bishop Hughes. The new bishop appointed the Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, pastor of St. Patrick's church, Rochester, his vicar-general, and began a retreat for his priests; then he gave missions for his people in the sixteen churches of the diocese. Many of these were plain frame structures, without architectural ornament, and many of them had no altar except a table or some rough timber fitted up for the purpose. In many cases services were held in rented buildings, especially where public works attracted large numbers of men but gave no promise of permanent settlement. Such was the case along the Erie Canal and the Genesee Valley Canal, where services were held in the largest workmen's shanty, or in the nearest town hall. Men engaged in these public works were attracted by the fertility of the soil or the advantages

BUFFALO

NIAGARA UNIVERSITY

ST. BONAVENTURE'S, ALLEGHENY

ST. JOSEPH'S CATHEDRAL

HOLY ANGELS COLLEGE

CANISIUS COLLEGE

of localities, and sent for their families and friends, and established homes in the western part of the State along the lines of public traffic. Thus little Catholic settlements were formed, and incipient congregations were organized. The first Catholic congregations were made up of settlers from the East or immigrants from Europe.

Scarcity of Priests.—The growth of the Church, before the advent of the bishop to the western part of the State, was entirely from immigration. Many were lost to the Church during this period because they had settled in remote localities, and priests were scarce. Nearly all the priests who laboured in Western New York during this period were from Europe, and some were not permanently attached to the diocese. The small number of priests could not visit regularly the many small settlements in that extensive territory, and many Catholics would not see a priest for months, or even years. Under such conditions it was but natural that some should fall away. Before there was a resident priest at Buffalo people journeyed all the way to Albany to have their children baptized, others took their children to Monroe, Michigan, where there was a resident priest. When young people decided to get married, two or three of the respectable old people of the community were called in as witnesses; troth was plighted, and the couple became man and wife, with the understanding that as soon as a priest came the blessing of the Church would be invoked upon the marriage. A journey to Albany in those days was a difficult undertaking. It meant many days travel through the forest, on horseback, by stage-coach, or rough wagons. When the Erie Canal was built, part of the journey could be made by packet boat; but as a rule people postponed the reception of the sacraments until some priest went through this region on his way to the Catholic settlements of the West, or in transit between the East and Montreal or Quebec. Priests were scarce for some years after Buffalo was made a diocese; and one of Bishop Timon's first labours was directed to the establishment of colleges and seminaries for the education of youth. He induced the Oblates, the Franciscans, and the Jesuits to send communities to found colleges, and to assist in the formation of parishes. The Oblate Fathers in August, 1851, started a seminary and college in a brick building, which was located on the site of the present cathedral rectory. This institution was later transferred to Prospect Hill, on the site of the present Holy Angels church property. The Franciscans in 1855 located at Ellicottville, but shortly after moved to Allegany. The Jesuits started the present St. Michael's Church and Canisius College (1851). After the advent of Bishop Timon fallen-away Catholics began to return to the Church, and many non-Catholics embraced the Faith. His missions and his lectures in all the towns of the diocese awakened an interest in Catholic teaching and practice; and from three to five hundred new members were added to the Church each year through the conversion of non-Catholics. Much of the prejudice also, which existed in some localities, was dispelled by the diffusion of knowledge of the Church.

Bishops of the See.—(1) Bishop Timon died 16 April, 1867. He was born 12 February, 1797, at Conewago, Pennsylvania, and ordained at St. Louis, Missouri, in June, 1825. For a long time he was a missionary in Texas and in April, 1840, was named Prefect Apostolic there but refused the office.—(2) The Very Rev. Stephen Vincent Ryan who, like his predecessor, was a Visitor General of the Congregation of the Mission, was appointed to succeed him as Bishop of Buffalo and was consecrated 8 November, 1868. Bishop Ryan was born 1 January, 1825, at Almonte, Ontario, Upper Canada. Distinguished for his piety, zeal, and learning, he continued the great work of Bishop Timon. He died 10 April, 1896.—(3) The Rev. James E. Quigley, D.D., his successor, was consecrated 24 February, 1897. Bishop Quigley's condemnation of the attempt of the Socialists to identify their doctrines with the principles of labour unionism, and thus wean men from their allegiance to the Church, gained for him a national reputation. He was promoted to the vacant archbishopric of Chicago, 19 February, 1903.—(4) The Rev. Charles H. Colton of New York, was next appointed to the see and consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, 24 August, 1903.

John Timon

Statistics.—There are 264 priests in the diocese; 168 secular, 96 of religious orders; 142 churches with resident priests, 32 mission churches, and 16 chapels; 54 Brothers and 1,085 Sisters of religious orders, teaching 94 parochial schools, with 27,787 pupils. There is one university, Niagara, under the Lazarist Fathers; five colleges for boys with 952 students; and two seminaries for secular clergy, and one for religious, with 181 students. The seminary at Niagara is conducted by the Lazarists; that at Allegany, by the Franciscans. The preparatory seminaries are the college departments at Niagara and at Allegany, and the colleges of Canisius, Holy Angels, and the Christian Brothers. The Oblates have a seminary in Buffalo for candidates for their order, and the Passionists have one in Dunkirk for their students. There are 159 students in the large seminaries, 81 in the preparatory, and 200 students in the university. There are eight academies for young ladies, with 1,200 students. St. John's Protectory for homeless, or wayward boys, founded in 1861, accommodates about 600 boys, who are taught some trade, along with the elementary branches of education. A Deaf Mute Institute, started in Buffalo in 1856, is now an important institution, under the charge of the Sisters of St. Joseph, with 166 pupils. In 1861 Bishop Timon secured the Sisters of St. Francis to care for the aged; these sisters now have three houses: one in Buffalo, one in Gardenville and one in Williamsville, with 600 inmates. The Sisters of the Good Shepherd in 1855 started a refuge for wayward girls and fallen women. They care for 150 inmates and 75 children. In 1888 the Rev. Daniel Walsh established the Working Boys Home, in which 80 boys and young men now find a comfortable home. In 1906 Bishop Colton established the St. Charles's Home for Working Girls, under the Sisters of Mercy. Bishop Quigley founded two mission houses for poor children, the Angel Guardian Mission and the St. James's Mission. In June, 1848, Bishop Timon secured a community of Sisters of Charity and placed them in the orphan asylum, which now has 250 orphans, and a large number of young girls employed in a technical school. There is a German orphan asylum in Buffalo, incorporated in 1874, in which there are 370 orphans, under the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis. The Polish orphan asylum at Doyle, under the care of the Felician Sisters of St. Francis, has 186 inmates. The Sisters of St. Joseph have the Orphan Asylum at Dunkirk with 88 orphans; and the Sisters of Charity direct an infant asylum in Buffalo, where 185 infant children can be accommodated, with 60 patients in the maternity hospital.

The Sisters of Charity hospital accommodates 250 patients. Their emergency hospital treats 1,200 patients a year. The Sisters of Mercy at the Mercy Hospital accommodate about 40 patients. Estimated Catholic population 200,000.

BAYLEY, *History of the Church in New York* (New York, 1870); TIMON, *Missions in Western New York* (Buffalo, 1862); DONOHUE, *History of the Catholic Church in Western New York* (Buffalo, 1904); ID., *The Iroquois and the Jesuits* (Buffalo, 1895); *Relations des Jésuites* (Quebec, 1858); MARGRY, *Découvertes* (Paris, 1893); HENNEPIN, *Nouvelle Découverte* (Utrecht, 1678); CRONIN, *Life and Times of Bishop Ryan* (Buffalo, 1893); *The Historical Writings of the late Orsamus H. Marshall* (Albany, 1887); *The Sentinel*, files (Buffalo); Maps by GENERAL JAMES CLARKE (Auburn); Bishop Timon's diary and unpublished letters.

THOMAS DONOHUE.

Buffier, CLAUDE, philosopher and author, b. in Poland, of French parents, 25 May, 1661; d. in Paris, 17 May, 1737. He received his early education at the Jesuit College in Rouen and entered the Society of Jesus in 1679. After teaching literature in Paris, he returned to Rouen to take a chair of theology. Mgr. Colbert, archbishop of that city, issued a pastoral recommending to his clergy certain books of Gallican and Jansenistic tendencies. Buffier attacked the pastoral in a pamphlet and having refused to make a retractation journeyed, with the leave of his superiors, to Rome to lay his case before the Congregations. There he easily justified himself and returning to Paris was connected, from 1701 to 1731, with the "Journal de Trévoux". He published works on history, asceticism, biography, education, literature, and especially on philosophy. He was not, as is often asserted, a disciple of Descartes, for he rejects altogether methodic doubt and follows in general the scholastics. The Encyclopedists, according to Tabaraud, inserted in their publications, without due credit, entire pages from his books, and Reid, the Scotch metaphysician, acknowledges his great indebtedness to Buffier. His chief works are: a Life of Count Louis de Sales, brother of the saint (Paris, 1708); "Pratique de la mémoire artificielle" (Paris, 1701) often reprinted; "Grammaire française sur un plan nouveau (Paris, 1732), in many editions and translations; "Exposition des preuves les plus sensibles de la Vraie Religion" (Paris, 1732); and "Cours des sciences" (Paris, 1722).

BERNARD in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II, 1050; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la. c. de J.*, II, 340–359.

WALTER DWIGHT.

Buglio, LOUIS, a celebrated missionary in China, mathematician, and theologian, b. at Mineo, Sicily, 26 January, 1606; d. at Peking, 7 October, 1682. He entered the Society of Jesus, 29 January, 1622, and, after a brilliant career as professor of the humanities and rhetoric in the Roman College, asked to be sent on the Chinese mission. With great zeal and success Father Buglio preached the Gospel in the provinces of Su-Tchuen, Fu-kien, and Kiang-si. He suffered severely for the Faith in the persecution which was carried on during the minority of the Emperor Kang-hi. Taken prisoner by one of the victorious Tatar chiefs, he was brought to Peking in 1648. Here, after a short captivity, he was left free to exercise his ministry. Father Buglio collaborated with Fathers Adam Schall, Verbiest, and Magalhaens in reforming the Chinese calendar, and shared with them the confidence and esteem of the emperor. At his death he was given a state funeral.

Thoroughly acquainted with the Chinese language, Father Buglio both spoke and wrote it fluently. A list of his works in Chinese, more than eighty volumes, written for the most part to explain and defend the Christian religion, is given in Sommervogel. Besides Parts I and III of the "Summa" of St. Thomas, he translated into Chinese the Roman Missal (Peking, 1670) the Breviary and the Ritual (ibid., 1674 and 1675). These translations require a special notice, as they were part of a project which, from the beginning of their apostolate in China, the Jesuit missionaries were anxious to carry out. Their purpose was not merely to form a native clergy, but, in order to accomplish this more easily, to introduce a special liturgy in the Chinese tongue for the use at least of native priests. This plan was approved by Pope Paul V, who, 26 March, 1615, granted to regularly ordained Chinese priests the faculty of using their own language in the liturgy and administration of the sacraments. This faculty was never used. Father Philip Couplet, in 1681, tried to obtain a renewal of it from Rome, but was not successful.

Acta SS., XIII, 123, Diss. xlviii; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la c. de J.*, II, 363; CORDIER, *Bibliotheca Sinica* (Paris, 1881), I, 514; *Ménologe S. J.: Assistance d'Italie.*

JOSEPH M. WOODS.

Buil (also BOIL or BOYL), BERNARDO, Friar Minor. The fact that there were two religious of the name of Bernardo Boil living in Spain at the same time has given rise to much confusion and even to the opinion that they were not two distinct persons, but that the same individual was at one time a member of the Franciscan order, and later became a Benedictine. It seems, however, more probable to assert that Bernardo Boil, the Franciscan, was a different person from Bernardo Boyl, the Benedictine. It was to the former that Alexander VI addressed his Bull dated 25 June, 1493, appointing him first vicar Apostolic of the New World. This appears to be certain, first of all from the opening words, "Dilecto filio Bernardo Boil, fratri Ordinis Minorum", etc. of the Bull itself, a part of which is reproduced in the first volume of THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. In the second place, the concluding words of the Bull, where reference is made to the prohibition of Boniface VIII concerning members of mendicant orders taking new domiciles without permission from the Holy See, seem clearly to indicate that the papal rescript was intended for Boil, the Franciscan, and not for his namesake the Benedictine. It is a matter of fact, however, that Bernardo Boyl, O.S.B., became first vicar Apostolic of the New World. This was due to the intrigues of King Ferdinand of Spain who employed Boyl, the Benedictine, to great advantage in several important diplomatic negotiations and had sought his appointment as vicar Apostolic in America. When the papal Bull arrived in Spain, ignoring the king's choice, and nominating a Franciscan of the same name with the trifling difference of the *i* and *y*, which letters were pronounced alike, the only exception being in the order to which the respective priests belonged, it became convenient to conclude that a mistake had been made in Rome—which interpretation Ferdinand found expedient to favour his own ends and views. A false copy of the Bull was therefore made with the necessary changes and delivered to Boyl, the Benedictine, while the king retained the original document appointing Boil, the Franciscan. In time this latter document disappeared so completely that no trace of it could be found in the Spanish archives. A copy, however, was carefully preserved in the Vatican library and was brought to light by the researches of the historian Roselly. Perhaps Bernardo Boil, O.F.M., never knew of the high dignity which Alexander VI had conferred upon him. It is certain he did not leave Spain; yet he was *de jure* the true, legitimate, and first vicar Apostolic of the New World. As regards Bernardo Boyl, O.S.B., it is a matter of history that his labours were without fruit, and the only record of his official action in America is the fulmination of censures.

ROSELLY DE LORGUES, *Christophe Colomb; Histoire de sa vie et de ses voyages* (Paris, 1856); I, 508–513, tr., BARRY (Boston, 1870); TARDUCCI, *Vita di Cristoforo Colombo* (Milan, 1885), I, xxxi, 613–615; GAMS, *Kirchen, Spaniens*, III, 96–100; HEUSER in *Records of American Catholic Historical Society* (Philadelphia, 1896), VII, 141–154; see also WADDING, *Annales Mino-*

rum, XV, 28–31, where reference is made to a curious work of fiction describing the imaginary labours of the Benedictine Boyl in the West Indies.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Buildings, ECCLESIASTICAL.—This term comprehends all constructions erected for the celebration of liturgical acts, whatever be the name given to them:—church, chapel, oratory, basilica, etc. The subject will be treated under the following heads: I. History; II. Division; III. Erection; IV. Repair and Maintenance; V. Consecration and Blessing; VI. Immunity; VII. Church Fabric.

I. HISTORY.—In the earliest days of the Christian religion, there were no buildings specially consecrated to Eucharistic worship; the assemblies for liturgical service were held in private houses (Acts, ii, 46; Rom., xvi, 5; I Cor., xvi, 15; Col., iv, 15; Philemon, 2). The assemblies which the first Christians held in the Temple of Jerusalem, in the synagogues or even in hired halls, were assemblies for instruction or for prayer (Acts, v, 12–13; xvii, 1–2; xix, 9). At the end of the second century and even later, during the periods of persecution, assemblies for Christian worship were still held in private houses. During this epoch, however, we begin to hear of the *domus ecclesiæ* (the house of the Church), an edifice used for all the services of the Christian community, in which one apartment was specially set apart for Divine worship. At an early date this apartment took on a special importance. During the third century the other parts of the building were detached from it and the *domus ecclesiæ* became the *Domus Dei* (the house of God) known also as the *Dominicum* or the *κυριακὸν οἶκον* (Duchesne, Origines du culte chrétien, 399–400, Paris, 1902; Wieland, Mensa und Confessio: Studien über den Altar der altchristlichen Liturgie, Munich, 1906, I, 27–35, 68–73). All such churches were situated in towns, and the inhabitants of the rural districts came thither on the Lord's Day, in order to assist at the Eucharistic Sacrifice; in large cities, like Rome, Alexandria, and Carthage, there were several churches, but they did not constitute separate parishes (Duchesne, 400; Wieland, 73–76). They depended upon the cathedral church, in which was established the see (*sedes*), or the chair (*cathedra*) of the bishop. There were, however, since the second century, outside the cities, mortuary churches attached to the Christian cemeteries. Here were celebrated the funeral rites, also the anniversary commemorations of the departed, but not the ordinary offices of Divine worship. Sanctuaries were also erected over the sepulchres of the martyrs, and popular devotion brought thither a large concourse of people, not only for the celebration of the anniversary, but at other times as well. The necessity of providing accommodation for these gatherings, as well as the desire to honour the saint, led to the construction of buildings, sometimes large and richly adorned. These churches multiplied when the people began to accord to any relic whatever, to a piece of cloth stained with his blood, to a phial of oil drawn from the lamp that burned constantly before his sepulchre, etc., the veneration at first given only to his burial place. These were the churches of "relics". They prevailed finally to such an extent that to-day every church must have relics in each of its altars (Duchesne, 402–403). It is almost universally recognized at the present day, that only on exceptional occasions did the catacombs serve for ordinary worship, even during the times of persecution. They were used solely for funeral services and for the celebration of the festivals of martyrs (Wieland, 81–100).

That churches existed in rural districts as early as the fourth century is undeniable. Priests went thither periodically to administer the sacraments. In the fifth century, however, on account of the increase in the number of the faithful, it became necessary to station resident priests in such districts. This was the origin of parish churches, which were established by the bishops in the most populous districts, the *vici*, and were known as *ecclesiæ rusticanæ*, *parochitanæ*, *diocesanæ*, *diocesis*, *parochia*, *ecclesiæ baptismales*, because in these churches only could the Sacrament of Baptism be administered; they were also termed *tituli majores* to distinguish them from the private churches, or *tituli minores* (Imbart de la Tour, Les paroisses rurales du IV^{e} au XII^{e} siècle, Paris, 1900). In addition to these churches of the *vici*, the owners of the *villæ* or great estates founded churches for their own use and for that of the persons connected with their establishments. Such churches could not be used for Divine worship without the consent of the local bishop, who was wont to exact from the proprietor a renunciation of all rights of possession. The ecclesiastical authority, however, was not long able to resist the proprietors, who from the seventh and eighth centuries retained the proprietary right over the churches they had built. These were called *oratoria*, *basilicæ*, *martyria*, or *tituli minores*, and were in no respect parish churches, because in them baptism could not be administered; moreover, on certain solemn days, the faithful were obliged to assist at Mass in the parish church. Neither did these churches receive any tithes. From the Carlovingian period, however, such private churches gradually became parish-churches. Some authors contend that from that epoch all churches became the private property of the laity, or of convents, or bishops. The ecclesiastical reforms of the eleventh and twelfth centuries brought this condition of things to an end. The Second Lateran Council (1139) commanded all laymen, under pain of excommunication, to resign to the bishops the churches in their possession. (Mansi, "Coll. Conc.", XXI, 529–532; Stutz, "Geschichte des kirchl. Benefizialwesens", Berlin, 1895, I; Hinschius, "System des kath. Kirchenrechts", Berlin, 1878, II, 262–269, 277–281; Imbart de la Tour, op. cit.) Even within the parishes, for the benefit of the faithful, there were established at various times, chapels which did not enjoy the prerogatives of parish churches, and were more or less dependent upon the latter (Von Scherer, Handbuch des Kirchenrechtes, Graz, 1898, II, 627). In addition to churches specially intended for the use of the faithful, others known as oratories were erected in the monasteries; they acquired a greater importance when the majority of the monks were ordained priests, still more when the exclusive privileges of the parish churches suffered diminution. Such oratories were also common in beneficent and charitable institutions. The medieval corporations (guilds) which were also religious confraternities, had sometimes their own special chapels (Viollet, Histoire des institutions politiques de la France, Paris, 1903, III, 143–176).

II. DIVISION.—Ecclesiastical buildings are usually divided into four classes: churches properly so called, public oratories, private oratories, and semi-public oratories. This division was confirmed by the Congregation of Rites, 23 January, 1899 (Decreta authent. Congreg. sacr. Rit. no. 4007, Rome, 1900). Churches are edifices set apart in perpetuity for the public exercise of Divine worship; such are basilicas, primatial, metropolitan, cathedral, collegiate and parish churches, and lastly the conventual churches of regulars, properly so called. Public oratories are buildings of less importance, definitely given over to Divine worship, and accessible to the public, whether the entrance itself be upon the public road or upon a passage-way leading to the latter. A private oratory is one established in favour of a particular family or even of a single individual. Finally, a semi-public oratory is established for the benefit of a number of people; such is the chapel of

a seminary, a college, a congregation of simple vows, a hospital, a prison, etc. With these may be classed the chapels of cardinals and of bishops.

III. Erection.—Basilicas, cathedrals, collegiate churches, and private oratories, may be erected only with the consent of the Holy See; other churches or oratories with the consent of the bishop. Nevertheless the authorization given by a bishop to a religious order of solemn vows to establish a monastery in his diocese involves, unless there is a stipulation to the contrary, the right to construct a monastic church. On the other hand, all provincial superiors of religious orders have the power to open semi-public oratories for the use of their religious, and that without the authorization of the bishop (Bull of Gregory XIII, "Decet Romanum", 3 May, 1575, granted to the Society of Jesus and applicable likewise to all religious orders in virtue of the communication of privileges. Cf. Vermeersch, De religiosis institutis et personis, Bruges, 1902, I, 316). For the erection of a private oratory, even by religious, the authorization of the pope is necessary (C. S. R., 10 November, 1906; "Canoniste Contemporain", 1907, XXX, 109, 110). Congregations of simple vows may have but one semi-public or public oratory, with the authorization of the bishop. If they wish to erect several for the convenience of priests or of the infirm, it is necessary to obtain the consent of the Holy See (C. S. R., 8 March, 1879, Decreta, no. 3484).

The erection of every church on the other hand must be justified by its necessity, or by its use; it must not in any way prejudice the rights of churches already established (c. iii, "De ecclesiis ædificandis vel reparandis", X, III, xlviii, c. i, ii, iv, "De novi operis nuntiatione", X, V, xxxii; Friedberg, "Corpus juris canonici", Leipzig, 1881, II, 652, 843). The church should also be sufficiently endowed (c. viii, "De consecratione ecclesiæ vel altaris", X, III, xl; Friedberg, II, 634). Practically it is sufficient that the church have at its disposal, e. g. through the gifts of the faithful, the revenues necessary for the maintenance of the building, the celebration of Divine service, and the support of its ministers (Bargilliat, Prælect. jur. can., Paris, 1900, II, 331). In certain countries the consent of the civil power is also needed. The building of a church cannot be begun before the bishop or his delegate has approved of the site, placed a cross there, and blessed the first stone (Pontificale Romanum, Pars II, De benedict. et imposit. prim. lapid. pro eccl. ædif.). The bishop can also reserve to himself the approval of the plans and conditions according to which the church is to be constructed (Wernz, Jus Decretal., Rome, 1901, III, 432, 433). To avoid useless expenditure and to prevent the parish priest from improvidently contracting debts, the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore enacted as a preliminary condition for the construction of a church, the consent of the bishop in writing (Acta et decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis, III, no. 279). The bishop has power to apply to the construction of his cathedral a part of the revenues, which in certain countries are annually assigned to him from the revenues of the different churches; the cathedral church being the *ecclesia matrix*, or mother-church of all those of the diocese, its construction is a work which interests the whole diocese (the Eighth Provincial, the Second Plenary, Councils of Baltimore, 1855 and 1866, and the Second Provincial Council of Australia, 1869; "Collectio Lacensis", Freiburg, 1875, III, 162, 429, 1078; also 200–202, 242, 1085). The bishop can even levy a *subsidium charitativum* for this purpose, i. e. a moderate tax upon the revenues of the churches and on those priests who enjoy ecclesiastical benefices. In default of other resources the usual means is to collect money for this object, or to ask the priests of the diocese for voluntary contributions.

IV. Repair and Maintenance.—Originally the repairs of churches were incumbent upon the bishops, as administrators of all ecclesiastical goods. When, according to the ancient system, these goods were divided into four parts, one part was assigned to the *Fabrica* (see below) i. e. to the church building and its maintenance. Later, each church had its own patrimony, and one part of its goods was assigned to its maintenance. This charge was also incumbent upon the holders of the goods and revenues of the church. The Decretals sanctioned this obligation; at the same time they urged the people to help defray the expenses (c. i, iv, "De ecclesiis ædificandis", X, III, xlviii; Friedberg, II, 652, 653). Finally the Council of Trent (Sess. XXI, De ref., c. vii) located more exactly the obligation to repair the parish churches (Permaneder, Die kirchliche Baulast, Munich, 1890, 1–18). By present ecclesiastical legislation the repairs of the church belong especially to the fabric, which must use the funds appropriated for that special purpose and if need be, its superfluous revenues (c. vi, "De ecclesiis ædificandis"; Friedberg, II, 654; Council of Trent, Sess. XXI, De ref., c. vii). These resources failing, the persons who possess the right of Patronage over the church must intervene, if they wish to preserve their privileges (Canones et decreta conc. Trid. ed. Schulte and Richter, Leipzig, 1853, 121, no. 4). This obligation rests also on all persons who enjoy part of the revenues of the church the tithe-owners, whether laymen or ecclesiastics, seculars or regulars, the parish priest, and all those who enjoy a benefice from the church. The parishioners themselves are bound to provide for the maintenance of the church, each according to his means. In practice collections should be made for this object. These same principles apply to cathedral churches; in case the revenues of the church are insufficient, the bishop, the chapter, the clergy of the cathedral, and the inhabitants of the diocese ought to contribute for its support (Sägmüller, Lehrbuch des kathol. Kirchenrechts, Freiburg, 1900–04, 798, 799). For the support of his cathedral, as for its erection, the bishop can ask from his clergy a special aid or *subsidium charitativum*. Wherever these rules have been abrogated by other customs, the latter should be followed. In case of fire, the insurance might cover the damage. Hence special laws may make obligatory the insurance of churches (Acta et Decreta Concilii Baltimorensis III, no. 283). Chapels or churches belonging to congregations of regulars or to particular establishments, ought to be maintained at the expense of these establishments. It sometimes happens that the civil power contributes to the support of churches, as well as to their construction. In reality such co-operation is often only a restitution of ecclesiastical property or revenues misappropriated by the civil government.

V. Consecration and Blessing.—Churches and oratories cannot be used for liturgical functions, without having first been consecrated or at least blessed. Cathedral and parish churches ought to be consecrated. However, in case of necessity they may be provisionally blessed (Rit. Rom., tit. viii, c. xxvii). Public oratories and other churches may be consecrated, though this is not necessary. They ought, however, to receive a solemn benediction. Private oratories, on the other hand, cannot receive such benediction; it is fitting, however, that the *benedictio loci* be given to them (op. cit. c. vi.) Some hold that semi-public oratories which in exterior appearance resemble churches or chapels, and which are definitely destined for Divine worship, may be solemnly consecrated (C. S. R., 7 August, 1875; 5 June, 1899; Decreta, nos. 3364, 4025).

The custom of dedicating churches to the worship

of God by a solemn ceremony is very ancient. In his Ecclesiastical History (X, iii, iv) Eusebius describes the dedication, in 314, of the church erected by Constantine at Tyre, at which time, however, there was no special rite for that purpose. At Rome in the sixth century, the dedication consisted in the public celebration of a solemn Mass, and if it was a church which was to contain relics, these latter were brought to the church in solemn procession. It seems that at the same period, there existed a special rite of consecration in Gaul. In their brief outlines, the present ceremonies are derived from a combination of the rites used in France and in Rome, a combination which had already been made before the beginning of the eighth century (Duchesne, op. cit., 403–418). The consecration or dedication is performed according to the rite prescribed in the "Pontificale Romanum" (De ecclesiæ dedicatione seu consecratione) by the bishop, or by a priest delegated for that office by the Holy See. The essential rite of this dedication consists in the anointing of the twelve crosses upon the walls with holy chrism, and the recitation of the words *Sanctificetur*, etc. (Wernz, III, 437). It is not permitted to consecrate a church without at the same time consecrating the high altar, or, if this has already been consecrated, another fixed altar. If all the altars have been consecrated, it will be necessary to ask the authorization of the Holy See. Without the consecration, however, of an altar, the consecration of the church will not be invalid (C. S. R., 12 August, 1854; 3 March, 1866; 19 May, 1896; Decreta, nos. 3025, 3142, 3907). When the public authorities forbid the performance of the prescribed ceremonies outside the church, a pontifical indult must be obtained, except in case of necessity; such ceremonies must then be performed in the sacristy or some other dependency of the church (C. S. R., 22 February, 1888; Decreta, no. 3687). A church built of wood cannot be consecrated (C. S. R., 11 April, 1902; "Canoniste contemporain", 1902, XXV, 495).

The vigil of the day of consecration is a fast-day of obligation for the bishop and for those who have asked for the consecration of the church (C. S. R., 29 July, 1780; 12 September, 1840; Decreta, nos. 2519, 2821; Reply of the Holy Office, 14 December, 1898; "Acta Sanctæ Sedis", 1898–99, XXXI, 533). The feast of the dedication must be celebrated every year on the anniversary day of the consecration, the Bishop may, if he chooses, fix another day; but this he should do on the very day on which he consecrates the church (C. S. R. 19 September, 1665, 23 May, 1834; Decreta, nos. 1321, 2719). While this feast should be celebrated by all the clergy connected with the consecrated church, the anniversary of the dedication of the cathedral ought to be celebrated by all the secular clergy of the diocese, and by all the regulars of the episcopal city (C. S. R., 12 September, 1884, 9 July, 1895; Decreta, nos. 3622, 3863). If the exact date of the anniversary is unknown, the most probable date should be chosen until such time as the date can be determined with certainty (C. S. R., 14 June, 1608, 13 March, 1649; Decreta, nos. 261, 920). The bishop may fix a day if the right one be completely unknown (C. S. R., 18 August, 1629; 3 March, 1674; 27 November, 1706; 12 March, 1735; Decreta, nos. 511, 1498, 2174, 2313). The Holy See sometimes permits the celebration of the anniversary of the dedication of the cathedral church and of all the churches of the diocese on the same day. All the clergy of the diocese are then bound to celebrate this festival (C. S. R., 29 November, 1878; Decreta, no. 3469).

The solemn benediction is a rite inferior to consecration. It is performed by a priest delegated by the bishop for that purpose (Rit. Rom. tit. viii, c. xxvii). It consists in the sprinkling of the upper and lower parts of the walls of the church with holy water, and in the prayers which accompany this action (Wernz, III, 437). A new consecration or benediction of a church or oratory ought to be made in the case of execration or desecration, that is to say, when the building has lost its consecration or benediction. This is the case when ecclesiastical buildings have been definitely put to profane uses (Council of Trent, Sess. XXI, De ref. c. vii,); similarly, in accordance with modern discipline, if almost the entire church or a large portion of the walls have been destroyed or renewed (C. S. R., 14 September, 1875; Decreta, no. 3372). Successive alterations and repairs, however, even though considerable, as also the renewal of the roof, are not to be regarded as execration (C. S. R., 31 August, 1872; Decreta, no. 3269). The consecration affects the entire building, but especially the walls; the removal, therefore, of the anointed crosses or even of the interior plastering (*intonaco*) of the walls, does not necessitate a new consecration (C. S. R., 13 July, 1883; 19 May, 1896; Decreta, nos. 3584, 3907). The same principles are applicable to churches that have been solemnly blessed; this benediction affects the walls rather than the pavement of the church. If, however, the belief was that the benediction attached itself to the pavement, the mere destruction of the walls would not have the effect of producing the execration of the church (Wernz, III, 441, 442).

Widely different from desecration is the *pollutio* of a church. This is a defilement of the church, which prevents the celebration of the Divine offices, until the church has been reconciled or purified. The priest is bound to interrupt the celebration of Mass, if the church in which he is celebrating is polluted before he has commenced the Canon (Missale Romanum, De defectibus in celebratione missarum occurrentibus, X). A church is polluted by every kind of homicide, even by a case of capital punishment, or by voluntary suicide committed in the church, but the wound must have been inflicted within the church and, according to some authors, death must have taken place there. A church is likewise polluted when a considerable quantity of blood has been wilfully and culpably spilled within it, or when the *effusio seminis humani* has taken place, wilfully and in a seriously culpable manner (c. iv, x, De consecratione ecclesiæ, X, III, xl; Friedberg, II, 634, 635). In like manner also a church is polluted by the burial within it of an infidel, or of a person who has been excommunicated (*excommunicatus vitandus*) (c. vii, loc. cit.; Bargilliat, II, 343–344), not, however, by the burial of catechumens, and perhaps not by that of unbaptized infants born of baptized parents (C. S. R., 23 April, 1875; Decreta, no. 3344).

It is important to remark that the reconciliation must be performed only when the pollution has been public. A church that has been solemnly blessed can be reconciled by a priest, according to the ceremonies prescribed in the "Rituale Romanum" (tit. viii, c. xxviii). Many authors, however, affirm that the priest should be delegated by the bishop, and the Congregation of Rites has given a decision to the same effect (8 July, 1904; Canoniste Contemporain, 1904, XXIV, 683). A church that has been consecrated can be reconciled only by the bishop, or by a priest delegated by the Holy See, and with water blessed by the bishop. This privilege has been granted to exempt religious (Bull of Leo X, "Religionis", 3 February, 1514). The Propaganda grants to bishops in missionary countries the power to delegate to priests the right to reconcile a consecrated church, but the water employed must be blessed by the bishop or, in case of necessity, by a priest (Bargilliat, II, 345; Putzer-Konings, "Commentarium in facultates apostolicas", New York, 1898, 215–217). Sometimes the reconciliation is

performed *ad cautelam* as for instance when a church has been occupied by soldiers for two days (C. S. R., 27 February, 1847; Decreta, no. 2938). This legislation does not refer to oratories which have received only the *benedictio loci*.

VI. Immunity.—Churches enjoy by ecclesiastical law the same immunity from secular burdens and duties as all ecclesiastical property. The State may not burden them with taxes (Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, De ref. c. xx; Syllabus nos. 30, 32). In many States the laws recognize this privilege for parish and cathedral churches. Such immunity is very ancient, and dates from the Christian emperors of the fourth century (O. Grashof, in Archiv f. kath. Kirchenrecht (1876), XXXVI, 3 sqq., 193 sqq. On the other hand, every irreverence within a church or public oratory is a sacrilege, such as the theft of an article even though it does not belong to the church; a fortiori, if it is the property of the church or an article that has been consecrated (Decretum Gratiani, P. II, c. xvii, q. 4, c. xxi; Friedberg, I, 820). Such also are the sins committed in a church, and especially external sins of the flesh (Lehmkuhl, Theologia moralis, Freiburg, 1898, I, 238, 239). The reverence due to the holy place forbids all profane actions. Therefore, the following actions are forbidden in a church: trials not falling within ecclesiastical jurisdiction, trading, games, plays and secular songs, banquets, the making of a dwelling either above or below the church, etc. In this category may be included the introduction of draperies and banners which have not been blessed by the Church (Wernz, III, 446). It belongs to the office of the bishop to specify what actions are forbidden in the churches, and to settle the controversies which may arise. The bishop is also empowered to provide for the maintenance of order and may also commit this care to a delegate, for instance, to the parish priest. In connexion with this see Right of Asylum.

VII. The Church Fabric.—By the term *Fabrica ecclesiæ* are to be understood not only the goods belonging to the Church but also the administrators of these goods. Ever since the thirteenth century the laity have been allowed to participate in this administration, and the Council of Trent did not reprove their intervention (Sess. XXII, De ref. ch. ix). The civil power also intervenes in order to regulate the administration of the property of cathedral and parish churches. The following are examples of how the fabrics are organized in certain countries. In France Napoleon recognized the fabrics of the churches, and entrusted the administration of the property of parish churches to five or nine elected members, to the parish priest, and the mayor. These formed the *conseil de fabrique*. The elective members holding office for six years and eligible for re-election, were chosen by the council itself. These vestrymen had in hand the administration of the temporal property of the church and elected from amongst their number a *bureau des Marguilliers* composed of three members and the parish priest, charged with the ordinary administration and execution of the decisions of the council. The bishop had the right of control over the management of the vestrymen. His approbation as well as that of the State was required for their most important undertakings. The communal authority could control the budgets and the accounts when the fabric asked the former for the necessary funds to defray the expenses of Divine worship, and for the maintenance of ecclesiastical buildings.

The French Municipal Law of 5 May, 1884, ordered that the budgets and accounts should always be submitted to the communal council, and freed the commune from the obligation of making up a deficit in the resources of the fabric for the ordinary expenses of divine worship. The bishop had the power to organize the fabric of the cathedral church himself, but the administration of its goods was still under the control of the Government (De Champeaux, "Recueil général de droit civil ecclésiastique français", Paris, 1860; Bargilliat, II, 110–159). This organization, modified, however, by the Constitution of 1831 and by the law of 4 March, 1874, still continues in force in Belgium (De Corswarem, Des fabriques d'églises, Hasselt, 1904). The Law of 11 December, 1905, suppressed the fabrics in France and replaced them by *associations cultuelles* which Pius X forbade by his Encyclical, "Gravissimo officii" (10 August, 1906; Canoniste contemporain, 1906, XXIX, 572). This law by handing over to seven, fifteen, or twenty-five persons the administration of church property, without making any mention whatever of ecclesiastical control, increases the State's power of interference in the administration of these associations and gives it full power to suppress them (Jénouvrier, Exposé de la situation légale de l'Eglise de France, d'après la loi du 11 décembre, 1905, Paris, 1906).

In Prussia the fabrics of the churches were organized by the law of 20 June, 1875, enacted during the *Kulturkampf*. In each parish (*Kirchengemeinde*) ecclesiastical goods are administered by a body of churchwardens termed *Kirchenvorstand* under the control of a parish board or *Gemeindevertretung*. This assembly is not, however, everywhere obligatory. The members of these assemblies are elected by all the male parishioners, who are of age and have resided for at least one year in the parish, pay the ecclesiastical tax, and have their own homes, conduct a business concern, or fill a public office. All electors over thirty years of age are eligible for office with the exception of ecclesiastics and the servants or employees of the church. No man can hold office in both these assemblies. The *Kirchenvorstand* is composed of members varying in number from four to ten, according to the total number of the population. Since the law of 21 May, 1886, the parish priest (*Pfarrer*) is the president ex officio of this assembly, except in those places in which, before the law of 1875, the presidency was given to a layman. This assembly administers the temporal concerns of the church. The *Gemeindevertretung* includes three times as many members as the *Kirchenvorstand*. It is necessary that they should give their consent to the most important acts of the administration of the *Kirchenvorstand:* the alienations, the acquisitions, the loans, the most important works, taxes (*Kirchensteuer*), etc., and approve the budgets and accounts. The president of the *Kirchenvorstand*, or his delegate, assists as a consultor at their meetings. All mandates remain in force for six years. The State and the ecclesiastical authority exercise supreme control over the most important actions of these fabrics (Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht, 1875, XXXIV, 167, 1876, XXXV, 161, 1886, LVI, 196, 1887, LVII, 153).

In the French-speaking portion of the Dominion of Canada (Province of Quebec) fabrics also exist. Their organization still corresponds, in its main outlines, to the ancient organization of the parishes in France before the Revolution of 1789, as described by Jousse in his "Traité du gouvernement spirituel et temporel des paroisses" (Paris, 1769). There is, first of all, the Parochial Assembly (Vestry) comprising all the *Francs-tenanciers* of the parish; no alienation, no loan, can be concluded without their intervention. In case a subscription is necessary they raise it by assessment. The churchwardens actually in office, called *marguilliers du Banc*, and the former churchwardens, must pay the ordinary expenses. This is the *bureau ordinaire* of the ancient

French law. Finally, ordinary matters of administration are attended to by a commission composed of three members, chosen for three years by the old and the newly elected churchwardens. Each one of the three churchwardens is in charge for a year, i. e., he performs the functions of treasurer and must render an account to the assembly. The parish priest is president of the fabric and represents the bishop. All the important accounts must be approved of by the latter (Beaudry, "Code des curés, marguilliers, et paroissiens", Montreal, 1870; Gignac, "Compendium juris canonici ad usum cleri Canadensis," Quebec, 1901; Migneault, "Droit paroissial", Montreal (1891).

For other countries, see Sägmüller, "Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts" (782, 795). In English speaking countries fabrics properly so called do not exist. In England ecclesiastical property is given in trust to reliable men. The bishops themselves regulate the administration of these goods. In Ireland the trustees are the bishop, the vicar-general, the parish priest and sometimes other reliable persons (First and Second Synod of Westminster, XIV, 4, and VIII, 1–21; Provincial Synod of Maynooth, 1875, tit. xxix, nos. 270–277; Collectio Lacensis, III, 926, 980). In the United States property is often given in trust to the bishop, and in cases where the parishes are civilly incorporated, sometimes the bishop forms the corporation sole; sometimes the administration of the property belongs to a board of trustees composed of the bishop, his vicar-general, the pastor of the church, and two lay trustees (Taunton, The Law of the Church, London, 1906, 310–317). In accordance with the Third Council of Baltimore (nos. 284–287) the bishop of each diocese judges whether or not it is wise to establish councilmen or a board of trustees; he fixes their number and the mode of their election. They are subject to the authority of the parish priest and the bishop. The relations of the State to church property, especially in English-speaking countries, will be treated in the articles PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL; INCORPORATION; TRUSTEE SYSTEM.

VAN DE BURGT, *De ecclesiis* (Utrecht, 1874); VAN GAMEREN, *De oratoriis domesticis* (Louvain, 1861); MANY, *Prælectiones de locis sacris* (Paris, 1904); GALANTE, *La condizione giuridica delle cose sacre* (Rome, 1903); IMB. DE LA TOUR, *De ecclesiis rusticanis ætate Carolingica* (Bordeaux, 1890); THOMAS, *Le droit de propriété des laïques sur les églises* (Paris, 1906); KÜNSTLE, *Die deutsche Pfarrei und ihr Recht zu Ausgang des M. A.* (Stuttgart, 1905); THOMASSINUS, *Vet. et nov. eccl. discip.* (Paris, 1691), Pars. III, lib. II, ch. XXXVI; CLÉMENT, *Recherches sur la paroisse et les fabriques du commencement, du XIII^e siècle* in *Mélanges d'arch. et d'hist. de l'Ecole française de Rome* (1895), XVI, 387–418; VON SCHERER, *Handbuch des Kirchenrechtes* (Graz, 1898), II, 624–648 (bibliography); LESÊTRE, *La paroisse* (Paris, 1906); VERING, *Lehrbuch des kathol. oriental. und prot. Kirchenrechts* (3d ed., Freiburg, 1893), 778 sqq.; 803 sqq.; PERMANEDER, *Die kirchl. Baulast* (1838); new ed. by RIEDLE, (1890).

A. VAN HOVE.

Bukarest (BUCARESTIENSIS; Rumanian, *Bucaresci* "City of Enjoyment"), ARCHDIOCESE OF, comprises the Kingdom of Rumania, of which Bukarest is the capital, excluding Moldavia, and contains, according to the archdiocesan year-book for 1907, about 56,000 Catholics of the Latin Rite, 4,000 to 5,000 Uniat Rumanians, chiefly immigrants from Transylvania, Banat, and Bukowina, and a few hundred Uniat Armenians. In the city of Bukarest which in 1905 had 285,445 inhabitants there are about 202,000 Orthodox Greeks and 43,000 Jews. The city is situated in a swampy plain on both sides of the Dimbobitza which is here crossed by about a dozen bridges. It is noted for many stately edifices, and the semi-Oriental appearance of its older quarters is heightened by the numerous gardens and the bright domes of its Greek churches. The Catholic cathedral chapter consists at present of 4 canons, 1 honorary canon, and 4 honorary canons outside the diocese. There are in the archdiocese 40 priests (in addition to the archbishop), including 2 Passionists, 1 Benedictine, and 1 Dominican; 24 parishes, one of the Greek-Rumanian Rite; 45 churches including 23 parish churches. The training of the clergy is provided for in the archiepiscopal seminary at Bukarest, which has four professors and nineteen seminarists; six seminarists are being trained outside the diocese. The opposition of the Rumanian Government has hitherto rendered the establishment of a Catholic college impossible. Catholic primary schools exist in all parishes. In the city of Bukarest are twenty-six Brothers of the Christian Schools who conduct three schools, with an attendance of 1,028. The English Ladies, numbering about 252, have two houses in Bukarest, one each in Braïla, Craiova, and Turnu Severin, and conduct five boarding schools with 705 pupils, eight primary schools for girls with an attendance of 1,493, and one orphanage with 20 children. The Dames de Sion have one foundation in Bukarest, with thirty-seven sisters and conduct a boarding school with an attendance of 133; the Sisters of Mercy one foundation with four sisters. The Hungarians have established nine Catholic schools (two in Bukarest), attended by about 945 children. In addition to the above-mentioned orders, the Passionists have one house with four members. The most important churches are: the cathedral, dedicated to St. Joseph, a three-naved Gothic edifice, the largest Catholic church in the country, which was completed in 1884; and the Baratsia, an early church of the Franciscans, destroyed by fire in 1848 and since rebuilt.

History.—For the history of the Catholic Church in the territory now comprised within the Archdiocese of Bukarest see RUMANIA. The present archdiocese was erected by Pope Leo XIII, 27 April, 1883. Bukarest, however, had previously been the residence of Catholic bishops, viz., the Bishops of Nicopolis, Bulgaria, who were also Administrators Apostolic of Wallachia, and had resided at Rustchuk. Bishop Paulus Davanlia (1777–1804) left Rustchuk and lived at the Franciscan monastery at Bukarest (1792–93), where he also died. His successor, Franciscus Ferreri transferred his residence to Cioplea, a village near Bukarest founded in 1812 by Bulgarian refugees, but he was prevented from entering Bukarest by the opposition of the Greek orthodox bishop. Only in 1847 was Bishop Josephus Molajoni able to establish his residence in Bukarest. His successor, Angelus Parsi, restored the episcopal palace, which had been destroyed by fire in 1847, and in 1852 brought to Bukarest the English Ladies, and in 1861 the Brothers of the Christian Schools. In 1863 Bishop Parsi was succeeded by Josephus Pluym, since 1869 Patriarchal Vicar of Constantinople, who in turn was followed by Ignatius Paoli. After the establishment of Rumania as a kingdom, a movement was set on foot by the Government to release the Catholic subjects from dependence on a foreign bishop, and negotiations were begun with Rome. In 1883 Pope Leo XIII erected two dioceses in Rumania immediately subject to the Holy See, the Archdiocese of Bukarest and the Diocese of Jassy. The first archbishop was Ignatius Paoli, succeeded in turn by Paulus Josephus Palma (1885–92); Otto Zardetti (1894–95), who was the second Bishop of St. Cloud, Minnesota, U. S. A. (1889–94), when he was transferred to Bukarest. He resigned this last office in 1895 and died in Rome, on 9 May, 1902; Xaverius Hornstein (1896–1905), who built a new episcopal residence and for the second time called the Brothers of the Christian Schools to Bukarest; Raymundus Netzhammer, O. S. B., born at Erzingen, Baden, 19 January, 1862, professed in the Benedictine monastery at Einsiedeln, 1881, and consecrated Archbishop of Bukarest 16 September, 1905.

Schematismus Archidiœcesis Latinæ Bucarestiensis (Bucharest, 1907); it contains also a history of the archdiocese with a bibliography and other items of interest. JOSEPH LINS.

Bulgari. See CATHARI.

Bulgaria, a European kingdom in the northeastern part of the Balkan Peninsula, bounded by the Black Sea, the Rhodope Mountains, Servia, and the Danube; it embraces an area of 37,200 sq. m. The population according to the census of 1900 numbers 3,744,283, divided according to religion into 3,019,296 Greek Orthodox, 28,579 Catholics of the Latin Rite and Uniat Greeks, 4524 Protestants, 13,809 Gregorian Armenians, 33,663 Jews, 643,300 Mohammedans, and 1112 of other creeds; according to nationality into 2,887,860 Bulgarians, 539,656 Turks, 89,549 Gypsies, 75,235 Rumanians, 70,887 Greeks, 32,753 Jews, 18,856 Tatars, 13,926 Armenians, and 15,741 of other nationalities. The number of inhabitants in 1905 was 4,028,239.

HISTORY.—At the beginning of the Christian Era, what is now Bulgaria constituted the Roman provinces of Mœsia and Thrace, a territory in which Christianity was preached at a very early period, as proved by the Council of Sardica in 343. During the migratory period Slavic races pushed forward into this region. Some time after the middle of the seventh century, the Bulgars, a people of Hunnic and Finnic stock, who had been driven from their habitations on the Volga as far as the Lower Danube, began to make incursions into Mœsia and Thrace. Completing their conquest of the country in a war with the Byzantine Empire, they founded an independent kingdom about 680. The Bulgars gradually became amalgamated with the former inhabitants, adopting the nationality and language of the latter, but giving their own name to the ethnographic mixture. The new State often came into conflict with the neighbouring Byzantine Empire, to which, however, in 718, it lent its support against the Arabs. Prince Boris, or Bogoris (844–845 or 852–888, d. 907), accepted Christianity for political reasons and was baptized in 864 or the beginning of 865; he first negotiated with Pope Nicholas I for the creation of a Bulgarian hierarchy, but in the end joined the Byzantine Church. During the reign of his younger son Symeon (893–927) the ancient Bulgarian State reached the zenith of its prosperity; its territories extended from the Danube to the Rhodope Mountains, and from the Black Sea to the Ionian Sea. In 917 Symeon assumed the title of Tsar, and in 924 compelled Byzantium to recognize the Bulgarian Church as an autocephalous patriarchate, with its seat at Ochrida or Achrida. Under his son Peter (927–969) the kingdom began to decline; during the reign of Shishman I the western part proclaimed its independence; two years after Peter's death the eastern section was pledged to the Eastern Empire. The western part, not able to preserve its autonomy, went to pieces in 1018 under the repeated attacks of the Emperor Basil II, surnamed Bulgaroktónos (the slayer of Bulgarians). Though Basil left the Bulgarian Church its autonomy, the Metropolitans of Achrida were no longer styled Patriarchs, but Archbishops, and after 1025 were chosen from the Greek clergy, instead of the Bulgarian.

After several futile uprisings against the oppressive Byzantine rule, a fresh Bulgarian insurrection took place about 1185. Two brothers, Peter and Ivan Asên, assumed the leadership, threw off the Byzantine yoke and re-established Symeon's empire. On their death (1197) their youngest brother Kaloyan, or Ivanitza, ruled alone until 1207; he entered into negotiations with the Holy See, promised to recognize the spiritual supremacy of the pope, and in November, 1201, was crowned with the royal diadem by Cardinal Leo, legate of Pope Innocent III. At the same time Archbishop Basil of Tirnovo was consecrated Primate of Bulgaria. This new Bulgarian Church embraced eight dioceses, Tirnovo being the primatial see, but the union with Rome was not of long duration. The new empire soon came into conflict with the recently founded Latin Empire (1204) of Constantinople; the Greeks fanned the dissensions in order to gain the Bulgarians over to their side. King Ivan Asên II (1218–41) formed an alliance with Emperor Vatatzes against the Latin Empire (1234), and again joined the Greek Church, which thereupon solemnly recognized the autonomy of the Church of Tirnovo (1235). Since that time, with the exception of brief intervals, the Bulgarian Church has persisted in schism. In 1236 Pope Gregory IX pronounced sentence of excommunication on Asên II, and in 1238 had a Crusade preached against Bulgaria. The history of the following period shows a succession of struggles with the Greeks, the Servians, and the Hungarians, of internal wars for the possession of the throne, and of religious disturbances, as, for instance, those consequent on the spread of the Bogomili and the Hesychasts, all of which weakened the State.

During the fourteenth century, the Turks, flushed with victory, invaded the Balkan Peninsula, and under Amurath I overthrew the Servian kingdom in the battle of Kossovo (Field of the Blackbirds, 1389), captured Tirnovo, and imprisoned Ivan III Shishman, the last Bulgarian Tsar, thus destroying the Bulgarian hegemony. The Church shared the fate of the State, and the last Bulgarian patriarch, Euthymius (1375–93), was driven into exile. Only the Patriarchate of Achrida continued as a Græco-Bulgarian metropolitan see, with Greek or hellenized occupants, until it was suppressed by the Porte in 1767 in consequence of the intrigues of the œcumenical patriarchs. The Greek language prevailed everywhere in schools and churches, and the remains of ancient Bulgarian literature were destroyed to a large extent by the Greeks. For almost five centuries the Bulgarian people groaned under the political yoke of the Turks and the ecclesiastical domination of the Greeks, yet continuous persecution did not avail to obliterate the memory of the nation's former greatness. The nineteenth century was destined to bring liberty to the Bulgarians, as well as to other Christian peoples of the Balkan Peninsula. The self-sacrificing generosity of wealthy Bulgarians made it possible to establish Bulgarian schools (the first at Gabrovo, 1835) and printing presses (at Saloniki, 1839, Smyrna, 1840, Constantinople, 1843), by which the national culture and patriotic sentiment were elevated. The reawakened national feeling first manifested itself in the ecclesiastical order.

In 1860 a representative body of the Bulgarian nation requested the Greek patriarch at Constantinople to recognize their national church, to accord them freedom in the selection of their bishops, and to appoint Bulgarian, rather than Greek prelates to Bulgarian sees. The Patriarch of Constantinople refused these concessions. This act inflamed the national feeling and was followed by the expulsion of the Greek bishops and finally insurrections against Turkish authority. To ensure its supremacy, the Porte sought to mediate between the parties, but fresh negotiations were productive of no further result, and the Sultan by a firman of 11 March, 1870, granted the Bulgarians an exarchate of their own, independent of the Greek patriarchate. In 1872 the first Bulgarian exarch was chosen by an assembly of Bulgarian bishops and laymen. In a council at which only twenty-nine orthodox bishops assisted the œcumenical patriarch solemnly excommunicated the Bulgarian Church, and declared it schismatical.

National autonomy followed close upon ecclesiastical independence. In May, 1876, the Turkish Government perpetrated unspeakable atrocities in the suppression of a Bulgarian insurrection. These horrors might never have touched the conscience of the civilized world had it not been for the courage

and enterprise of Januarius Aloysius MacGahan, an American Catholic (b. in Perry County, Ohio, 12 June, 1844; d. at Constantinople, 9 June, 1878). As correspondent of the London "Daily News", and accompanied by Eugene Schuyler, Commissioner of the United States Government, MacGahan was the only journalist to visit the devastated districts; he obtained the evidence of eyewitnesses and, supplementing this with his own observation, published a mass of facts which enabled Mr. Gladstone to arouse among the English-speaking peoples a lively sympathy for the Bulgarian Christians. A conference of the European powers demanded of Turkey the erection of an autonomous Bulgarian province. The Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, however, and the Peace of San Stefano created an autonomous Bulgarian principality, tributary to the Porte. The Berlin Congress of 1878 abrogated some of the provisions of the Peace of San Stefano and divided Greater Bulgaria into an autonomous Bulgarian principality and a province of Eastern Rumelia under a Christian governor-general, to be appointed by the Porte every five years, but subject to the approval of the Powers. On 22 February, 1879, the first Bulgarian assembly of notables convened in the principality; on 28 April the new constitution was signed; and on 29 April Prince Alexander of Battenberg was chosen as sovereign by the first national assembly. In Eastern Rumelia, from the very first the trend of events pointed to union with the Bulgarian principality. In September, 1885, an insurrection broke out, and a provisional regency proclaimed the union with Bulgaria. In September, Alexander announced from Philippopolis the union of the two countries and, after repelling a Servian invasion, received recognition as Governor-General of Eastern Rumelia (5 April, 1886). The unexpected independence which Alexander had shown in the face of Russia, brought him into disfavour with that power, and a military conspiracy, secretly supported by Russia, was successful in having him transported across the frontier (20 August, 1886). He was recalled, it is true, by the popular voice, after ten days, but, not wishing to rule without Russia's favour, which Bulgaria found indispensable, and yet not being able to gain the Tsar's friendship, he abdicated, 7 September, 1886. A regency, under Stambuloff, administered the national affairs until a new sovereign was elected by the National Assembly. The choice fell on the Catholic prince, Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg-Kohary, 7 July, 1887. As Ferdinand at first left the national policy in the hands of Russia's enemy, Stambuloff, Russia, as well as the Porte, refused to recognize the new king. Only after the assassination of Stambuloff (1895) was a reconciliation with Russia effected. The Sultan then recognized Ferdinand as prince and governor-general, in view of the fact that Ferdinand induced his son Boris, heir to the throne, to adopt the Greek orthodox faith (1896). The economic and intellectual progress of the country is retarded by financial complications, by partisanship in politics, and by the unrest incident to the so-called Macedonian question.

STATISTICS.—(a) *Catholics, Latin Rite.*—The Catholics of Bulgaria are for the most part descendants of the Bogomili or Paulicians converted by the Franciscans during the sixteenth century, and are directly subject to the Diocese of Nicopolis with its seat at Rustchuk, and the Vicariate Apostolic of Sofia and Philippopolis, with the seat at Philippopolis. The Diocese of Nicopolis (*Diœcesis Nicopolitana*) contains, according to the Missiones Cattolicæ (Rome, 1907), about 13,000 Latin Catholics, 14 parishes, 3 stations, 5 secular and 18 regular priests, a great seminary in Rustchuk, 3 parish schools for boys and 3 for girls, 3 houses of male religious orders (Passionists, Marists, and Assumptionists); there are also houses of the Sisters of the Assumption, with a boarding school at Varna; Dames de Sion, with a day school at Rustchuk, and Dominican Sisters from Cette, France. The Vicariate Apostolic of Sofia and Philippopolis (Sofiæ et Philippolis), established in 1759, contains 14,880 Latin Catholics, 1000 Greek Catholics, 13 parishes, 23 secular and 27 regular priests, 31 Capuchin Fathers, almost all engaged in parochial work; 20 Assumptionists, Fathers and lay brothers, with 4 foundations, one a college at Philippopolis, the only Catholic college in Bulgaria; 2 Resurrectionists, 10 Brothers of the Christian Schools, with a boarding and a day school at Sofia; 40 French Sisters of St. Joseph de l'Apparition, with 6 houses, a boarding school, orphan asylum and hospital at Sofia, a boarding school and day school at Philippopolis, and a boarding school and day school at Burgas; 13 Austrian Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, with a hospital at Philippopolis; 22 Bulgarian Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis; and 7 Sisters of the Assumption. There are also 2 colleges for boys, 3 for girls, a seminary in Philippopolis, 12 parish schools for boys and 12 for girls, 2 hospitals, 3 orphanages and 3 asylums for girls.

(b) *Uniat Bulgarians.*—While the Bulgarians were contending with the Greek patriarchate for ecclesiastical autonomy, and the patriarch refused to make any concession, a movement was set on foot among the Bulgarians which pointed towards union with Rome. On 30 December, 1860, 120 deputies of the people petitioned the Apostolic Delegate to receive them into the Roman Church on condition of the recognition of their language and liturgy, and the appointment of a bishop of their own nationality; almost 60,000 of their fellow-countrymen joined in the request. Pius IX himself, 21 January, 1861, consecrated a priest named Sokolski as first Vicar Apostolic of Uniat Bulgaria. This movement, however, did not win the support of Catholic Europe, while the greatest obstacles were placed in its way by Russia and the patriarchate of Constantinople. Sokolski lapsed back into schism in June, 1861, and embarked for Odessa on a Russian vessel; the majority of the Bulgarian priests and laymen attached themselves to the recently founded national exarchate. Only about 13,000 Bulgarians remained true to the Roman Church, and they live for the most part outside of Bulgaria in the Turkish provinces of Macedonia and Thrace. For these two Vicariates Apostolic have been erected. The Vicariate Apostolic of Thrace, with seat at Adrianople, contains 3,000 Catholics, 14 parishes and stations, 20 churches and chapels, 16 native secular priests, 25 Resurrectionists in 3 houses and 10 Assumptionists in 3 houses, 36 Sisters of the Assumption, with a boarding school, 3 Sisters of the Resurrection, 2 colleges, one in Kara-Agasch near Adrianopolis under the Assumptionists and the other at Adrianople under the Resurrectionists. The Vicariate Apostolic of Macedonia, with its see at Saloniki, contains 5,950 Græco-Bulgarian Catholics, 21 churches, 33 Bulgarian priests of the Slavonic Rite, a seminary at Zeitenlink near Saloniki, 17 schools for boys and 10 for girls, 4 houses of the Congregation of the Mission, with 15 priests, 6 houses of the Sisters of Mercy, 4 of the Eucharistines, 3 orphan asylums.

(c) *Oriental Churches.*—The Greek Orthodox church of Bulgaria is divided into 5 eparchies or provinces. The Bulgarians under the exarch (or supreme head of the Bulgarian National Church) are divided into 11 eparchies, 3 in Eastern Rumelia, with 2123 parishes, 78 monasteries for men, 15 for women, 1800 churches and 1906 clergy.

VAILHÉ in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, 1174–1236, containing an extensive bibliography; MIKLOSICH, *Monumenta Serbica* (Vienna, 1858); HILFERDING, *Geschichte der Serben und Bulgaren*, tr. from Russian (2 parts, Bautzen, 1856, 1864); D'AVRIL,

La Bulgarie chrétienne (Paris, 1861); L. DUCHESNE, *Les églises séparées* (Paris, 1896); DUMONT, *Les Bulgares* (2nd ed., Paris, 1872); JIREČEK, *Geschichte der Bulgaren* (Germ. tr., Prague, 1876); KANITZ, *Donau-Bulgarien und der Balkan* (2nd ed., 3 vols., Leipzig, 1882); BALAN, *Delle relazioni fra la chiesa Cattolica e gli Slavi* (Rome, 1880); FERMENDZIN, *Acta Bulgariæ ecclesiastica ab anno 1565 usque ad annum 1799* (Agram, 1887); JIRECZEK in *Kirchenlexikon*, II, 1459–67; SAMUELSON, *Bulgaria, Past and Present* (London, 1888); DICEY, *The Peasant State: an account of Bulgaria in 1894* (London, 1894); JIREČEK, *Das Fürstentum Bulgarien* (Prague, 1891); LAMOUCHE, *La Bulgarie dans le passé et le présent* (Paris, 1892), with bibliography; RATTINGER, *Die Bulgaren und die griech. schismat. Kirchen*, in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* (1873), IV, 45–57, 252–655; DRANDAR, *Les événements politiques en Bulgarie depuis 1876 jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1896); MARKOVICH, *Gli Slavi ed i papi* (Agram, 1897); STRAUSS, *Die Bulgaren* (Leipzig, 1898); DURASTEL, *Annuaire international de la Bulgarie* (Sofia, 1898 ——); FALKENEGG, *Aus Bulgariens Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1900); GELZER, *Der Patriarchat von Achrida* (Leipzig, 1902); BOJAN, *Les Bulgares et le patriarche œcuménique* (Paris, 1905); VON MACH, *Der Machtbereich des bulgarischen Exarchats in der Türkei* (Leipzig and Neuchâtel, 1906); *Echos d'Orient* (Paris, 1898 ——), I–X, passim; HERBERT, *By-Paths in the Balkans* (London, 1906); MACGAHAN, *Turkish Atrocities in Bulgaria* (London, 1876).

JOSEPH LINS.

Bulgarian Version. See VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

Bulla Aurea (GOLDEN BULL), a fundamental law of the Holy Roman Empire, probably the best known of all the many ordinances of the imperial diet. It takes its name from the golden case in which the seal attached to the document proclaiming the decree was placed. The law was signed by the Emperor Charles IV, January, 1356, during the Diet of Nuremberg, and was revised at the Diet of Metz in November of the same year. The contents of the Bulla Aurea were of constitutional importance for the empire. It ordained that each emperor should be chosen by election, the right of voting being vested in electoral princes, the number of whom was fixed at seven. As electors the edict appointed, on the one side, the three ecclesiastical princes most closely connected with the history of the empire, i. e. the Archbishops of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne. On the other side, the law settled the question, as far as it was still in dispute, as to whether the electoral vote pertained to certain secular principalities or to certain ruling families. It ordained that the right belonged to Bohemia, the Rhenish Palatinate, Saxony (Sachsen-Wittenberg), and the Mark of Brandenburg; this made the secular electors the King of Bohemia, the Count Palatine of the Rhine, the Duke of Saxony, and the Margrave of Brandenburg. The Bull also defined the powers given by the imperial constitution to the electors, taken as a body, and to certain individual electors separately, both during a vacancy of the throne and during an imperial reign. Thus the document granted to the electors in their character as rulers of principalities certain privileges which had been originally reserved to the German king and emperor and were the signs of his sovereignty. The transfer of these rights to subordinate rulers would, necessarily, gradually make them independent of the head of the empire. The Bull also provided for the preservation of peace in the empire and enacted measures for holding in check the increasing political importance of the rising free cities. In the main the law was intended to confirm rights which had already had a historical development and to settle disputed details of these rights. Constitutional law in the Holy Roman Empire reached its full growth between the years 1220 and 1555. As to the position of the "Golden Bull" in connexion with this development, see GERMANY.

GOLDEN BULLA OF THE EMPEROR CHARLES IV

BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire* (New York, 1904), 234 and passim; HAHN, *Ursprung u. Bedeutung d. Goldenen Bulle* (Breslau, 1903); *Mittheil. des Instituts f. oesterreich. Gesch.* (1884), V, 96–120.

MARTIN SPAHN.

Bulla Sacræ Cruciatæ. See CRUSADES, BULL OF THE.

Bullaker, THOMAS (or JOHN BAPTIST), VENERABLE, Friar Minor and English martyr, b. at Chichester about the year 1604; d. at Tyburn, 12 October, 1642. He was the only son of a pious and well-to-do physician of Chichester. His parents were both fervent Catholics, and, following their example, Bullaker grew up in the ways of innocence and piety. At an early age he was sent to the English College at St-Omer, and from there he went to Valladolid in Spain to complete his studies. Convinced of his vocation to the Franciscan Order, after much anxious deliberation, he received the habit at Abrojo, and a few years later, in 1628, was ordained priest. Having left Spain to labour on the English mission, he landed at Plymouth, but was immediately seized and cast into prison. Liberated after two weeks from the loathsome dungeon where he had suffered the most untoward hardships, Bullaker, by order of Father Thomas of St. Francis, then Provincial in England, laboured for nearly twelve years with much zeal and devotedness among the poor Catholics of London. On the 11th of September, 1642, Bullaker was seized while celebrating the Holy Sacrifice in the house of a pious benefactress. He has left a partial, but touching, account of his apprehension and trial. He was condemned to be drawn on a hurdle to Tyburn and there hanged, cut down alive, quartered and beheaded. It is related that as he was going out of prison he met Ven. Arthur Bell, a religious of his own order, who said to him: "Brother, I was professed before you. Why do you take precedence of me?" Bullaker answered: "It is the will of God. But you will follow me". Bell remembered the prophetic words of the pious Bullaker when his own day of martyrdom was at hand. The cause of the beatification of Bullaker was introduced in Rome in 1900.

THADDEUS, *The Franciscans in England* (London, 1898), ix, 62, 63, 67; XV, 205, 206; STONE, *Faithful unto Death* (London, 1892), vii, 132–150; MASON (ANGELUS A S. FRANCISCO), *Certamen Seraphicum* (2d ed., Quaracchi, 1885), 35–68; ORTOLANI, *De causis beatorum et servorum Dei ord. min.* (Quaracchi, 1905), 14.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Bullarium is a term commonly applied to a collection of bulls and other analogous papal documents, whether the scope of the collection be quite general in character, or whether it be limited to the bulls connected with any particular order, or institution, or locality. The name *bullarium* seems to have been invented by the canonist Laertius Cherubini who in 1586 published under the title "Bullarium, sive Collectio diversarum Constitutionum multorum Pontificum" a large folio volume of 1404 pages con-

taining 922 papal constitutions from Gregory VII down to Sixtus V, the pope then reigning. With regard to this and all subsequent collections, three things have carefully to be borne in mind. First, whatever may have been the intrinsic importance or binding force of any of the bulls so published, the selection itself was a matter which depended entirely upon the arbitrary choice of the various editors. As a collection the publication had no official character. The only recognized exception to this assertion is the first volume of a collection of his own bulls which was sent by Pope Benedict XIV in 1746 to the University of Bologna to serve as a *fons iuris*, or source of legal principles. Secondly, it was never seriously maintained, despite some rather pretentious title pages, that these collections were in any sense complete or that they even included all the constitutions



TITLE PAGE, EARLIEST PRINTED VOLUME OF THE BULLARIUM ROMANUM, CALLED TOME VII (1733)

of more general interest. Thirdly, it was the intention of the editors, at least at first, rather to exclude than to include the papal pronouncements which had already been incorporated in the text of the canon law. The avowed object of the early collections was to render assistance to canonists by bringing within their reach papal enactments which either had been overlooked by the compilers of the "Corpus" or which had been issued subsequently to the latest decrees included in it.

We may disregard in the present notice various small collections of relatively recent papal constitutions which were published in the early part of the sixteenth century. A typical specimen of such booklets is supplied by a rare little volume of sixty-two pages printed at Rome *per Stephanum Guillereti in regione Parionis 1509*, a copy of which is in the British Museum Library. A contribution of more substantial value appears to have been a volume edited by Mazzutellus in 1579 which contained 723 documents. But it is to Laertius Cherubini that the credit is usually given of creating the bullarium in substance as well as in name. In the preface to the volume of which the title has been already given, the editor refers to his personal experiences in the ecclesiastical courts of Rome. "In these courts I have noticed", he says, "that certain advocates and judges went completely astray because they had not at hand the text of those apostolic constitutions a knowledge of which is most necessary in treating and pronouncing upon causes, seeing that in such constitutions is embodied the whole of the most recent pontifical law". After this explanation it is not surprising to find that out of Cherubini's 922 documents more than 800 were of recent date, that is to say, that they belonged to the hundred years immediately preceding the appearance of the volume. Of this collection a second edition in three volumes, was printed at Rome in 1617, and a third edition in four volumes extending in this case from Leo I to Urban VIII, was prepared by the editor's son, Angelo Cherubini, in 1638, with a supplement added in 1659. Other editions followed, always somewhat enlarged. The fifth in six volumes was brought out by two Franciscans at Rome 1669–72.

THE LUXEMBURG BULLARIUM.—Moreover, a fuller but not more accurate reprint with supplementary volumes appeared in the eighteenth century, nominally at Luxemburg, though the actual place of impression is said to have been Geneva. Of this edition, which is one of the most commonly met with in libraries, the first eight volumes coming down to Benedict XIII all bear the date 1727, while a ninth and tenth volume, supplementing the earlier portion, appeared in 1730. Other supplements followed at intervals. Four volumes which were published in 1741 covered respectively the periods 1670–89, 1689–1721, 1721–30, 1730–40. In the same series, and still later, we have the following volumes: XV (1748), extending over 1734–40; XVI (1752), 1740–45; XVII (1753), 1746–49; XVIII (1754), 1748–52; XIX (1758), 1752–57. The last four volumes are entirely taken up with the Bulls of Benedict XIV. Although this is not the most important bullarium, it seemed worth while to indicate the arrangement of this Luxemburg edition as it appears to have been in part the source of the great confusion which is to be found in many accounts of the subject, notably in the recent article "Bullaire" in the "Dictionnaire de théologie catholique". It is not quite true, as has sometimes been supposed, that the "Luxemburg" editors contributed nothing of their own to the collection. For example, in Vol. IX (1730) we have two Bulls of the English pope, Adrian IV, printed from the originals at Geneva with engraved facsimiles of the *rota* and leaden *bulla*, and in fact the whole of the contents of Vols. IX and X represent a large measure of independent research. The later volumes of the series, however, have simply been copied from the Roman edition next to be mentioned.

MAINARDI'S ROMAN BULLARIUM.—This Roman edition of the Bullarium, which still remains the most accurate and practically useful, bears on the title pages of its thirty-two volumes the name of the publisher, Girolamo Mainardi, while the dedications to various cardinals prefixed to the different volumes and extending from 1733 to 1762 are also signed by him. The arrangement of the volumes, however, is peculiar, and the neglect to indicate these peculiarities has made the account given of this edition in most bibliographies almost unintelligible. Mainardi began with the idea of printing a supplement to the latest Roman edition of Cherubini's bullarium. As this was in six volumes and stopped short at the pontificate of Clement X (1670–76),

Mainardi called his first published volume Tom. VII, and reprinted the Bulls of Clement X from the beginning of his pontificate to his death. Moreover, an engraved frontispiece prefixed to this volume, printed in 1733, bears the words "Bullarium Romanum, Tom. VII". The book further contains a promise that the six volumes of Cherubini's bullarium should in course of time be reprinted in a corrected and enlarged form, with the aid of the documents contained in the secret archives of the Holy See. Seven other volumes followed in sequence to this first. They were printed from 1734 to 1744 and brought the collection from Clement X in 1670 to the accession of Benedict XIV in 1740. Meanwhile the publisher had engaged an able scholar, Charles Cocquelines, to re-edit the six volumes of Cherubini's bullarium from Leo I to Clement X. In his hands an immense mass of material accumulated. The first volume was printed in 1739 and it bore a slightly different title from that of the instalment which Mainardi had already published, beginning at "Tom. VII". Cocquelines' section was headed "Bullarum, privilegiarum ac diplomatum Romanorum Pontificum amplissima collectio" and in comparison with Cherubini's meagre gleanings from antiquity the epithet *amplissima* was fully deserved. This series, like all good work, advanced very slowly. A tabular arrangement will best show the details. The editor had to make his numbering correspond with Cherubini's six volumes and consequently some of the nominal *tomi* of the new edition were divided into several parts:

Vols.	Called	Period Covered	Year of Publication
I	Tom. I	450–1061	1739
II	Tom. II	1061–1181	1740
III–V	Tom. III (in 3 parts)	1181–1521	1740–1743
VI–IX	Tom. IV (in 4 parts)	1521–1588	1745–1747
X–XIV	Tom. V (in 5 parts)	1588–1626	1751–1756
XV–XX	Tom. VI (in 6 parts)	1626–1669	1758–1762

Some time before the completion of the series Cocquelines had died, and the last five volumes to appear did not bear his name. Simultaneously with this amplified edition of Cherubini, Mainardi had also been publishing, in folio, but somewhat smaller, the four volumes of the bullarium of Benedict XIV, the first of which, as already noted, appeared with that pontiff's own authentication. In sum the whole collection which issued from Mainardi's press amounted to thirty-two folio volumes and extended from Leo I in 450 to the death of Benedict XIV, 1758. As this in time grew antiquated, Andrew Barberi began in 1835 the publication of the Bulls of Pope Clement XIII and his successors under the title of "Bullarii Romani Continuatio" (19 vols., fol.), Rome, 1835–57. These came down to the fourth year of Pope Gregory XVI, i. e. to 1834. There is also another series of the same kind which appeared as a continuation of the bullarium of Benedict XIV at Prato in 1843–67 (10 vols., fol.).

The Turin Bullarium.—Finally, a large quarto edition of the bullarium was begun at Turin under the auspices of Cardinal Gaude in 1857, edited by Tomasetti. It claims to be more comprehensive, better printed and better arranged than the work of Cocquelines, but the additions made are insignificant and the typographical errors are numerous. Moreover among the documents added, especially in Appendix I (1867), are included some whose authenticity is more than doubtful. At Turin twenty-two volumes were printed (1857–72) down to Clement XII and five more, continuing the work to the end of Benedict XIV, were added at Naples (1867–85).

Particular Bullaria.—Besides the general bullarium of which we have so far spoken, various particular bullaria have been compiled at different times collecting the papal documents relating to this or that religious order or institution or locality. For example, eight volumes have recently been published by R. de Martinis under the title "Jus Pontificium de Propagandâ Fide" (Rome, 1888–98). This is in substance the bullarium of the Congregation of Propaganda brought up to date. Similarly an exhaustive collection or rather calendar of early papal documents concerning the churches of Italy has been undertaken by P. F. Kehr under the title of "Italia Pontificia" (Berlin, 1906). The expense is defrayed by the Göttingen Academy. Of the more important religious orders nearly all have at some time or other collected their privileges in print. Among the most extensive of such compilations, which formerly often went by the name of "Mare Magnum" (Great Ocean) may be mentioned the Bullarium of the Dominicans, edited by Ripoll and Bremond (8 vols., Rome, 1729–40); that of the Franciscans, edited by Sbaralea (4 vols., Rome, 1758–80), with a more modern continuation by Eubel (3 vols., Rome, 1897–1904); that of the Capuchins (7 vols., Rome, 1740–52); that of the Benedictines of Monte Cassino (2 vols., Venice, 1650). All the volumes here mentioned are folios, mostly of considerable bulk.

Historically speaking, the most interesting papal documents are often those contained in the "Regesta" (see Bulls and Briefs) which have never been included in the general Bullarium. Since the Archives of the Vatican were thrown open to students by Leo XIII in 1883, immense labour has been spent upon the copying and publication of the Bulls contained in the "Regesta". But even before this date facilities for research were not unfrequently accorded. Many hundreds of copies of documents relating to Great Britain were made for the British Government by Marino de Marinis in the early part of the nineteenth century and are now preserved in the British Museum. In 1873 the Rev. Joseph Stevenson was sent to Rome for a similar purpose and the large collection of transcripts made by him during four years' residence may be consulted at the Record Office, London. Since then Messrs. Bliss and Twenlow have been engaged on the same task and have published at the expense of the British Government seven volumes of a "Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers illustrating the History of Great Britain and Ireland". These are primarily papal letters, and they extend from the beginning of the thirteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century. The members of the Ecole Française de Rome have been equally active and it is mainly to them that we owe the publication of detailed calendars of the entire contents of the "Regesta" of various pontificates mostly of the thirteenth century. Those of Honorius IV (1285–87), Nicholas IV (1288–92), Benedict XI (1303–04) have been published and are complete. Those of Innocent IV (1243–54), Urban IV (1261–64), Clement IV (1265–68) are all but complete; while great progress has been made with those of Gregory X and John XXI (1271–77), Nicholas III (1277–80), Martin IV (1281–85), Boniface VIII (1294–1303), Gregory IX (1227–41), and Alexander IV (1254–61). Besides these, the "Regesta" of Clement V (1305–14) have been published by the Benedictines in nine volumes folio at the cost of Leo XIII, and those of John XXII (1316–34), as far as they relate to France, are being printed by A. Coulon, while those of the other Avignon popes are also in hand. The "Regesta" of Innocent III and his successor Honorius III have long been printed, and they are among the last volumes included in the Patrology of Migne. Finally among local bullaria we may mention the considerable collections published some years ago by Augus-

tine Theiner for various countries under the general heading of "Vetera Monumenta".

With regard to the early centuries, where no originals of official copies exist to which we can make appeal, the task of distinguishing genuine from spurious papal letters becomes exceedingly delicate. The collection of Dom Coustant, "Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum" (Paris, 1721), is of the highest value, but the compiler only lived to carry his work down to the year 440, and A. Thiele, who continued it, brought it no further than 553. Some further help has been furnished by Hampe, regarding the papal letters to Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, and by Hirsch-Gereth for Sergius II. For practical purposes the chief court of appeal for an opinion on all early papal documents is the "Regesta Pontificum Romanorum" of Jaffé, much improved in its second edition by its editors, Wattenbach, Ewald, Kaltenbrunner, and Löwenfeld. In this a brief synopsis is given of all existing papal documents known to be in existence, from the time of Peter to that of Innocent III (1198), with indications of the collections in which they have been printed and with an appendix dealing with spurious documents. This most useful work has been continued by Potthast to the year 1304 (2 vols., Berlin).

It may be added that compendiums have also been published of the "Bullarium Romanum" as printed in the eighteenth century. Of these the most valuable is probably that of Guerra "Pontificiarum Constitutionum in Bullario Magno contentarum Epitome" (4 vols., Venice, 1772), which possesses a very complete and useful index. Commentaries upon the bullarium or upon large portions of it have been published by the Jesuit J. B. Scortia (Lyons, 1625), by the Dominican, M. de Gregorio (Naples, 1648), and by Cardinal Vincent Petra (Rome, 1705–26). Finally, attention may be called to the important Bulls contained in a useful little volume recently edited by Galante "Fontes Juris Canonici" (Innsbruck, 1906).

No long bibliography is needed for an article which is itself bibliographical. ORTOLAN in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, 1243–55, with fuller details regarding monastic and other bullaria. See remark, page 49, col. 2, under sub-title *The Luxemburg Bullarium*. GRISAR in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1479–82; PITRA, *Annalecta Solesmensia Novissima* (Frascati, 1885); PHILLIPS, *Kirchenrecht* (Ratisbon, 1845), IV, 483 sqq.; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1905), I, 379.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Bull-Fight, THE SPANISH.—Neither the English term nor the German (*Stiergefecht*) used to designate this popular diversion of the Spaniards, can be said to express adequately the essential idea of the Spanish *corrida de toros*.

Great has been the discussion as to the origin of this spectacle. Some attribute it to the Roman Circus, where men contended with wild beasts, among them wild bulls; others—Don Nicolás de Moratín, for example—to the customs of the ancient Celtiberians. As Spain was infested by wild bulls, first necessity and afterwards sport led to this personal combat. In this opinion, indeed, is to be found what might be called the philosophic origin of the bull-fight. Man, surrounded by wild natural conditions, saw himself obliged to struggle with wild beasts in order to protect himself from them; and as the peoples naturally acclaimed as heroes those who slew in single combat these ferocious animals, so, when the necessity of protecting life had ceased, brave men still sought glory in these struggles. (In this connexion the killing of the Calydonian boar by the Ætolians, as related by Homer, the legend of Hercules and the Nemean lion, the Catalonian legend of Wilfrid slaying the Tarasque, and the Swiss legend preserved by Schiller in his "William Tell", with many others of a like nature, suggest themselves as examples.) But if, putting aside these a priori considerations, we turn our attention to historical facts, we shall find that the Spanish bull-fight originated in a Moorish custom.

To understand this better it will be necessary to distinguish between three kinds of bull-fights: (1) *caballerescas*, (2) *populares*, and (3) *gladiatorias*.

(1) The *corridas caballerescas* had their origin, without a doubt, in the usages of the Arabo-Spanish *jinetes* (cavaliers or mounted men-at-arms) who, to accustom themselves to the activities of war, occupied themselves in time of peace with exercises in the use of arms, among which exercises were fights with wild bulls; the Moorish cavaliers fought on horseback, killing the bulls with spears, thus combining courage with knightly address. From historical sources we know that the Cid Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar was the first Christian to vie with the Arab knights in the sport of killing fierce bulls, spearing several from his horse in the year 1040, to the enthusiastic admiration of Ferdinand I of Castile. The lawyer Francisco de Cepeda, in his "Resumpta Historial de España", assures us that in 1100 there were bull-fights for the public, and that in Leon there was a bull-fight on the occasion of the marriage of Doña Urraca, daughter of Alfonso VIII, to the King Don García of Navarre. These *corridas caballerescas* reached the highest degree of splendour in the reign of John II, when *plazas* began to be built, as we see by a story of the Marqués de Villena. The marriage of John II to Doña María de Aragón (20 October, 1418) was celebrated by *corridas* in Medina del Campo. In the last epoch of the reconquest, the intercourse, frequent in times of peace, between the Spaniards and the Moors of Granada—where bull-fights were held until the time of Boabdil—resulted in an increase of valour among the Christian cavaliers, and a desire to demonstrate it in this dangerous sport.

(2) From this time the bull-fight developed into a popular amusement, and became so rooted in the affections of the Spanish people that neither Isabella the Catholic, who wished to suppress it, nor Philip II, nor Charles III, dared issue an order that would prohibit it absolutely. The Emperor Charles V, although he had not been educated in Spain, killed a bull during the festivities held in Valladolid to celebrate the birth of his son Philip. The first Bourbons were educated in France and naturally did not display much fondness for the popular *corridas de toros*. The *corridas populares*, heritage of the Mohammedan population, more especially in Valencia and Andalusia, differ from the *caballerescas* in their democratic character. Bulls not quite so ferocious are selected and are fought on foot, sometimes in an enclosure formed of wagons and planks, sometimes through the streets, in which case the bull is generally tied to a long rope. In these *corridas populares* the bull is not killed, but after the populace has amused itself with the bull, provoking him, and then fleeing from his attack, a tame cow is let loose and the bull follows her quietly to the pen. Generally the bull is taken to the slaughter-house and the meat used for the feasts that follow.

(3) The *corridas gladiatorias* are those in which the participants are professionals, and these are the ones which have given rise among foreigners to so much criticism of this popular diversion of the Spaniards. Francisco Romero, a native of Ronda, about the middle of the eighteenth century, sets forth in the "Arte Taurino" (Tauromaquia) the rules which are the guiding principle of these contests. Romero invented the *muleta*, a scarlet cloth laid over a stick, used to attract the attention of the bull, and he was the first to kill a bull on foot and face to face. His skill was inherited by his son Juan, and his grandsons, Pedro, José, and Antonio. After this the different skilful manœuvres (*suertes*) that give variety to the

bull-fight were evolved. Juan Romero was the first to organize a *cuadrilla de toreros* (band, or company, of bullfighters).

THE MODERN BULL-FIGHT.—The modern bull-fight begins with the entrance of the *toreros* into the *plaza* (ring), marching to music, and dressed in richest satin, embroidered in silk or gold thread. The costume consists of tight-fitting satin knee-breeches, a short open Andalusian coat and vest, silk hose, and shoes without heels. The shoulders are decorated with handsome shoulder knots which in reality serve as protection in case of falls, as also the *moña*, a pad which is worn on the head, and which is covered with a rich cloth cap ornamented with tassels on each side. From the shoulders a short cape of embroidered satin is suspended. In the centre of the ring they ceremoniously salute the presiding official—the governor, sometimes the king himself—and receive from him the key of the bull pen (*toril*). Then each one takes his place. At the four equidistant points of the circumference of the ring the *picadores* are situated. These are men mounted on old or otherwise incapacitated horses, with cow-boy saddles, very large iron stirrups, and one leg protected against the bull's horns by the *espinillera*, an apparatus of iron. The bugle now gives the signal, the door of the pen opens, and the first bull is released. The *capeadores* attract the bull's attention with their scarlet capes, leading him towards the *picadores* who ride into the middle of the ring to meet him, and parry his attacks with their spears. If the bull happens to unhorse one of the *picadores*, or kill his horse, the *capeadores* rush to the rescue, attracting the bull once more with their scarlet capes, and carrying him off to another part of the ring. When the *picadores* have had their turn with the bull, the bugle sounds for *banderillas*. These are tiny steel points to which are attached many coloured ribbons or papers, which are stuck in the fleshy portion of the bull's neck by the *banderilleros*, who await his coming in the centre of the ring, facing him with arms extended. These, and many other tricks, such as *el salto de la garrocha*, etc., besides giving incident and variety to the spectacle, have as their object to weaken the enormous strength of the bull, so as to render possible and less dangerous the work of the *matador*—not, as many imagine, to infuriate the bull still more. When the presiding officer gives the signal for the death of the bull, the *matador* draws near the bull with the *muleta* in his left hand and the sword in his right hand; he calls the bull to him, or throws himself upon him, and plunges the sword into the neck of the bull. If he strikes him in the nape of the neck, killing him instantly, it is called *descabellar*, but if the bull is simply wounded the *puntillero* puts an end to his life with a dagger. The music now strikes up, while two little mules, richly caparisoned, drag out the bull and the dead horses. This is repeated again and again, the number of bulls being usually eight for each *corrida*.

Bull-fights have occasioned many accusations of barbarity against the Spaniards. The reason for this is, first, an utter ignorance of a game in which man with his reason and dexterity overcomes the brutal strength and ferocity of the bull. Foreigners as a rule think that the Spanish populace go to the bull-fight to witness the shedding of human blood. This is false. Generally there are no casualities; and when an accident does occur, no one derives pleasure from it; on the contrary, all deplore it. Second, the misconception implies a lack of comparison with other spectacles. The risks taken by acrobats, tight-rope dancers, and tamers of wild beasts are no less barbarous than those of the bull-fight, although the performances themselves are less diverting. And prize-fighting is surely much more brutal, seeing that the vanquished is a human being and not a brute. Lastly, the modern theatre is frequently more evil in its effects than bull-fighting, which, whatever else may be said of it, arouses no immoral or anti-social passions.

The authorities of the Catholic Church have often condemned bull-fighting. St. Pius V (1 November, 1567, Const. "De salute") prohibited this form of amusement everywhere, threatening with many penalties the princes who countenanced it, as well as the performers and spectators, especially clergymen and religious. But in Spain to-day these prohibitions are not in force. Gregory XIII (23 August, 1575, "Exponi") moderated the constitution of St. Pius V for Spanish laymen, and Clement VIII (Bull "Suscepti muneris", 12 January, 1597) reduced it to a *jus commune*, limiting the prohibition to holidays and to the clergy. Moralists as a rule are of the opinion that bull-fighting as practised in Spain is not forbidden by the natural law, since the skill and dexterity of the athletes precludes immediate danger of death or of serious injury (cf. P. V, Casus conscientiæ, Vromant, Brussels, 1895, 3d ed., I, 353, 354; Gury-Ferreres, Comp. Th. mor., Barcelona, 1906, I, n. 56). Even in Spain and Spanish America they have been forbidden to clergymen and religious, by Pius V, as well as by the Plenary Council for Spanish America (n. 650; cf. also C. prov., Vallisol., I, p. 5, tit. 1, n. 11). The Bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo received the same answer from the Penitentiaria (19 September, 1893). It is false to say that the Spanish clergy encourage these spectacles. Although public festivals are celebrated with religious ceremonies as well as bull-fights, the clergy is in nowise responsible for this. If both are announced on the same bill poster, the authorities, or particular associations, are responsible for the printing of this, not the clergy. It is worthy of note that foreigners who have been present at bull-fights are not so harsh in their judgments as those who have formed an opinion from what they have heard about them from the societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals.

RAMÓN RUIZ AMADO.

Bullinger, JOHANN HEINRICH. See ZWINGLI.

Bullion, ANGÉLIQUE, b. in Paris, at commencement of the seventeenth century, her parents being Guichard Favre and Madeleine Brulart de Sillery. Claude de Bullion, her husband, was Keeper of the Seals and Superintendent of Finances under Louis XIII; Cardinal Richelieu annually rewarded his intelligent and disinterested administrations by a bonus of 100,000 livres. After his death (1640), her four children being well provided for, she followed the advice of the Recollet Father Rapin, and contributed in 1641–42, 60,000 livres to the foundation of Ville-Marie, now the city of Montreal, Canada. She founded and endowed (1643) a Hotel-Dieu in honour of St. Joseph, begun at Ville-Marie (1642) by Mademoiselle Mance, and confided in 1657–59, to the care of the Sisters of St. Joseph, an order instituted at La Flèche by a pious layman, Royer de la Dauversière, one of the joint founders of Montreal. She likewise contributed more than 20,000 livres for the defence of the settlement against the Iroquois Indians, thereby helping to save the whole colony of New France from destruction. She always insisted on being mentioned in the deeds ratifying her donations as "An unknown benefactress". Her identity was revealed only after her death.

FAILLON, *Vie de Mademoiselle Mance* (Villemarie, 1854).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Bulls and Briefs.—A *bulla* was originally a circular plate or boss of metal, so called from its resemblance in form to a bubble floating upon water (Lat. *bullire*, to boil). In course of time the term came to be applied to the leaden seals with which papal and royal documents were authenticated in the early Middle Ages, and by a further development

the name, from designating the seal, was eventually attached to the document itself. This did not happen before the thirteenth century and the name *bull* was at first only a popular term used almost promiscuously for all kinds of instruments which issued from the papal chancery. A much more precise acceptation has prevailed since the fifteenth century, and a bull has long stood in sharp contrast with certain other forms of papal documents. For practical purposes a bull may be conveniently defined to be "an Apostolic letter with a leaden seal", to which one may add that in its superscription the pope invariably takes the title of *episcopus, servus servorum Dei*.

In official language papal documents have at all times been called by various names, more or less descriptive of their character. For example, there are "constitutions", i. e. decisions addressed to all the faithful and determining some matter of faith or discipline; "encyclicals" which are letters sent to all the bishops of Christendom, or at least to all those of one particular country, and intended to guide them in their relations with their flocks; "decrees", pronouncements on points affecting the general welfare of the Church; "decretals" (*epistolæ decretales*), which are papal replies to some particular difficulty submitted to the Holy See, but having the force of precedents to rule all analogous cases. "Rescript", again, is a term applicable to almost any form of Apostolic letter which has been elicited by some previous appeal, while the nature of a "privilege" speaks for itself. But all these, down to the fifteenth century, seem to have been expedited by the papal chancery in the shape of bulls authenticated with leaden seals, and it is common enough to apply the term *bull* even to those very early papal letters of which we know little more than the substance, independently of the forms under which they were issued.

Monks of the Certosa of Pavia Receiving the Bull of Investiture

It will probably be most convenient to divide the subject into periods, noting the more characteristic features of papal documents in each age.

I. Earliest times to Adrian I (772).—There can be no doubt that the formation of a chancery or bureau for the drafting and expediting of official papers was a work of time. Unfortunately, the earliest papal documents known to us are only preserved in copies or abstracts from which it is difficult to draw any safe conclusions as to the forms observed in issuing the originals. For all that, it is practically certain that no uniform rules can have been followed as to superscription, formula of salutation, conclusion, or signature. It was only when some sort of registry was organized, and copies of earlier official correspondence became available, that a tradition very gradually grew up of certain customary forms that ought not to be departed from. Except for the unsatisfactory mention of a body of notaries charged with keeping a record of the Acts of the Martyrs, c. 235 (Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I, pp. c–ci), we meet with no clear reference to the papal archives until the time of Julius I (337–353), though in the pontificate of Damasus, before the end of the same century, there is mention of a building appropriated to this special purpose. Here in the *scrinium*, or *archivium sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ*, the documents must have been registered and kept in a definite order, for extracts and copies still in existence preserve traces of their numbering. These collections or *regesta* went back to the time of Pope Gelasius (492–496) and probably earlier. In the correspondence of Pope Hormisdas (514–525) there are indications of some official endorsement recording the date at which letters addressed to him were received, and for the time of St. Gregory the Great (590–604) Ewald has been at least partially successful in reconstructing the books which contained the copies of the pope's epistles. There can be little doubt that the pontifical chancery of which we thus infer the existence was modelled upon that of the imperial court. The *scrinium*, the regionary notaries, the higher officials such as the *primicerius* and *secundicerius*, the arrangement of the Regesta by indictions, etc. are all probably imitations of the practice of the later empire. Hence we may infer that a code of recognized forms soon established itself, analogous to that observed by the imperial notaries. One formulary of this description is probably still preserved to us in the book called the "Liber Diurnus," the bulk of which seems to be inspired by the official correspondence of Pope Gregory the Great. In the earlier papal letters, however, there are as yet but few signs of the observance of traditional forms. Sometimes the document names the pope first, sometimes the addressee. For the most part the pope bears no title except *Sixtus episcopus* or *Leo episcopus catholicæ ecclesiæ*, sometimes, but more rarely, he is called *Papa*. Under Gregory the Great, *servus servorum Dei* (servant of the servants of God) was often added after *episcopus*, Gregory, it is said, having selected this designation as a protest against the arrogance of the Patriarch of Constantinople, John the Faster, who called himself "Œcumenical Bishop". But though several of St. Gregory's successors followed him in this preference, it was not until the ninth century that the phrase came to be used invariably in documents of moment. Before Pope Adeodatus (elected in 672) few salutations are found, but he used the form "salutem a Deo et benedictionem nostram". The now consecrated phrase "salutem et apostolicam benedictionem" hardly ever occurs before the tenth century. The Benedictine authors of the "Nouveau traité de diplomatique" in ascribing a much earlier date to this formula were misled by a forged bull purporting to be addressed to the monastery of St. Benignus at Dijon. Again, in these early letters the pope often addressed his correspondent, more especially when he was a king or person of high dignity, by the plural *Vos*. As ages went on this became rarer, and by the second half of the twelfth century it had completely disappeared. On the other hand, it may be

noticed incidentally that persons of all ranks, in writing to the pope invariably addressed him as *Vos*. Sometimes a salutation was introduced by the pope at the end of his letter just before the date—for example, "Deus te incolumem custodiat", or "Bene vale frater carissime". This final salutation was a matter of importance, and it is held by high authorities (Bresslau, "Papyrus und Pergament", 21; Ewald in "Neues Archiv", III, 548) that it was added in the pope's own hand, and that it was the equivalent of his signature. The fact that in classical times the Romans authenticated their letters not by signing their names, but by a word of farewell, lends probability to this view. In the earliest original bulls preserved to us BENE VALETE is written at full length in capitals. Moreover, we have at least some contemporary evidence of the practice before the time of Pope Adrian. The text of a letter of Pope Gregory the Great is preserved in a marble inscription at the basilica of St. Paul Outside the Walls. As the letter directs that the document itself is to be returned to the papal archives (*Scrinium*), we may assume that the copy on stone accurately represents the original. It is addressed to Felix the subdeacon and concludes with the formula "BENE VALE. Dat. VIII Kalend. Februarias imp. dn. n. Phoca PP. anno secundo, et consulatus eius anno primo, indict. 7." This suggests that such letters were then fully dated and indeed we find traces of dating even in extant copies as early as the time of Pope Siricius (384–398). We have also some *bullæ* or leaden seals preserved apart from the documents to which they were once attached. One of these perhaps dates back to the pontificate of John III (560–573) and another certainly belongs to Deusdedit (615–618). The earliest specimens simply bear the pope's name on one side and the word *papæ* on the other.

II. SECOND PERIOD (772–1048).—In the time of Pope Adrian the support of Pepin and Charlemagne had converted the patrimony of the Holy See into a sort of principality. This no doubt paved the way for changes in the forms observed in the chancery. The pope now takes the first place in the superscription of letters unless they are addressed to sovereigns. We also find the leaden seal used more uniformly. But especially we must attribute to the time of Adrian the introduction of the "double date" endorsed at the foot of the bull. The first date began with the word *Scriptum* and after a chronological entry, which mentioned only the month and the indiction, added the name of the functionary who drafted or engrossed the document. The other, beginning with *Data* (in later ages *Datum*), indicated, with a new and more detailed specification of year and day, the name of the dignitary who issued the bull after it had received its final stamp of authenticity by the addition of the seal. The pope still wrote the words BENE VALETE in capitals with a cross before and after, and in certain bulls of Pope Sylvester II we find some few words added in shorthand or "Tyronian notes". In other cases the BENE VALETE is followed by certain dots and a big comma, by a S S (*subscripsi*), or by a flourish, all of which no doubt served as a personal authentication. To this period belong the earliest extant bulls preserved to us in their original shape. They are all written upon very large sheets of papyrus in a peculiar handwriting of Lombard type, called sometimes *littera romana*. The annexed copy of a facsimile in Mabillon's "De re diplomatică" reproducing part of a bull of Pope Nicholas I (863), with the editor's interlinear decipherment, will serve to give an idea of the style of writing. As these characters were even then not easily read outside of Italy it seems to have been customary in some cases to issue at the same time a copy upon parchment in ordinary minuscule. A French writer of the tenth century speaking of a privilege obtained from Pope Benedict VII (975–984) says that the petitioner "going to Rome obtained a decree duly expedited and ratified by apostolic authority, two copies of which, one in our own character (*nostra littera*) on parchment, the other in the Roman character on papyrus, he de-



BULL FROM MABILLON'S "DIPLOMATIQUE"

posited on his return in our archives". (Migne, P. L., CXXXVII, 817.) Papyrus seems to have been used almost uniformly as the material for these official documents until the early years of the eleventh century, after which it was rapidly superseded by a rough kind of parchment. Apart from a small fragment of a bull of Adrian I (22 January, 788) preserved in the National Library at Paris, the earliest original bull that remains to us is one of Pope Paschal I (11 July, 819). It is still to be found in the capitular archives of Ravenna, to which church it was originally addressed. The total number of papyrus bulls at present known to be in existence is twenty-three, the latest being one issued by Benedict VIII (1012–24) for the monastery of Hildesheim. All these documents at one time had leaden seals appended to them, though in most cases these have disappeared. The seal was attached with laces of hemp and it still bore only the name of the pontiff on one side and the word *papæ* on the other. After the year 855 the letters of the pope's name were usually stamped round the seal in a circle with a cross in the middle.

The details specified in the "double dates" of these early bulls afford a certain amount of indirect information about the personnel of the papal chancery. The phrase *scriptum per manum* is vague and leaves uncertain whether the person mentioned was the official who drafted or merely engrossed the bull, but we hear in this connexion of persons described as *notarius*, *scriniarius* (archivist), *proto-*

scriniarius sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, *cancellarius*, *ypocancellarius*, etc., and after 1057 of *camerarius*, or later still *notarius S. palatii*. On the other hand, the *datarius*, the official mentioned under the heading *data*, who presumably delivered the instrument to the parties, after having superintended the subscriptions and the apposition of the seal, seems to have been an official of still higher consequence. In earlier documents he bears the titles *primicerius sanctæ sedis apostolicæ*, *senior et consiliarius*, etc., but as early as the ninth century we have the well-known phrase *bibliothecarius sanctæ sedis apostolicæ*, and later *cancellarius et bibliothecarius*, as a combined title borne by a cardinal, or perhaps by more than one cardinal at once. Somewhat later still (under Innocent III) the *cancellarius* seems to have threatened to develop into a functionary who was dangerously powerful, and the office was suppressed. A vice-chancellor remained, but this dignity also was abolished before 1352. But this of course was much later than the period we have now reached.

III. Third Period (1048–1198).—The accession of Leo IX, in 1048, seems to have inaugurated a new era in the procedure of the chancery. A definite tradition had by this time been created, and though there is still much development we find uniformity of usage in documents of the same nature. It is at this point that we begin to have a clear distinction between two classes of bulls of greater and less solemnity. The Benedictine authors of the "Nouveau traité de diplomatique" call them great and little bulls. In spite of a protest in modern times from M. Léopold Delisle, who would prefer to describe the former class as "privileges", and the latter as "letters", this nomenclature has been found sufficiently convenient, and it corresponds, at any rate, to a very marked distinction observable in the papal documents of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. The most characteristic features of the "great bulls" are the following:—

(1) In the superscription the words *servus servorum Dei* are followed by a clause of perpetuity, e. g. *in perpetuam memoriam* (abbreviated into IN PP. M.) or *ad perpetuam rei memoriam*. In contrast to this the little bulls have usually *salutem et apostolicam benedictionem*, but these words also appear in some great bulls after the clause of perpetuity.

(2) After the second quarter of the twelfth century the great bulls were always subscribed by the pope and a certain number of cardinals (bishops, priests, and deacons). The names of cardinal-bishops are written in the centre, under that of the pope; those of cardinal-priests on the left, and those of cardinal-deacons on the right, while an occasional blank shows that space had been left for the name of a cardinal who accidentally failed to be present. The pope has no cross before his name; the cardinals have. Earlier than this, even great bulls were subscribed by the pope alone, unless they embodied conciliar or consistorial decrees, in which case the names of cardinals and bishops were also appended.

(3) At the foot of the document to the left of the signature of the pope is placed the *rota* or wheel. In this the outer portion of the wheel is formed by two concentric circles and within the space between these circles is written the pope's *signum* or motto, generally a brief text of Scripture chosen by the new pontiff at the beginning of his reign. Thus Leo IX's motto was "Misericordiâ domini plena est terra"; Adrian IV's "Oculi mei semper ad dominum". Before the words of the motto a cross is always marked, and this is believed to have been traced by the hand of the pope himself. Not only in the case of the pope, but even in the case of the cardinals, the signatures appear not to have been their own actual handwriting. In the centre of the rota we have the names of Sts. Peter and Paul above and beneath them the name of the reigning pope.

(4) To the right of the signature opposite the rota stands the monogram which represents *Bene Valete*. From the time of Leo IX, and possibly somewhat earlier, the words are never written in full, but as a sort of grotesque. It seems clear that the *Bene Valete* is no longer to be regarded as the equivalent of the pope's signature or authentification. It is simply an interesting survival of an earlier form of salutation.

(5) As regards the body of the document, the pope's letter in the case of great bulls always ends with certain imprecatory and prohibitory clauses *Decernimus ergo*, etc., *Siqua igitur*, etc. On the other hand, *Cunctis autem*, etc., is a formula of blessing. These and the like clauses are generally absent from the "little bulls", but when they appear—and this happens sometimes—the wording used is somewhat different.

(6) In the eleventh century it was usual to write *Amen* at the end of the text of a bull and to repeat it as many times as was necessary to fill up the line.

(7) In appending the date, or, more precisely, in adding the clause which begins *datum*, the custom was to enter the place, the name of the datarius, the day of the month (expressed according to the Roman method), the indiction, the year of our Lord's Incarnation, and the regnal year of the pontiff, who is mentioned by his name. An example taken from a bull of Adrian IV will make the matter clear: "Datum Laterani per manum Rolandi sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ presbyteri cardinalis et cancellarii, XII Kl. Junii, indic. V°, anno dominicæ incarn. MCLVII°, pontificatus vero domini Adriani papæ quarti anno tertio."

Before this period, it was also usual to insert the first dating clause, "Scriptum", and there was sometimes an interval of a few days between the "Scriptum" and the "Datum". The use of the double date, however, soon came to be neglected even in "great bulls", and before 1124 it had gone out of fashion. This was probably a result of the general employment of "little bulls", the more distinctive features of which may now be specified.

(1) Although both great and little bulls alike begin with the pope's name—Urbanus, let us say, or Leo, "episcopus, servus servorum Dei"—in the little bulls we have no clause of perpetuity, but instead of it there follows immediately "salutem et apostolicam benedictionem".

(2) The formulæ of imprecation, etc., at the end only occur by exception, and they are in any case more concise than those of the great bulls.

(3) The little bulls have no rota, no *Bene Valete* monogram and no subscriptions of pope and cardinals.

The purpose served by this distinction between great and little bulls becomes tolerably clear when we look more narrowly into the nature of their contents and the procedure followed in expediting them. Excepting those which are concerned with purposes of great solemnity or public interest, the majority of the "great bulls" now in existence are of the nature of confirmations of property or charters of protection accorded to monasteries and religious institutions. At an epoch when there was much fabrication of such documents, those who procured bulls from Rome wished at any cost to secure that the authenticity of their bulls should be above suspicion. A papal confirmation, under certain conditions, could be pleaded as itself constituting sufficient evidence of title in cases where the original deeds had been lost or destroyed. Now the "great bulls" on account of their many formalities and the number of hands they passed through, were much more secure from fraud of all

kinds, and the parties interested were probably willing to defray the additional expenditure that might be entailed by this form of instrument. On the other hand, by reason of the same multiplication of formalities, the drafting, signing, stamping, and delivery of a great bull was necessarily a matter of considerable time and labour. The little bulls were much more expeditious. Hence we are confronted by the curious anomaly that during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, when both forms of document were in use, the contents of the little bulls are from an historical point of view immensely more interesting and important than those of the bulls in solemn form. Of course the little bulls may themselves be divided into various categories. The distinction between *litteræ communes* and *curiales* seems rather to have belonged to a later period, and to have primarily concerned the manner of entry in the official "Regesta", the *communes* being copied into the general collection, the *curiales* into a special volume in which documents were preserved which by reason of their form or their contents stood apart from the rest. We may note, however, the distinction between *tituli* and *mandamenta*. The *tituli* were letters of a gracious character—donations, favours, or confirmations constituting a "title". They were, indeed, little bulls and lacked the subscriptions of cardinals, the rota, etc., but on the other hand, they preserved certain features of solemnity. Brief imprecatory clauses like *Nulli ergo*, *Si quis autem*, are usually included, the pope's name at the beginning is written in large letters, and the initial is an ornamental capital, while the leaden seal is attached with silken laces of red and yellow. As contrasted with the *tituli*, the *mandamenta*, which were the "orders", or instructions, of the popes, observe fewer formalities, but are more business-like and expeditious. They have no imprecatory clauses, the pope's name is written with an ordinary capital letter, and the leaden seal is attached with hemp. But it was by means of these little bulls, or *litteræ*, and notably of the *mandamenta*, that the whole papal administration, both political and religious, was conducted. In particular the Decretals, upon which the whole science of Canon Law is built up, invariably took this form.

IV. Fourth Period (1198–1431).—Under Innocent III, there again took place what was practically a reorganization of the papal chancery. But even apart from this, we might find sufficient reason for beginning a new epoch at this date in the fact that the almost complete series of Regesta preserved in the Vatican archives go back to this pontificate. It must not, of course, be supposed that all the genuine bulls issued at Rome were copied into the Regesta before they were transmitted to their destination. There are many perfectly authentic bulls which are not found there, but the existence of this series of documents places the study of papal administration from this time forward on a new footing. Moreover, with their aid it is possible to make out an almost complete itinerary of the later medieval popes, and this alone is a matter of considerable importance. In the light of the Regesta we are able to understand more clearly the working of the papal chancery. There were, it seems, four principal bureaux or offices. At the office of the "Minutes" certain clerks (*clerici*), in those days really clerics, and known then or later as *abbreviatores*, drew up in concise form the draft (*litera notata*) of the document to be issued in the pope's name. Then this draft, after being revised by a higher official (either one of the notaries or the vice-chancellor) passed to the "Engrossing" office, where other clerks, called *grossatores* or *scriptores*, transcribed in a large official hand (*in grossam literam*) the copy or copies to be sent to the parties. At the "Registration" office again it was the duty of the clerks to copy such documents into the books, known as Regesta, specially kept for the purpose. Why only some were copied and others not, is still uncertain, though it seems probable that in many cases this was done at the request of the parties interested, who were made to pay for the privilege which they regarded as an additional security. Lastly, at the office of "Bulls", the seal, which now bore the heads of the two Apostles on one side and the name of the pope on the other (see cut), was affixed by the



Bulla of Boniface VIII

officials called *bullatores* or *bullarii*. At the beginning of the thirteenth century the great bulls, or *privilegia*, as they were then usually called, with their complex forms and multiple signatures, became notably more rare, and when the papal court was transferred to Avignon in 1309 they fell practically into disuse save for a few extraordinary occasions. The lesser bulls (*litteræ*) were divided, as we have seen, into *tituli* and *mandamenta*, which became more and more clearly distinguished from each other not only in their contents and formulæ but in the manner of writing. Moreover, the rule of authenticating the letter with a leaden seal began in certain cases to be broken through, in favour of a seal of wax bearing the impression of the "ring of the fisherman". The earliest mention of the new practice seems to occur in a letter of Pope Clement IV to his nephew (7 March, 1265). "We do not write", he says, "to thee or to our intimates under a [leaden] bull, but under the signet of the fisherman which the Roman pontiffs use in their private affairs" (Potthast, Regesta, no. 19,051). Other examples are forthcoming belonging to the same century. The earliest impression of this seal now preserved seems to be one lately discovered in the treasury of the Sancta Sanctorum at the Lateran, and belonging to the time of Nicholas III (1277–80). It represents St. Peter fishing with rod and line and not as at present drawing in his net.

Bulla of Honarius III

V. Fifth Period (1431–1878).—The introduction of briefs, which occurred at the beginning of the pontificate of Eugenius IV, was clearly prompted by the same desire for greater simplicity and expedition which had already been responsible for the disappearance of the greater bulls and the general adoption of the less cumbersome *mandamenta*. A brief (*breve*, i. e. "short") was a compendious papal letter which dispensed with some of the formalities previously insisted on. It was written on vellum, generally closed, i. e. folded, and sealed

in red wax with the ring of the fisherman. The pope's name stands first, at the top, normally written in capital letters thus: PIUS PP IIII; and, instead of the formal salutation in the third person used in bulls, the brief at once adopts a direct form of address, e. g. *Dilecte fili—Carissime in Christo fili*, the phrase used being adapted to the rank and character of the addressee. The letter generally begins by way of preamble with a statement of the case and cause of writing and this is followed by certain instructions without minatory clauses or other formulæ. At the end the date is expressed by the day of the month and year with a mention of the seal—for example in this form: "Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris die V Martii, MDLXXXXI, pont. nostri anno primo." The year here specified, which is

BULLA OF PAUL II

used in dating briefs, is probably to be understood in any particular case as the year of the Nativity, beginning 25 December. Still this is not an absolute rule, and the sweeping statements sometimes made in this matter are not to be trusted, for it is certain that in some instances the years meant are ordinary years, beginning with the first of January. (See Giry, "Manuel de diplomatique", pp. 126, 696, 700.) A similar want of uniformity is observable in the dating of bulls though, speaking generally, from the middle of the eleventh century to the end of the eighteenth, bulls are dated by the years of the Incarnation counted from 25 March. After the institution of briefs by Pope Eugenius IV, the use even of lesser bulls, especially in the form of *mandamenta*, became notably less frequent. Still, for many purposes bulls continued to be employed—for example in canonizations (in which case special forms are observed, the pope by exception signing his own name, under which is added a stamp imitating the rota as well as the signatures of several cardinals), as also in the nomination of bishops, promotion to certain benefices, some particular marriage dispensations, etc. But the choice of the precise form of instrument was often quite arbitrary. For example, in granting the dispensation which enabled Henry VIII to marry his brother's widow, Catherine of Aragon, two forms of dispensation were issued by Julius II, one a brief, seemingly expedited in great haste, and the other a bull which was sent on afterwards. Similarly we may notice that, while the English Catholic hierarchy was restored in 1850 by a brief, Leo XIII in the first year of his reign used a bull to establish the Catholic episcopate in Scotland. So also the Society of Jesus, suppressed by brief in 1773, was restored by a bull in 1818. A very interesting account of the formalities which had to be observed in procuring bulls in Rome at the end of the fifteenth century is contained in the "Practica" recently published by Schmitz-Kalemberg.

VI. SIXTH PERIOD: SINCE 1878.—Ever since the sixteenth century the briefs have always been written in a clear Roman hand upon a sheet of vellum of convenient size, while even the wax seal with its guard of silk and the impression of the fisherman's ring was replaced in 1842 by a stamp which affixed the same device in red ink. The bulls, on the other hand, down to the death of Pope Pius IX retained many medieval features apart from their great size, leaden seal, and Roman fashion of dating. In particular, although from about 1050 to the Reformation the writing employed in the papal chancery did not notably differ from the ordinary book-hand familiar throughout Christendom, the engrossers of papal bulls, even after the end of the sixteenth century, went on using an archaic and very artificial type of Gothic writing known as *scrittura bollatica*, with manifold contractions and an absence of all punctuation, which was practically undecipherable by ordinary readers. It was in fact the custom in issuing a bull to accompany it with a *transsumptum*, or copy, in ordinary handwriting. This condition of things was put an end to by a *motu proprio* issued by Pope Leo XIII shortly after his election. Bulls are now written in the same clear Roman script which is used for briefs, and, in view of the difficulties arising from transmission by post, the old leaden seal is replaced in many cases by a simple stamp bearing the same device in red ink. In spite, however, of these simplifications, and although the pontifical chancery is now as an establishment much reduced in numbers, the conditions under which bulls are prepared are still very intricate. There are still four different "roads" which a bull may follow in its making. The *via di cancelleria*, in which the document is prepared by the *abbreviatori* of the chancery, is the ordinary way, but it is, and especially was, so beset with formalities and consequent delays (see Schmitz-Kalemberg, Practica) that Paul III instituted the *via di camera* (see APOSTOLIC CAMERA) to evade them, in hope of making the procedure more expeditious. But if the process was more summary, it was not less costly, so St. Pius V, in 1570, arranged for the gratuitous issue



BULLA OF SIXTUS IV

of certain bulls by the *via segreta;* and to these was added, in 1735, the *via di curia*, intended to meet exceptional cases of less formal and more personal interest. In the three former processes the Cardinal Vice-Chancellor, who is at the same time "Sommista", is the functionary now theoretically responsible. In the last case it is the Cardinal "Pro-Datario", and he is assisted in this charge by the "Cardinal Secretary of Briefs". As the mention of this last office suggests, the *minutanti* employed in the preparation of briefs form a separate department under the presidency of a Cardinal Secretary and a prelate his substitute.

SPURIOUS BULLS.—There can be no doubt that during a great part of the Middle Ages papal and other documents were fabricated in a very unscrupulous fashion. A considerable proportion of the early entries in chartularies of almost every class are not only open to grave suspicion, but are often plainly spurious. It is probable, however, that the motive for these forgeries in most cases was not criminal. They were prompted by the de-

sire of protecting monastic property against tyrannical oppressors who, when title deeds were lost or illegible, persecuted the holders and extorted large sums as the price of charters of confirmation. No doubt, less creditable motives—e. g. an ambitious desire to exalt the consideration of their own house—were also operative, and while lax principles in this matter prevailed almost universally it is often difficult to distinguish the purpose for which a papal bull was forged. A famous early example of such forgery is supplied by two papyrus bulls which profess to have been addressed to the Abbey of St. Benignus at Dijon by Popes John V (685) and Sergius I (697), and which were accepted as genuine by Mabillon and his confrères. M. Delisle has, however, proved they are fabrications made out of a later bull addressed by John XV in 995 to Abbot William, one side of which was blank. The document was cut in half by the forger and furnished him with sufficient papyrus for two not unsuccessful fabrications. Though deceived in this one instance, Mabillon and his successors, Dom Toustain and Dom Tassin, have supplied the most valuable criteria by the aid of which to detect similar fabrications, and their work has been ably carried on in modern times by scholars like Jaffé, Wattenbach, Ewald, and many more. In particular a new test has been furnished by the more careful study of the laws of the *cursus*, or rhythmical cadence of sentences, which were most carefully observed in the authentic bulls of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. It would be impossible to go into details here, but it may be said that M. Noël Valois, who first investigated the matter, seems to have touched upon the points of primary importance. Apart from this, forged bulls are now generally detected by blunders in the dating clauses or other formalities. In the Middle Ages one of the principal tests of the genuineness of bulls seems to have been supplied by counting the number of points shown in the circular outline of the leaden seal or in the figure of St. Peter depicted upon it. The *bullatores* apparently followed some definite rule in engraving their dies. Finally, regarding these same seals, it may be noted that when a bull was issued by a newly elected pope



Bulla Conferring Title of Defender of the Faith on Henry VIII

before his consecration, only the heads of the Apostles were stamped upon the *bulla*, without the pope's name. These are called *bullæ dimidiatæ*. The use of golden buliæ (*bullæ aureæ*), though adopted seemingly from the thirteenth century (Giry, 634) for occasions of exceptional solemnity, is too rare to call for special remark. One noteworthy instance in which a golden seal was used was that of the bull by which Leo X conferred upon King Henry VIII the title of *Fidei Defensor*.

Ortolan in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, 1255–63—see remark, page 49, col. 2; Grisar in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1482–95; Giry, *Manuel de diplomatique* (Paris, 1894), 661–704—an excellent summary of the whole subject; Pflugk-Harttung, *Die Bullen der Päpste* (Gotha, 1901)—mainly concerned with the period before Innocent III; Melampo in *Miscellanea di Storia e Cultura Ecclesiastica* (1905–07), a valuable series of articles not too technical in character, by a Custodian of the Vatican Archives; Mas-Latrie, *Les éléments de la diplomatique pontificale* in *Revue des questions historiques* (Paris, 1886–87), XXXIX and XLI; Diekamp, *Zum päpstlichen Urkundenwesen* in *Mittheilungen des Inst. f. Oesterr. Geschichtsforschung* (Vienna, 1882–83), III and IV, and in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 1883, IV; Delisle, *Les régistres d'Innocent III* in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* (Paris, 1853–54), with many other articles; Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre* (Leipzig, 1889), I, 120–258; De Rossi, Preface to *Codices Palatini Latini Bib. Vat.* (Rome, 1886); Berger, preface to *Les régistres d'Innocent IV* (Paris, 1884); Kehr and Brachmann, *Päpsturkunden* in various numbers of the *Göttinger Nachrichten* (Phil. Hist. Cl., 1902–04); Kehr, *Scrinium und Palatium* in the Austrian *Mittheilungen, Ergänzungsband*, VI; Pitra, *Analecta Novissima Solesmensia* (Tusculum, 1885), I; Schmitz-Kalemberg, *Practica* (1904). Among earlier works mention may be made of Mabillon, *De Re Diplomaticâ* (Paris, 1709), and the *Nouveau traité de diplomatique* by the Benedictines of Saint-Maur (Paris, 1765, VI volumes).

Early Bulls.—Bresslau, *Papyrus und Pergament in der päpstlichen Kanzlei* in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts, für Oest. Geschichtsforschung* (Innsbruck, 1888), IX; Omont, *Bulles pontificales sur papyrus* in *Bibl. de l'école des chartes* (Paris, 1904), LXV; Ewald, *Zur Diplomatik Silvesters II* in *Neues Archiv* (Hanover, 1884), IX; Kehr, *Scrinium und Palatium* in the Austrian *Mittheilungen, Ergänzungsband* (Innsbruck, 1901), VI; Kehr, *Verschollene Papyrusbullen* in *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven* (Rome, 1907), X, 216–224; Rodolico, *Note paleografiche e diplomatiche* (Bologna, 1900).

For *facsimiles* both of early bulls and of their seals, the great collection of Pflugk-Harttung, *Specimina Selecta Chartarum Pontificum Romanorum* (3 vols., Stuttgart, 1887) is of primary importance, but isolated facsimiles are to be found elsewhere.

On the *cursus* it will be sufficient to mention the article of Noël Valois, *Etudes sur le rythme des bulles pontificales* in *Bibl. de l'école des chartes* (1881), XLII, and De Santi, *Il Cursus nella storia litter. e nella liturgia* (Rome, 1903).

Herbert Thurston.

Bulstrode, Sir Richard, soldier, diplomatist, and author, b. 1610; d. 1711, was the second son of Edward Bulstrode by Margaret, daughter of Richard Astley, chamberlain of the queen's household and member of the Inner Temple. He was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, and while at the university was the author of a poem on the birth of the Duke of York. At twenty-three years of age he entered the Inner Temple and in 1649, at his father's request and through his interest, was made a bencher. During the Civil War he was loyal to the king, serving in the Prince of Wales's regiment and holding at times the post of adjutant. He was later promoted to the rank of Adjutant-General of Horse, and still later to be Quartermaster-General. He was appointed to take charge of the funeral of Lord Strafford and became responsible for the expenses attending it; on being pressed by his creditors he fled to Bruges. He subsequently underwent a short term of imprisonment, which was terminated by the payment of the debt by Charles II. On his return he was appointed auditor of a Scotch regiment then serving in the Netherlands and in 1673 was appointed agent at the Court of Brussels. He was temporarily recalled two years later, and in 1675 was knighted and again sent to Brussels, this time as resident, where he remained until the accession of James II when he was made envoy. When the revolution of 1688 compelled James to leave England, Bulstrode accompanied him to the court of Saint-Germain, where he remained until his death. Among his writings are: "Original Letters written to the Earl of Arlington, with an account of the Author's Life and Family", "Life of James II", "Memoirs and Reflections on the Reign and Government of Charles I and Charles II" and a large number of elegies and epigrams.

Henderson in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, VII, 259; Gillow, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, I, 340.

Thomas Gaffney Taaffe.

Bunderius (VAN DEN BUNDERE), JOANNES, Flemish theologian and controversialist, b. of distinguished parents at Ghent in 1482; d. there 8 January, 1557. He entered the Dominican Order in his native city about 1500, and after having made his religious profession was sent to Louvain to pursue his studies in philosophy and theology. He obtained the degree of Lector in Sacred Theology, and in 1517 returned to Ghent, where, until near the close of his life, he taught philosophy and theology. While occupied in teaching he filled the office of prior of the convent of Ghent three times (1529–35; 1550–53), and discharged the duties of General Inquisitor of the Diocese of Tournai. As inquisitor he was untiring in his efforts to check the spread of the errors that were being disseminated by Lutherans, Calvinists, and Mennonites; but always used prudence in his dealings with heretics. Long training in the schools and the experience he had gained as professor of theology fitted him exceptionally well to explain and defend Catholic doctrine, and to detect and expose the errors of heretical teaching. While prior of the convent of Ghent for the first time, he formed a federation of religious orders in that city for the safeguarding of the faith of the people and for the preservation of the rights of the Church and the privileges of the orders. In recognition of his ability as a preacher and as a reward for his long labours in the pulpit a general chapter of his order conferred upon him the degree of Preacher General. Of his writings, which are nearly all of a polemical character, the most worthy of note are: (1) "Compendium dissidii quorumdam hereticorum atque theologorum" (Paris, 1540–43, 1545); (2) "Compendium concertationis hujus sæculi sapientium et theologorum" (Paris, 1549; Venice, 1553, etc). After the author's death this work was frequently published under the title: "Compendium rerum theologarum, quæ hodie in controversia agitantur"; (3) "Detectio nugarum Lutheri cum declaratione veritatis Catholicæ (Louvain, 1551); (4) "De Vero Christi baptismo contra Mennonem Anabaptistarum principe (Louvain, 1553).

DE JONGHE, *Belgium Dominicanum* (Brussels, 1719), 72; ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 160; PAQUOT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des Pays-Bas* (Louvain, 1765), I, 391.

A. L. MCMAHON.



MICHELANGELO BUONARROTI

Buonarroti, MICHELANGELO, Italian sculptor, painter, and architect, b. at Caprese in the valley of the upper Arno, 6 March, 1475; d. at Rome, 18 February, 1564. Michelangelo, one of the greatest artists of all times, came from a noble Florentine family of small means, and in 1488 was apprenticed to Domenico Ghirlandajo. While apprentice, he excited the admiration of his master by the life-like animation of his drawings, and upon Ghirlandajo's recommendation, and at the wish of Lorenzo the Magnificent, he received further training (1489–92) in the palace of the Medici, at the school of sculpture then under the direction of Bertoldo, one of Donatello's pupils. As student and resident of the palace, Michelangelo lived with Lorenzo's sons in the most distinguished society of Florence, and at this time was introduced by the poet Politian into the circle of the scholars of the Academy and to their learned pursuits. Meanwhile, Michelangelo was studying with marked success the frescoes in the Brancacci chapel. After Lorenzo's death he passed his time partly at home, partly at the monastery of Santo Spirito, where be busied himself with anatomical studies, and partly in the house of Pietro de' Medici, who, however, was banished in 1494. About the same time Michelangelo left Florence for Bologna. He returned in 1495, and began to work as a sculptor, taking as his model the works of his predecessors and the masterpieces of classical antiquity, without, however, sacrificing his individuality. In 1496 he went to Rome, whither his fame had preceded him, and remained there working as a sculptor until 1501. Returning to Florence, he occupied himself with his painting and sculpture until 1505, when Pope Julius II called him to enter his service. After this, Michelangelo was employed alternately in Rome and Florence by Julius and his successors, Leo X, Clement VII, and Paul III being his special patrons. In 1534, shortly after the death of his father, Michelangelo left Florence, never to return. The further events of his life are closely connected with his artistic labours. Some weeks after his death his body was brought back to Florence, and a few months later a stately memorial service was held in the church of San Lorenzo. His nephew, Leonardo Buonarroti, erected a monument over his tomb in Santa Croce, for which Vasari, his well-known pupil and biographer, furnished the design, and Duke Cosimo de' Medici the marble. The three arts are represented as mourning over the sarcophagus, above which is a niche containing a bust of Michelangelo. A monument was erected to his memory in the church of the Santi Apostoli, at Rome, representing him as an artist in working garb, with an inscription: *Tanto nomini nullum par elogium.* (No praise is sufficient for so great a man.)

Michelangelo was a man of a many-sided character, independent and persistent in his views and his endeavours. His most striking characteristic was a sturdy determination, guided by a lofty ideal. Untiring, he worked until far advanced in years, at the cost of great personal sacrifices. He was not, however, unyielding to the point of obstinacy. His productions in all departments of art show the

great fertility of his mind. In literature he was a devoted student and admirer of Dante. A copy of the "Divine Comedy", ornamented by him with marginal drawings, has unfortunately been lost. Imitating the style of Dante and Petrarch, he wrote verses, *canzoni*, and especially sonnets, which are not without value, and excite surprise by their warmth of feeling. Some of his poems give expression to an ideally pure affection. He never married. A stern earnestness is characteristic of the sculptor, but the tenderness of his heart is shown in his touching love and solicitude for his father and brothers. Although seemingly absorbed in his art, and often straitened in circumstances, he was ever ready to aid them by word and deed. "I will send you what you demand of me", he wrote, "even if I have to sell myself as a slave". After the death of his father he conceived a deep affection for a young Roman, Tommaso de' Cavalieri, and also entered into intimate friendship with the noble-minded poetess, Vittoria Colonna, then past her youth. With his pupils, Vasari and Condivi, he was on the most cordial terms, and a servant who was twenty-six years in his employ experienced his bounty. The biographies we have from the pupils just mentioned and the letters of Michelangelo himself testify to the gentler traits of his character. He gave younger artists generous aid by suggestions, sketches, and designs, among others to Sebastiano del Piombo, Daniele da Volterra, and Jacopo da Pontormo. Michelangelo had few personal wants and was unusually self-denying in dress and diet. Savonarola's sermons, which he recalled even in his old age, probably influenced him in some degree to adopt this austerity of life. Moreover, the seriousness of his own mind caused him to realize the vanity of earthly ideals. His spirit was always absorbed in a struggle to attain perfection. Yet with all this he was not haughty; many of his sayings that have come down to us show him to have been unusually unassuming. The explanation of his unwillingness to have the aid of assistants must be sought in the peculiarity of his artistic methods. Michelangelo's life was one of incessant trials, yet in spite of an imperious temper and many bodily infirmities he showed remarkable composure and forbearance. No matter how much trouble was caused him by his distinguished patrons he seldom failed in loyalty to them. He was equally faithful to his native city, Florence, although the political confusion which reigned there wrung from him many complaints. It obliged him to spend half of his life elsewhere, yet he wished to lie after death in Florentine earth; nor could the most enticing offers induce him to leave Italy. A contemporary bestows praise which seems merited, when he says that Michelangelo in all the ninety years of his life never gave any grounds for suspecting the integrity of his moral virtue.

Sculpture.—*First Period.*—If the years before 1505, that is, before the summons by Julius II, be taken as Michelangelo's youth, it may be said that, even when a pupil in Bertoldo's school, he attracted attention not only by his work in clay and by the head of a faun in marble after a classical model, but especially by two marble bas-reliefs of his own design. The "Madonna Seated on a Step", pressing the Child to her breast under her mantle, shows, it is true, but little individuality, grace, and tenderness, though perhaps for this very reason all the more dignity. Michelangelo's later style is more easily recognized in the "Battle of the Centaurs", which represents a large group of figures, anatomically well drawn, engaged in a passionate struggle. It is said that in after years the artist, in referring to this group, expressed regret that he had not devoted himself exclusively to sculpture. He appears to have taken the conception for this work from a bronze relief of Bertoldo and to have imitated the style of Donatello. Michelangelo's work certainly recalls Donatello in the drapery of the Madonna above mentioned and in the realistic way in which the sentiment of this composition is expressed. After Lorenzo's death Michelangelo produced a marble Hercules of heroic size that was taken to Fontainebleau and has since disappeared. Thode, however, appears to have found the Crucifix which Michelangelo carved for the church of Santo Spirito. The body in this is almost entirely free from the cross; there is no intense pain expressed on the youthful face, and the hands and hair are not completely worked out. The "St. John in the Wilderness", with the honeycomb, now at Berlin, is probably the San Giovannino that Michelangelo executed in Florence in 1495. The realistic modelling of the head and the beautiful lines of the body show a study of both classic and modern models. Shortly before this Michelangelo completed several figures for the shrine of St. Dominic which Niccolò dell' Arca had left unfinished. A figure of a pagan deity was the occasion of Michelangelo's first visit to Rome, and a statue of Bacchus carved by him on that occasion is extant at Florence. This work, which is the result of a study of the antique, is merely a beautiful and somewhat intoxicated youth.

Far more important is the Pietà executed in 1499 for the French chapel in St. Peter's. A calm, peaceful expression of grief rests on all the figures of the group. The face of the mother has youthful beauty; the head is bowed but slightly, yet expressive of holy sorrow. Her drapery lies in magnificent folds under the body of the Saviour. The latter is not yet stiff and reveals but slight traces of the suffering endured, especially the noble countenance so full of Divine peace. Not the lips but the hand shows the intensity of the grief into which the mother's soul is plunged. When sixty years old Michelangelo desired to execute a Pietà, or, more properly, a "Lamentation of Christ" for his own tomb. The unfinished group is now in the Cathedral of Florence, and is throughout less ideally conceived than the Pietà just mentioned. The body of Christ is too limp, and Nicodemus and Mary Magdalen are somewhat hard in modelling. This Pietà was broken into pieces by the master, but was afterwards put together by other hands. Two circular reliefs of the "Virgin and Child", one now in London and one in Florence, belong to the sculptor's youthful period. In the Florentine relief, especially, intensity of feeling is combined with a graceful charm. Mother and Child are evidently pondering a passage in Scripture which fills them with sorrow; the arms and head of the Boy rest on the book. A life-sized group of about the same date in the church of Our Lady (Eglise Notre-Dame) at Bruges shows the Madonna again, full of dignity and with lofty seriousness of mien, while the Child, somewhat larger than the one just mentioned, is absorbed in intense thought. In contrast to Raphael, Michelangelo sought to express Divine greatness and exalted grief rather than human charm. He worked entirely according to his own ideals. His creations recall classical antiquity by a certain coldness, as well as by the strain of superhuman power that characterizes them.

Second Period.—To Michelangelo's second creative period (beginning 1505) belongs the statue of Christ which he carved for the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. It was sent to Rome in 1521 in charge of an assistant who was to add some last touches to the statue when it was put in position. The Saviour, a life-sized marble figure, holds the cross, sponge, and rod of hyssop. The face, earnest, almost hard, is turned to the left, as if saying:

ERYTHRÆAN SIBYL—MICHELANGELO BUONAROTTI

CEILING OF THE SISTINE CHAPEL

"My people, what have ye done to Me?" Properly, however, the figure is not that of the suffering Saviour, but of the risen Saviour and therefore nude, according to the desire of the patron who gave the commission. The age of the Renaissance, in its ardour for the nude, paid no regard to decorum. At a later date a bronze loin cloth, unfortunately too long, was placed on the statue. In conformity with the spirit in which the whole composition is conceived, the figure of Christ is not stiff and severe like the statue of an antique god, but expresses a resigned humanity. A youthful Apollo produced at about the same time has also little of the classic in its design. A dying Adonis comes nearer to classic models in its conception. But the gigantic David, the embodiment of fresh young daring, in reality a representation of a noble boy, resembles an antique god or hero. It can hardly be said that the colossal size, over twelve and a half feet, is suitable for a youth; however, the deed for which David is preparing, or more probably, the action which he has just completed, is a deed of courage. The right hand is half closed, the left hand with the sling seems to be going back to the shoulder, while the gaze follows the stone. The figure resembles that of an ancient athlete. The body is nude, and the full beauty of the lines of the human form is strikingly brought out. In 1508 Michelangelo agreed to carve the twelve Apostles in heroic size (about nine and a half feet high) for the church of Santa Maria del Fiore, but of the whole number only the figure of St. Matthew, a great and daring design, was hewn in the rough. Similarly, he executed but four of the saints which were to decorate the memorial chapel to Pius II and left the rest of the work unfinished. A bronze statue of David with the head of Goliath under his feet was sent to France and has since disappeared. A pen-and-ink sketch of this statue is still in the Louvre.

David

His powers fully matured, Michelangelo now entered the service of the popes and was entrusted with the carrying out of two great undertakings. In 1505 Julius II called him to Rome to design and erect for the pope a stately sepulchral monument. The monument was to be a four-sided marble structure in two courses, decorated with some forty figures of heroic size. Michelangelo spent eight months in Carrara superintending the sending of the marble to Rome. He hoped in carrying out this commission to execute a work worthy of classic times, one containing figures that would bear comparison with the then newly discovered Laocoön. His plans, however, were brought to nought by a sudden change of mind on the part of Julius, who now began to consider the rebuilding of St. Peter's after the designs of Bramante. Julius may be said to have driven Michelangelo from the Roman court. Fearful of the malice of enemies, Buonarroti fled in despair to Florence and, turning a deaf ear to the pope's entreaties to return to Rome, offered to go on with the work for the monument at Florence. To this, however, Julius would not listen. In his exasperation Michelangelo was on the point of going to Constantinople. However, at the invitation of the pope, in the latter part of 1506, he went to Bologna, where, amid the greatest difficulties and in straitened circumstances, he cast a bronze statue of Julius II, of heroic size. This effigy was destroyed during a revolt against Julius in 1511. Once more in Rome, he was obliged for the time being to abandon the scheme for the monument to Julius and, against his will, to decorate the Sistine Chapel with frescoes. Julius II lived only long enough after the completion of the frescoes to arrange for his monument in his will. After his death in 1513 a formal contract was made for the construction of the memorial. According to this new agreement the monument was no longer to be an independent structure, but was to be placed against the church wall in the form of a chapel. The plan for the structure was even more magnificent than the original design, but was in the end abandoned, both on account of its size and of other circumstances which arose. The new pope, Leo X, of the Medici family, was a friend of Michelangelo's youth and looked on him with much favour, but had new designs in reference to him. After Michelangelo had laboured for two years on the monument to Julius, Pope Leo, during a visit to Florence, commanded him, to construct a stately new façade for the church of San Lorenzo, the family burial place of the Medici. With tears in his eyes, Michelangelo agreed to this interruption of his great design. The building of the new façade was abandoned in 1520, but the sculptor returned to his former work for a time only. The short reign of Adrian VI was followed by the election to the papal throne of another early friend of Michelangelo, Giulio de' Medici, who took the name of Clement VII. Since 1520 Giulio de' Medici had desired to erect a family mortuary chapel in San Lorenzo. When he became pope he obliged Michelangelo to take up this task. The new commission was not unworthy of the sculptor's powers, yet an evil fate prevented this undertaking also from reaching its full completion. Michelangelo suffered unspeakably from the constant alteration of his plans; he was, moreover, beset by many detractors; the political disorders in his native city filled him with grief, and the years brought with them constantly increasing infirmities.

In 1545 the designs, some of which still exist, for the monument to Julius II were carried out on a much reduced scale. The monument is in the church of San Pietro in Vincoli; in the centre of the lower course of the monument between two smaller figures is placed the gigantic statue of Moses, which was originally intended for the upper course, where it would have made a much more powerful impression. When seen close by, the criticism may be made that the expression is too violent, there is no sufficient reason for the swollen veins in the left arm, the shoulders are too massive in comparison with the neck, the chin, and the forehead; that even the folds of the robe are unnatural. Yet, seen from a distance, it is precisely these features that produce the desired effect. The great statue, which is double life size, was intended to express the painfully restrained and mighty wrath of the leader of a stiff-necked people. It is plain that an allusion to the warlike prowess of Julius II was intended and that the sculptor here, as in many of his other undertakings, has embodied his own tremendous conception of force. The way in which the Tables of the Law are grasped, the bare arm and right knee, the heavy beard and the "horns" heighten the effect that is aimed at. The flank-

ing figures of Rachel and Leah, symbols respectively of contemplative and active life, were carved by Michelangelo himself, but they are not as satisfactory as the Moses. The monument itself and the figures on the upper course were not executed by the great master, though they were worked out according to his suggestions. On the other hand, two shackled figures out of the series planned by the sculptor are in the Louvre, though incomplete. The "Slaves" were intended to typify the power of the pope in the domains of war and art, and were to stand in front of the hermæ pillars, where the inverted consoles now are. In the "Slaves" in the Louvre the antithesis between resistance to the fetters and submission to the inevitable is expressed with remarkable skill. There are also in Florence some unfinished figures belonging to this monument, namely, a victor kneeling on a fallen foe, and four other figures, which are merely blocked out. About the time of the completion of this monument Michelangelo carved a striking bust of Brutus as the hero of liberty. Michelangelo regarded the freedom of his native city as lost after the second return of the Medici from exile and the assumption of the control of affairs by Alessandro and Cosmo de' Medici. The sorrow this caused him suggested the bust of Brutus, and cast a shadow on the tombs of Giuliano and Lorenzo de' Medici in the chapel spoken of above. The greater part of the work in the chapel, however, had been done before this time, and so the expression of embittered sorrow must be explained by the general depression of the artist not less than by his failure to realize his highest ideal, which also accounts for the gloom characteristic of his other creations.

Moses

Twelve figures included in the original design for the sepulchral monument of the Medici were never carved. According to Vasari's arrangement in 1563, a seated figure of Giuliano is placed in an upper niche of one of the monuments, while symbolical figures representing Day and Night recline on a sarcophagus below. If Michelangelo's words have been rightly understood, these symbolical figures are to be regarded as mourning for the untimely death of the duke, and as grieving that life for him had not been worth the living. "Not to see, nor to hear must be happiness for me", are the words attributed to Night, which is represented as a giantess sunk in heavy and uneasy slumber, and symbolized by a mask, an owl, and a bunch of poppy-heads. The other allegorical figure, Day, a man, is represented as having no desire to rouse himself to action. The plan of the second monument is similar to that of the one just described; the figures of Evening and Dawn make the same impression as those of Night and Day. The two Medicean dukes are ideally treated as ancient warriors, rather than portrayed as in life. In the statue of Giuliano it is the superb modelling of the different parts that delights the eye; in the statue of Lorenzo the charm lies in the pose and the way in which the face is shadowed by the helmet. This figure of Lorenzo bears the name of Il Penseroso (the Meditative). Against the wall of the chapel stands the unfinished and really unsuccessful Madonna and Child; the pose of the Madonna is unique.

Paintings.—Michelangelo once said that he was no painter; on another occasion he declared he was no architect, but in reality he was both. About 1503 he painted a Holy Family, now in Florence, in which the Madonna holds the Child over her shoulder to St. Joseph who stands behind. In this canvas Michelangelo departs from the traditional representation of the Holy Family, by the quaint grouping of nude figures in the background even more than by the entirely new pose of the Mother and Child. An "Entombment of Christ", now in London, is unfinished. Like Leonardo da Vinci, the greatest painter of that period, Michelangelo made a large number of sketches. He also entered into competition with that famous artist by undertaking (1504) a battle-piece which was to adorn the wall opposite Leonardo's "Battle of Anghiari" in the great council chamber of the palace of the Signory, called then the Palazzo dei Priori and now the Town-hall of Florence. As Michelangelo just at this date entered the service of the popes, the cartoon he prepared was never carried out and is now lost. After years of disagreement with Julius II the painting of the Sistine Chapel was begun in 1508, and in 1512 the ceiling was uncovered. Michelangelo, who was not a fresco-painter, exerted all his powers of mind and body, abandoning his preference for the effects of sculpture in order to express without assistance, and in defiance of the envious, the full ideal of his conceptions in this unwonted medium. Creation, the Fall, and the preparation for the coming of the Redeemer form the subject of the fresco. The painter first divided and enclosed the ceiling with painted architecture which formed a frame for the frescoes; the cornice for this frame on the broad side of the chapel is adorned with the figures of naked youths. The nine fields of the smooth vault contain the history of the sinful human race as far as Noe. Around the dome, between the lunettes, are vaulted triangular spaces or pendentives; in these are placed prophets and sibyls, together with boy-angels, all pointing to the approaching redemption. In the lunettes over the windows, and in the vaulted triangular spaces over the lunettes are represented the ancestors of Christ. The subject, arrangement, and technical excellence of these frescoes have always excited the greatest admiration. The Divine, the prophetic, and the human are here most happily expressed; the conception of the first is original; the prophets and sibyls have wonderful individuality, and great skill is shown in handling the drapery, while human beings are represented in animated action. The architect created the beautiful division of the space and the exact proportions, the sculptor produced the anatomically correct figures, and the painter knew how to blend forms and colours into perfect harmony. After the completion of the work Michelangelo could no longer regret that it had been forced upon him against his will. Equally famous is the great fresco of the "Last Judgment" which he painted upon the altar-wall of the chapel (1535–41). In this fresco, however, the nudity of the figures aroused objection, and they have been painted over by various hands. The "Last Judgment" has been more blackened and disfigured by time than the painting on the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel.

Architecture.—The commission given by Leo X

for the rebuilding of the façade of the church of San Lorenzo, which has been already mentioned, ended in a bitter disappointment for Michelangelo. He produced very rapidly a fine design for the front and made the first preparations for the work. After four years (in 1520) the contract was rescinded without anything having been accomplished. However, the commission that Michelangelo received from Giulio de' Medici, afterwards Clement VII, for a mortuary chapel for the Medici family was not revoked, and the chapel was completed in 1524. It is a simple building surmounted by a dome. Its only purpose is to hold the monuments. Michelangelo's design for the enlargement of San Giovanni de' Fiorentini at Rome was never used. He also produced designs for the Piazza of the Campidoglio (Capitol) and the Porta Pia. It is a remarkable fact that the citizens of Florence in 1529 appointed him engineer-in-chief of the fortifications of the city. Of more importance was his appointment as chief architect for the reconstruction of St. Peter's by Pope Paul III, after the death of Sangallo (1546). He held this position seventeen years. Michelangelo carried out, with some changes, Bramante's plans for the new building and rejected those of Sangallo. His own work is notably the magnificent dome. He completed the drum, but not, however, the upper dome. The clay model made by his own hands is still to be seen at the Vatican.

Death brought to an end a life filled with fame and success, but also replete with suffering and sorrow; a life on which a great genius made demands which could not be satisfied. The ambitions of Michelangelo were insatiable, not so much owing to his desire for renown, as to his almost gigantic striving after the absolute ideal of art. For this reason Michelangelo's creations bear the stamp of his subjectivity and of his restless efforts to attain the loftiest ideals by new methods. He accomplished much that was extraordinary in three or four departments of art, but at the same time broke through many limitations prescribed by the laws of beauty in all arts, wilfully disregarding, at times, in his modelling of the human figure, even that fidelity to nature which he esteemed so highly. The way he pointed was dangerous, inasmuch as it led directly to extravagance, which, though perhaps endurable in Michelangelo, in his successors often substituted empty show for an ideal of lofty beauty. For a time Michelangelo obscured even the fame of Raphael; he swayed not only his own age, but succeeding generations.

Monographs by SUTHERLAND-GOWER, HOLYROD, STRUTT (London, 1903); THODE, *Michelangelo und das Ende der Renaissance* (1903, 1904); ROLLAND, *Michelange* (1905).

G. GIETMANN.

Burchard of Basle (also OF HASENBURG or ASUEL, from his ancestral castle in Western Berne, Switzerland), Bishop of Basle in the eleventh century and a warm partisan of Henry IV (1056–1106). He belonged to the family of the counts of Neuenburg, or Neuchâtel, was b. towards the middle of the eleventh century, and d. 12 April, 1107. Having entered the ecclesiastical state he was made Bishop of Basle (1072) by Henry IV; in recognition of this favour he was ever loyal to the king, and became one of his foremost advisers. In Henry's first difficulties with the Saxons (1073–75) Burchard rendered him all possible assistance. When the conflict between the king and Pope Gregory VII (1073–85) broke out, Burchard was among the bishops who assembled at Worms (January, 1076), proclaimed the deposition of the pope, and wrote him an insulting letter. Together with Bishop Huzmann of Speyer he also went to Northern Italy for the purpose of inducing the Lombard bishops to take similar action with regard to the pope. In this he was successful; a synod was assembled at Piacenza, and the Lombard bishops renounced obedience to Gregory. For these rebellious acts Burchard was excommunicated and deposed by the pope in the Lenten synod of 1076; a similar sentence was inflicted on other bishops and on Burchard's royal master. King Henry obtained absolution at Canossa in January, 1077; and Burchard, who accompanied him on the penitential pilgrimage, was reinstated in office.

During the civil war in 1077 and the following years, between Henry and his rival, Duke Rudolf of Suabia, raised to the throne by many princes, Burchard stood on the side of Henry, in whose interest he fought repeatedly, both against Rudolf and his supporter, Berthold of Zähringen. In 1078 Burchard and his friend suffered a crushing defeat, and he barely saved his life by precipitate flight. But the fortunes of war turned; Burchard and his partisans ravaged the country of Alemannia, or Suabia, the home of Rudolf and Berthold, and many cruelties were committed. Churches, sanctuaries, and perhaps monasteries as well were destroyed by the reckless and savage soldiery. But it all helped the cause of Henry and weakened that of his rival, who was finally vanquished and killed in 1080. Burchard was rewarded for his services with grants of land from Henry. It is not certain that he was present in the synod held at Brixen (Tyrol) in June, 1080, where the partisans of Henry again deposed Gregory VII and elected in his stead Wibert, Archbishop of Ravenna. He was with Henry, however, when the schismatic king took possession of Rome, 21 March, 1084, and it may be taken for granted that he assisted at the installation of the antipope Clement III (1084–1100) and at the imperial coronation of Henry, which events occurred on the 24th and 31st of March respectively. Shortly afterwards Burchard returned to Germany with his royal master.

Two synods were held there during the year 1085, in which Burchard, though not present, was directly concerned. The first, in the latter part of April, was held at Quedlinburg by the partisans of Gregory VII; it condemned all adversaries of the pope, including Bishop Burchard. Henry's faction held its synod at Mainz in the early part of May; Pope Gregory and all the bishops loyal to him were deposed. For the next twenty years Burchard was less active in the cause of Henry, but he remained to the end loyal to his king. When Henry was hard pressed in Italy by his son Conrad, in rebellion since 1093, and other enemies, Burchard was one of the very few bishops of Germany, who brought him any comfort. In 1095 he appeared at the king's court at Padua, and after Henry's return to Germany he paid several other visits to the royal court. How much Henry counted on the loyalty of Burchard was made evident in a letter which the monarch wrote to the princes of the empire from Liège in the early part of the year 1106, shortly before his death. Henry besought the princes to accord him sufficient time to consult with the princes and bishops about the matters relating to his abdication or reconciliation with his rebellious son Henry V (1106–25), and among the bishops faithful to him he mentioned the name of Burchard of Basle.

Burchard, however, did not always remain an uncompromising adversary of the popes. After the death of Gregory VII, particularly after the election of Urban II (1088–99), his sentiments underwent a change. He sought a reconciliation with the Holy See; and in order to prove his interest in purely ecclesiastical and spiritual matters he became instrumental in the erection of several monasteries or other religious institutions. Among those founded by him may be mentioned the monastery of St. Alban in Basle, the chapterhouse of Grandis Vallis to the south of Basle, and the monastery of St. John, erected partly by his brother and partly by himself

at Erlach in the neighbourhood of his ancestral castle. In spite of his attachment to Henry IV he died fully reconciled with the pope.

TROUILLAT, *Monuments de l'histoire de l'ancien évêché de Bâle* (Porrentruy, 1852); BLÖSCH, *Zwei bernische Bischöfe* in *Berner Taschenbuch* (Bern, 1881); GIESEBRECHT, *Gesch. der deutschen Kaiserzeit* (Leipzig, 1890), III; FIALA in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1514–19.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Burchard of Worms, Bishop of that see, b. of noble parents in Hesse, Germany, after the middle of the tenth century; d. 20 August, 1025. He received his education in Coblenz and other places, and ultimately entered the service of Archbishop Willigis of Mainz (975–1011), by whom he was ordained deacon. He rose gradually in ecclesiastical rank and was finally appointed by Willigis first chamberlain, and primate or judge of the city. In these offices he showed so much discretion and impartiality, that his reputation reached Emperor Otto III. During a personal interview with his imperial master (1000) he was appointed to the vacant Bishopric of Worms; a few days later he was advanced to the priesthood and the episcopal dignity by Willigis at Heiligenstadt. Thenceforth he laboured unceasingly for the temporal and spiritual welfare of his subjects. He rebuilt the walls of Worms and with the approval of Henry II tore down the stronghold of a certain Duke Otto, which served as a place of refuge to criminals and malefactors. Between 1023 and 1025 he promulgated a celebrated body of laws, the "Leges et Statuta familiæ S. Petri Wormatiensis", with the purpose of insuring the impartial administration of justice. (Boos, in Urkundenbuch der Stadt Worms, I, 1886; Weiland, in Mon. Ger. Hist.: Leges, IV, 1.) Many monasteries and churches were erected by him. On the site of the aforesaid Otto's castle he built a monastery in honour of St. Paul; his sister Mathilda was placed in charge of a community of religious women, whose home was practically rebuilt; the cathedral of St. Peter at Worms was reconstructed and dedicated in 1016. He also devoted himself to the formation of ecclesiastical students in his cathedral school and to the instruction of ecclesiastics generally. To stimulate their zeal he would at times answer difficult questions submitted to him. The prevalent evils he tried to reform through visitations and synods.

For the sake of uniformity in all church matters he drew up a manual for the instruction and guidance of young ecclesiastics, this is his well-known "Collectarium canonum" or "Decretum" in twenty books, a compilation of ecclesiastical law and moral theology, drawn from previous similar collections, the penitential books, the writings of the Fathers, the decrees of councils and popes, and the Sacred Scriptures. For more than a century, until the publication of the "Decretum" of Gratian (c. 1150), this was a widely used practical guide of the clergy, often quoted as "Brocardus". The nineteenth book, known as "Corrector, seu medicus", was circulated frequently as a separate work and was esteemed as a practical confessor's guide. (Von Scherer, Kirchenrecht, I, 238.) The work was undertaken at the suggestion of Brunicho, the provost of the Worms Cathedral, and was executed with the help of Bishop Walter of Speyer and Abbot Olbert of Gembloux (ed. Foucher, Paris, 1549; Migne, P. L., CXL, Paris, 1853). Burchard enjoyed the special esteem of his imperial masters. With Otto III he was on the most intimate terms; Henry II and Conrad II made visits to him in 1009 and 1025 respectively. Personally Burchard was a saintly man. His biographer, probably an ecclesiastic, praises his devotion to prayer, his mortification, his fairness and charity towards others.

Vita Burchardi Episcopi in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, IV; also in *P. L.*, Paris, 1853, CXL; GROSCH, *Burchard I Bischof zu Worms* (Jena, 1890); HAUCK, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1896), III; VON SCHERER in *Kirchenlex.*, II; HAUCK in HERZOG, *Realencyc.* (Leipzig, 1897), III; GIETL, *Hist. Jahrb.* (1895), XVI, 116–119; WATTENBACH, *Deutschl. Geschichtsquellen* (6th ed., 1893), I, 392; CONRAT, *Gesch. d. Quellen des röm. Rechts im M. A.*, I, 261.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Burchard of Würzburg, SAINT, first Bishop of Würzburg, b. in England of Anglo-Saxon parents, date unknown; d. in Germany most probably in 754. After the death of his father and mother he left home to go as a missionary to Germany, being drawn to this life by the great reputation of his countryman, St. Boniface, to whom he offered himself as an assistant. As Boniface was at this time an archbishop it must have been after the year 732 that Burchard began missionary work on German soil. He soon showed himself a competent and zealous messenger of the Faith and was consecrated Bishop of the new See of Würzburg by St. Boniface when the latter erected the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the mission territory of Thuringia. The date is probably 741, for on 22 October, 741, Burchard and Witta of Büraburg took part as bishops in the consecration of St. Willibald as Bishop of Eichstätt. In a letter to St. Boniface, 1 April, 743, Pope Zachary confirmed the founding of the new diocese. But a year before this (April, 742) Burchard had been a member of the first German synod. He now devoted himself to spreading and confirming Christianity in the new bishopric. In the spring of 748 he went to Rome to make a report on the condition of the Church in Franconia and to submit various questions for decision. Burchard was held in high esteem by Pepin the Short. When the latter, in 749, appointed an embassy to lay before Pope Zachary the question who should be King of the Franks, he placed Burchard and Abbot Fulrad of St. Denis at its head. After his return from Rome Burchard was not able to continue his apostolic activity for any great space of time and died before St. Boniface. One of his successors, Hugo (984–990), had Burchard's remains dug up and solemnly buried on 14 October. This day has remained the feast-day of the saint.

Vita S. Burchardi in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, XV, 47–50 (unreliable account of ninth and tenth centuries); *Vita S. Burchardi*, in *Acta SS.*, Oct., IV, 575 sqq. (account of twelfth century); NÜRNBERGER, *Aus der litterar. Hinterlassenschaft des hl. Bonifatius und des hl. Burchardus* (Neisse, 1888); ULRICH, *Der hl. Burchardus, erster Bischof von Würzburg* (Würzburg, 1877); HAUCK, *Kirchengesch.* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1898–1900), I, II, passim.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Burckmair (or BURGKMAIR), HANS, a painter of the Swabian school, b. at Augsburg in 1473; d. in 1531. He was the son of Toman, or Thomas Burckmair, and received his first lessons in art from his father, then went, it appears, to Schongauer in Alsace, and afterwards to Italy. In company with the elder Holbein he painted, between the years 1501 and 1504, the seven great churches of Rome on panels in the monastery of St. Catherine at Augsburg. To Burckmair belong, among these, the basilica of St. Peter, the basilica of the Lateran, and the church of Santa Croce. The building itself is represented in the main compartment of each picture; above are, respectively, Christ's prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, the Scourging, and the Crucifixion. Following the titles of the churches there are, in the first picture, St. Peter enthroned and accompanied by the Fourteen Holy Martyrs; in the second, the legend of St. John the Evangelist, and in the third, the martyrdom of the Eleven Thousand Virgins. Several fine figures in the paintings show Italian influence. Not much later in date is the painting of Christ and the Blessed Virgin, the latter wearing a crown; most charming figures of angels and three groups of saints are depicted on the wings as surrounding the central personages. The pictures just mentioned are in Augsburg. Among the Madonnas at Nuremburg, the Madonna with the bunch of grapes is especially

CORONATION OF THE VIRGIN BURCKMAIR

IN THE CLOISTER OF ST. CATHERINE, AUGSBURG

admired. An attractive genre picture with a background of harmonious tone that brings out the effect is the Holy Family in the Berlin Museum.

The best of Burckmair's later panel pictures are: the Crucifixion, with St. George and the Emperor Heinrich on the wings, painted in 1519 and now at Augsburg; St. John in Patmos, and Esther before Assuerus, painted in 1528 (these two at Munich). Several portraits still exist which Burckmair painted in the later years of his life. Among these is one of the artist himself and his wife, painted in 1529, now at Vienna. In this picture his wife holds a mirror in her hand in which two skulls are reflected.

A woodcut of earlier date (1510) resembles a picture from a Dance of Death. In this engraving Death stops a pair of lovers, throws the youth down, and strangles him; at the same time he seizes with his teeth the dress of the young woman, who is fleeing. The woodcuts that Burckmair produced in the middle part of his career (1510–19), at the command of the Emperor Maximilian, possess unusual merit. Only one of them, or, at most, very few were inserted in the emperor's Prayer Book. For the other books concerned with Maximilian or his ancestors Burckmair's work was as follows: for the "Österreichische Heiligen" (Austrian Saints) Burckmair made 124 engravings on wood; for "Teuerdank" 12; for "The Triumph" over 60; for the "Weiszkunig" more than 200; he finally completed the "Genealogie" with some 70 illustrations. As an example of his decorative work may be mentioned the adornments, which are full of imaginative power, in the so-called "Damenhof" of the house of the Fugger family at Augsburg. Under the influence of Italian art Burckmair modified the old realistic method of treating a subject, gradually replaced Gothic architecture in his work by that of the Renaissance, substituted colour for gold in painting, and developed the use of landscape as a background.

JANITSCHEK, *Geschichte der deutschen Malerei* (Berlin, 1890); HUBER in *Zeitschrift des hist. Vereins für Schwaben*, I, Parts II, III; MUTHER in *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, XIX; IDEM in *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, IX.

G. GIETMANN.

Burgis, EDWARD AMBROSE, a Dominican historian and theologian, b. in England c. 1673; d. in Brussels, 27 April, 1747. When a young man he left the Church of England, of which his father was a minister, and became a Catholic, joining the Dominican Order at Rome, where he passed his noviceship in the convent of Sts. John and Paul on the Cœlian Hill, then occupied by the English Dominicans. After his religious profession (1696) he was sent to Naples to the Dominican school of St. Thomas, where he displayed unusual mental ability. Upon the completion of his studies he was sent to Louvain, where for nearly thirty years he taught philosophy, theology, Sacred Scripture, and church history in the College of St. Thomas, established in 1697 for the Dominicans of England through the bequest of Cardinal Thomas Howard, O.P. He was rector of the college from 1715 to 1720 and again from 1724 to 1730. In the latter year he was elected to the office of provincial; in 1741 he became Prior of the English Dominican convent at Bornhem, and in 1746 he was appointed Vicar-General of the English Dominicans in Belgium. He published a number of pamphlets of considerable merit containing theses written in Latin on Scriptural, theological, and historical subjects. But it was as a writer of English that he excelled, especially along historical lines; his style is easy and pleasing, and he is accurate in his statements. In 1712 he published in London "The Annals of the Church", a volume embracing the period from A. D. 34 to 300. As stated in the preface it was his intention to bring the annals down to his own time in a work of nine volumes, but he abandoned this plan, rewrote the first period, and published "The Annals of the Church from the Death of Christ", in five octavo volumes (London, 1738), the first work of the kind written in English by Catholic or Protestant. The book entitled "An Introduction to the Catholic Faith", by Father Thomas Worthington, O.P. (London, 1709), was completed by Father Burgis, although his name does not appear in connexion with it.

PALMER, *Obituary Notices O.S.D.* (London, 1884); OLLIVER, *Collections.*

A. L. MCMAHON.

Burgoa, FRANCISCO, b. at Oaxaca about 1600; d. at Teopozotlan in 1681. He entered the Dominican Order 2 August, 1629, and soon became master in theology. The voluminous books written by him on the past of his native Mexican State, Oaxaca, are very rare. They are valuable, though not absolutely reliable on several topics. He was curate of several Indian parishes and his knowledge of the Indian languages, the Zapotec and Mixteco, is stated to have been very thorough. In 1649 he became Provincial of the Province of San Hipólito and took part in the chapter general of his order at Rome, 1656. Returning to Mexico with the title of vicar-general, a member of the Inquisition of Spain, and Commissary and Inspector of Libraries of New Spain (Mexico), he again became Provincial of Oaxaca in 1662. He was interested in several ecclesiastical foundations and improvements, and highly respected at the time of his death. The two historical and geographical works through which he is best known are the "Palestra histórica, ó Historia de la Provincia de San Hipólito de Oaxaca, de la Orden de Predicadores" (Mexico, 1670), and the "Descripción geográfica de la América setentrional" etc. (Mexico, 1674). He published a number of sermons and also wrote "Itinerario de Oaxaca á Roma y de Roma á Oaxaca", which is still in manuscript.

PINELO, *Epítome de la biblioteca oriental y occidental* (Madrid, 1737); ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca hispana nova* (Madrid, 1733–38); EGUIARA, *Biblioteca mexicana* (Mexico, 1755); BÉRISTAIN, *Biblioteca hispano-americana etc.* (Amecameca, 1883); BRASSEUR DE BOURBOURG, *Bibl. mexico-guatémalienne* (Paris, 1871).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Burgos (BURGENSIS), ARCHDIOCESE OF.—Burgos (from *burgi, burgorum*, signifying a consolidation of districts or small villages) has been since the tenth century an episcopal see of Spain, to which in the eleventh century the ancient Sees of Oca and Valpuesta were transferred. In 1574 Gregory XIII raised it to metropolitan rank, at the request of Philip II. The archdiocese now (Concordat of 1851) comprises almost the entire province of Burgos. Its suffragans are: Calahorra (Logroño), El Burgo de Osma, Palencia, Santander, Leon, and Vitoria. Its area is approximately 8694 square miles, with a population of 340,000. The diocese is divided into 1220 parishes, which form forty-seven vicariates.

PHYSICAL FEATURES.—The northern and eastern portion of the diocese is mountainous, thickly wooded, and traversed by rivers, among which is the Ebro, which rises in the mountains and serves as the eastern boundary for Miranda. The Arlanza which crosses the diocese from east to west flows by Salas de los Infantes, near the famous monastery of Silos, and through the centre of the well-known town of Lerma. The mountainous region is unproductive of cereals, but fruits grow in abundance, and fine pasture-lands sustain great herds of cows and sheep, which furnish excellent meat and milk. Delicate cheeses which take their name from the city and are famous throughout Spain, are made in this section. Minerals are abundant, especially sulphate of soda, common salt, iron, and hard coal. The southern part of the diocese, especially the valley and plains, is fertile and produces abundantly vegetables, cereals, and quite a quantity of wine. The climate, cold but healthy, is

damp towards the north. Although this section has few industries, the transportation of its fruit and minerals is greatly facilitated by the numerous highways and by the railroad between Madrid and France which crosses the eastern side of the diocese from south to north. There are also some secondary railway lines for the operation of the mines.

Religious Edifices.—Burgos possesses more religious monuments than any other Spanish diocese, not even excepting Toledo—evidences of the piety of the counts and kings of Castile and Leon. In addition to the collegiate churches of Lerma, Villadiego, Plampiega, Palenzuela, Cobarrubias, and others, there are in Burgos alone many magnificent buildings. The cathedral, with its chapel of the Condestable, the monastery of Las Huelgas, and the Carthusian monastery of Miraflores, are museums of really permanent value.

The Cathedral.—As an architectural monument this structure displays the best features of the art of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. It was commenced by Bishop Mauritius in 1221, in



Façade, the Cathedral, Burgos

the reign of Ferdinand III and Beatrice of Swabia, and is Gothic in style. The principal façade, Santa María la Mayor, faces west, and on either side rise two towers about 262 feet in height, terminating in octagonal spires covered with open stonework traceries. The façade is composed of three stories, or sections. The first, or ground story has three ogival entrances with rectangular openings; the second has a gallery enclosed by a pinnacled balustrade and a rose window as delicately carved as a piece of lace, which admits some light into the church. In the uppermost story there are two double-arched windows of ogival style, with eight intercolumnar spaces, in each of which there is a statue on a pedestal. The whole is finished with a balustrade of letters carved in stone and forming the inscription: *Pulchra es et decora* (Thou art beautiful and graceful), in the centre of which is a statue of the Blessed Virgin. In the lateral sections (the towers) the windows are enclosed by stone balustrades, and the top is surmounted by balconies of stone surrounded by balustrades formed of Gothic letters in various inscriptions; needle-pointed pinnacles finish the four corners. The spires, as already said, are octagonal in shape; a gallery runs around the eight sides near the top, upon which rest the graceful points of the conical finial.

The north portal is known as the *portada de la Coronería.* In the lower portion of this are statues of the Twelve Apostles, the windows in the central section being of the primitive ogival style, and in the upper story there are three double-arched windows with statues joined to the shafts of the columns; two small spires, conical in shape like the main ones and decorated with balustrades, rise on either side of this façade. From the portal of the *Coronería* one can descend to that of the *Pellejería,* which faces east and is of the Renaissance style known as the Plateresque. It is divided into three sections, the two end ones being alike, with the centre different in style and dimensions. The former are composed of pilasters minutely carved, between which four statues are placed. The middle section, which serves for an entrance, has three alabaster pilasters, the intercolumnar spaces bearing panel-pictures representing the martyrdom of saints. The façade as a whole gives the impression of a gorgeous picture, and the ornate and fantastic devices sculptured all over its magnificent surface are simply innumerable.

The octagonal chapel of the Condestable, of florid Gothic and very pure in design, is the best of the many chapels of the cathedral. Its roof is finished with balustraded turrets, needle-pointed pinnacles, statues, and countless other sculptural devices. In the lower portion coats of arms, shields, and crouching lions have been worked into the ensemble. The exterior of the sacristy is decorated with carved traceries, figures of angels and armoured knights. The tabernacle is of extraordinary magnificence and is composed of two octagonal sections in Corinthian style.

Las Huelgas.—Next to the cathedral in magnificence is the famous Monasterio de las Huelgas on the outskirts of the city. It dates from the year 1180, and architecturally belongs to the transition period from Byzantine to Gothic, although in the course of time almost every style has been introduced into it. This convent has two remarkable cloisters, one a very fine example of the earlier period and of the use of semi-circular arches and delicate and varied columns; the other of the ogival style of the transition period. The interior of the church is in the style of the latter, enormous columns supporting its magnificent vault; the entrance is modern. This convent is celebrated for the extraordinary privileges granted to its abbess by kings and popes.

Miraflores.—The Carthusian monastery of Miraflores, celebrated for the strict observance of its rule, is situated about one mile from the city. A very beautiful and life-like statue of St. Bruno carved in wood is one of the treasures of the monastery; the stalls in the church also display exquisite workmanship. The mausoleum of King John II and of his wife Isabel, in this monastery, is constructed of the finest marble and so delicately carved that portions seem to be sculptured in wax rather than stone. Around the top are beautiful statues of angels in miniature, which might be the work of Phidias. The French soldiers in the War of Independence (1814) mutilated this beautiful work, cutting off some of the heads and carrying them away to France.

Celebrated Churches.—Burgos has other important churches. That of Santa Agueda, commonly called Santa Gadea, is chiefly celebrated for its antiquity and for the historic fact that it was in this church

that Alfonso VI, in the presence of the famous Cid Campeador (Rodrigo Díaz del Vivar), swore that he had taken no part in the death of his brother the king, Don Sancho, assassinated in the Cerco de Zamora. Without this oath he never would have been allowed to succeed to the royal crown of Castile. In this church also the Augustinian friar, St. Juan de Sahagún, was wont to preach, hear confessions, and give missions, after he had renounced the canonry and other ecclesiastical benefices which he held in that diocese. Among the other notable churches are: San Esteban, San Gil (Sancti Ægidii), San Pedro, San Cosme y San Damian, Santiago (Sancti Jacobi), San Lorenzo, and San Lesmes (Adelelmi). The Convento de la Merced, occupied by the Jesuits, and the Hospital del Rey are also worthy of mention. In the walls of the city are the famous gateway of Santa María, erected for the first entrance of the Emperor Charles V, and the arch of Fernán González. The diocese has two fine ecclesiastical seminaries. There are also many institutions for secular education. Schools are maintained in every diocese, the Instituto Provincial, and many colleges are conducted by private individuals, religious orders, and nuns both cloistered and uncloistered.

History of Burgos.—When the Romans took possession of what is now the province of Burgos it was inhabited by the Morgobos, Turmodigos, Berones, and perhaps also the Pelendones, the last inhabitants of the northern part of the Celtiberian province. The principal cities, according to Ptolemy, were: Brabum, Sisara, Deobrigula, Ambisna Segisamon, Verovesca (Briviesca), and others. In the time of the Romans it belonged to Hither Spain (Hispania Citerior) and afterwards to the Tarragonese province. The Arabs occupied all of Castile, though only for a brief period, and left no trace of their occupation. Alfonso (III) the Great reconquered it about the middle of the ninth century, and built many castles for the defence of the Christians, then extending their dominion and reconquering the lost territory. In this way the region came to be known as Castilla (Lat. *castella*), i. e. "land of castles". Don Diego, Count of Porcelos, was entrusted with the government of this territory, and commanded to promote the increase of the Christian population. With this end in view he gathered the inhabitants of the surrounding country into one village, which took the name of Burgos, or Burgi. The city thus bounded began to be called Caput Castellæ. The territory (*condado*), subject to the Kings of Leon, continued to be governed by counts and was gradually extended by victories over the Moors, until the time of Fernán González, the greatest of these rulers, when it became independent; it later on took the name of the Kingdom of Castile, being sometimes united with Navarre and sometimes with Leon. In the reign of St. Ferdinand III (c. 1200–52), Leon and Castile were definitely united, but they continued to be called respectively the Kingdom of Leon and the Kingdom of Castile until the nineteenth century. This district has been the scene of many and varied events: the wars with the Arabs, the struggles between Leon and Navarre, and between Castile and Aragon, the War of Independence against France, and the civil wars of the Spanish succession.

Councils.—Some important councils have been held in Burgos. A national council took place there in 1078, although opinions differ as to date (the "Boletín de la Academia de la Historia de Madrid", 1906, XLIX, 337, says 1080). This was presided over by the papal delegate, Cardinal Roberto and attended by Alfonso VI, and was convoked for the purpose of introducing into Spain the Roman Breviary and Missal instead of the Gothic, or Mozarabic, then in use. Another national council, presided over by Cardinal Boso (d. 1181), also papal delegate, settled questions of discipline and established diocesan rights and limits. The proceedings of this council remained unpublished until quite recently, when they were made known in the Boletín already mentioned (XLVIII, 395). In 1898 a provincial council was called by Archbishop (now Cardinal) Don Fr. Gregorio Aguirre, in which the obligations of the clergy and the faithful were most minutely set forth.

Saints of Burgos.—St. Julian, Bishop of Cuenca, called the Almoner, because of his great charity to the poor, was born in Burgos; also St. Amaro the Pilgrim, who has always had a special cult paid to him in Burgos, though not found in the Roman Martyrology. St. Iñigo (Enecus or Ignatius), abbot of Oña, while not born in Burgos, laboured there for many years; also St. Domingo de Silos, abbot and reformer of the famous convent of Silos, and St. Juan de Sahagún, a native of that town in the province of Leon. Among its saints may also be mentioned the martyrs of Cardeña, religious of the convent of the same name, who in the tenth century were put to death for the Faith by the Arab soldiers of the Emir of Cordova in one of their numerous invasions of Castile; and St. Casilda, daughter of one of the Moorish kings of Toledo. She was converted near Burgos whither she had gone with her father's consent to drink the water of some medicinal springs. She built a hermitage and died a saintly death.

Famous Bishops and Citizens.—In the long line of bishops and archbishops the following deserve special mention: Pablo de Santa María (1396–1456), a converted rabbi, preceptor and counsellor of John II; his son and successor (1435–56) Alfonso (de Cartagena), one of the most learned members of the Council of Basle and to whom is owing the erection of the Chapel del Condestable by Juan de Colonia, a German architect who accompanied him to Spain; Cardinal Iñigo López de Mendoza y Zuniga, brother of the Count of Peñaranda, Duke of Miranda, who in 1535 convoked a synod; the Cardinal Archbishop de Pacheco, in whose time Burgos was raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see; and Archbishop Don Fr. Gregorio Aguirre, also administrator of the See of Calahorra.

Among the famous laymen, the name of Rodrigo Díaz del Vivar (d. 1099), the Cid Campeador, naturally stands pre-eminent. He was the hero of his time, and the man most feared by the Mohammedans, whom he defeated in innumerable encounters. He is buried in Burgos, in the monastery of San Pedro de Cárdena. Don Ramón Bonifaz was according to some authorities a native of Burgos, but in any event he lived there. St. Ferdinand entrusted to him the task of forming the Spanish squadron with which he established and maintained communication with the troops who were besieging Seville, and prevented the Moors from communicating with the city. One of his fleets destroyed the bridge by which the Moors had access to the outside world and received provisions; this brought about the surrender (1248) of the city of Seville to the Christians, led by St. Ferdinand himself.

Burgos has produced many men of letters. The bibliography, published (1889) by Don Manuel Martínez Añibarro under the title "Diccionario Biográfico y Bibliográfico de Burgos", forms a small folio volume of 570 pages. Among the most distinguished writers are Archbishop Pablo de Santa María who wrote "Scrutinium Scripturarum" (Mantua, 1474) against the Jews; the aforesaid Don Alonso de Cartagena, his son, author of various works; the learned Augustinian friar Enrique Flórez, author of the famous works, "La España Sagrada" (1743–75, 29 vols., continued by others to 1886, 51 vols.), "Memorias de las Reynas" (1762), "Medallas Antiguas" (1757–73), and many others. His statue was erected in his native town of Villadiego by popular subscription.

Among the several newspapers published at Burgos

"El Castellano" and "El Boletín Eclesiástico" are under the direction of the archbishop.

FLÓREZ, *La España Sagrada* (1743–1886); GIL DÁVILA, *Teatro de las Iglesias de España;* VENERO, *Historia de la Ciudad de Burgos;* CANTÓN, *Memorias para la Historia de Burgos;* CUADRADO, *Descripciones de España;* SALVA, *Burgos á Vuela Pluma;* STREET, *Gothic Architecture in Spain.*

TIRSO LÓPEZ.

Burgundy (Lat. *Burgundia*, Ger. *Burgund*, Fr. *Bourgogne*), in medieval times respectively a kingdom and a duchy, later a province of France (to 1789), and now represented mostly by the departments of Ain, Saône-et-Loire, Côte-d'Or, and Yonne. It has nearly 2,000,000 inhabitants, and is famous for its diversified scenery, its rich wines, its rivers and canals, varied industries, mineral wealth, and many prosperous cities. In the fifth century a Germanic tribe, the Burgundi or Burgundiones, conquered from the Romans the fertile basins of the Rhone, the Saône, and the Loire, but were unable to maintain their sovereignty (Lyons, Geneva, Vienne) which in the next century they lost (534) to the Frankish successors of Clovis [Binding, "Das burgundisch-romanische Königreich von 443–532", Leipzig, 1868; Drapeyron, "Du rôle de la Bourgogne sous les Mérovingiens" in "Mém. lus à la Sorbonne", 1866, 29–42; B. Hauréau, "L'Eglise et l'Etat sous les premiers rois de Bourgogne" in "Mém. de l'Acad. des inscriptions et belles-lettres", Paris, 1867, XXVI (1), 137–172]. In the latter quarter of the ninth century this territory again acquired independence, first as the short-lived Kingdom of Arles, and then as the dual Kingdom of North and South (or Lesser) Burgundy, the latter including Provence or the lands between Lyons and the sea, while the former took in, roughly speaking, the territory north of Lyons, now divided between France and Switzerland. These kingdoms, known as Transjurane and Cisjurane Burgundy, were reunited (935) under Rudolf II. The independence of this "middle kingdom", the medieval counterpart of modern Switzerland, was short-lived, for in 1038 Emperor Conrad II obtained the crown of Burgundy for his son (later Emperor) Henry III. For two centuries German influence was uppermost in the counsels of the Burgundian rulers, but little by little the growing prestige and power of neighbouring France asserted themselves, beginning with the annexation of Lyons by Philip the Fair in 1310 and ending with that of Savoy and Nice in 1860. During this time, in language, laws, and institutions Burgundy became regularly more closely assimilated to France, and finally an integrant part of that nation when, on the death of Charles the Bold (1477), Louis XI incorporated with France the Duchy of Burgundy and extinguished thereby, in favour of the royal prerogative, one of the most important fiefs of the French Crown (G. Hüffer, "Das Verhältniss des Königreichs Burgund zu Kaiser und Reich, besonders unter Friedrich I", Paderborn, 1874; Reese, "Die staatsrechtliche Stellung der Bischöfe Burgunds und Italiens unter Kaiser Friedrich I", Göttingen, 1885; cf. André Du Chesne, "Hist. des rois, ducs, et comtes de Bourgogne et d'Arles", Paris, 1619; de Camps, "De la souveraineté de la couronne de France sur les royaumes de Bourgogne Transjurane et d'Arles", in "Mercure de France", April, 1723; von Bertouch, "Burgund als Scheidewand zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich, eine historisch-politische Frage", Wiesbaden, 1885).

The medieval political vicissitudes of the Kingdom of Burgundy are accurately outlined in E. Freeman, "Historical Geography of Europe" (ed. Bury, London, 1903), *passim*. The following passage from that work (pp. 258–259) exhibits in a brief but philosophic way the political vicissitudes and rôle of medieval Burgundy:—

"The Burgundian Kingdom, which was united with those of Germany and Italy after the death of its last separate king, Rudolf the Third [1032], has had a fate unlike that of any other part of Europe. Its memory, as a separate state, has gradually died out. The greater part of its territory has been swallowed up, bit by bit, by a neighbouring power, and the small part which has escaped that fate has long lost all trace of its original name or its original political relations. By a long series of annexations, spreading over more than five hundred years, the greater part of the kingdom has gradually been incorporated with France. Of what remains, a small corner forms part of the modern Kingdom of Italy, while the rest still keeps its independence in the form of the commonwealths which make up the western cantons of Switzerland. These cantons, in fact, are the truest modern representatives of the Burgundian Kingdom. And it is on the confederation of which they form a part, interposed as it is between France, Italy, the new German Empire, and the modern Austrian Monarchy, as a central state with a guaranteed neutrality, that some trace of the old function of Burgundy, as the middle kingdom, is thrown. This function it shares with the Lotharingian lands at the other end of the empire, which now form part of the equally neutral Kingdom of Belgium, lands which, oddly enough, themselves became Burgundian in another sense." The present article deals chiefly with Northern Burgundy since the middle of the fourteenth century, and may serve as an introduction to the articles on BELGIUM and the NETHERLANDS.

STATES OF THE HOUSE OF BURGUNDY.—The formation of the Burgundian State from which sprang the two Kingdoms of Belgium and the Netherlands, is an historical phenomenon of intense interest. The Duchy of Burgundy was one of the fiefs of the French Crown. Made vacant in 1361 by the death of Philippe de Rouvre, the last of the older line of dukes, it was presented by John II, King of France, to his son Philip the Bold who, at the age of fourteen, had fought so valiantly at his father's side in the battle of Poitiers. In 1369, as the result of the negotiations of his brother, King Charles V, Philip married Marguerite de Male, widow of his predecessor and sole heir to the countship of Flanders, thereby acquiring that magnificent domain including the cities of Antwerp and Mechlin and the countships of Nevers and Rethel, not to mention the countships of Artois and Burgundy to be inherited from his wife's grandmother. He thus became the most powerful feudatary of the Kingdom of France. To be sure he had to conquer Flanders by dint of arms, as the people of Ghent, who had rebelled against the late count, Louis de Male, had no intention of submitting to his heir. But Philip had the armies of his nephew, King Charles VI, march against them and they lost the battle of Roosebeke (1382); then, after continuing the struggle for two years longer, they were finally obliged to submit in 1385. The Peace of Tournai put Philip in possession of his countship, yet he was not satisfied and, through adroit negotiations, he succeeded in securing foothold for his family in most of the other Netherland territories. By the marriage of his daughter Margaret with Count William of Hainault, proprietor of the countships of Hainault, Holland, and Zealand, Philip provided for the annexation of these three domains. Moreover, he obtained for his wife, Margaret, the inheritance of her widowed and childless aunt, Jane, Duchess of Brabant and Limburg, and gave it to Anthony, his youngest son, whilst the eldest, John the Fearless, was made heir to his other states (1404). But John the Fearless did nothing great for the Netherlands, being better known for his ardent participation in the troubles that disturbed the Kingdom of France during the reign of the deranged King Charles VI. After assassinating Louis of Orléans, the king's brother, John

himself perished at the Bridge of Montereau during his famous interview with the Dauphin, being dispatched by the latter's followers (1414). The first two Dukes of Burgundy who reigned in the Netherlands were pre-eminently French princes and bent upon preserving and augmenting the prestige they enjoyed in France as princes of the blood royal. On the other hand, their two successors were essentially Belgian princes whose chief aim was the extension of their domains and whose policy was distinctly anti-French. Of course the assassination at Montereau, by setting them at variance with the French Crown, had helped to bring this change about, but it would have taken place in any event. To avenge his father, Philip the Good allied himself with the English to whom he rendered valuable services, especially by delivering to them Joan of Arc, made prisoner by his troops at Compiègne. When, in 1435, he at length became reconciled to the king by the treaty of Arras, it was on condition of being dispensed from all vassalage and of receiving the cities along the River Somme. At this price he agreed to help the king against his own former allies and participated in the unsuccessful siege of Calais (1436).

Effect of Philip's Rule.—The chief work of Philip the Good was to reunite under his authority most of the Netherland provinces. In 1421 he purchased the countship of Namur from John III, its last incumbent. In 1430 he became Duke of Brabant and Limburg as heir of his first cousin, Philip of Saint-Pol, son of Duke Anthony; in 1428 he constrained his cousin Jacqueline of Bavaria, Countess of Hainault, Holland, and Zealand, and Lady of Friesland, to recognize him as her heir, and even during her lifetime, in 1433, he obliged her to relinquish this inheritance. Finally, in 1444, he purchased the claims of Elizabeth of Gorlitz to the Duchy of Luxemburg, thus owning all of modern Belgium except the principality of Liège, all the western provinces of the present Kingdom of the Netherlands, and several French provinces. However, this did not suffice and he managed to place his bastards in the episcopal Sees of Cambrai and Utrecht and his nephew in that of Liège. Victorious over all his enemies, among whom was the King of France, in 1437 he held out against the Emperor Sigismund who tried in vain to re-establish the dependency of the Netherlands upon the empire. On two different occasions in 1447 and 1463, he importuned the Emperor Frederick III to give him the title of king, but the attempts failed. Nevertheless, under the title of "Grand Duke of the West" he won the admiration of his contemporaries and was the richest and most powerful sovereign in Europe. It was he whom Pope Nicholas V wished to place at the head of the new crusade he was planning, and during a sumptuous feast at which he made the celebrated *vœu du faisan*, Philip promised to take the cross. But the crusade did not take place. Being master of so many provinces, Philip wished to unite them under a central government, but this was not easy of accomplishment. Each of them considered itself a self-governing State, independent of all the others and living its own life; moreover, the large cities of Flanders also claimed to be separate commonwealths and tried to escape centralization. Despite his entreaties, Ghent forsook the duke at the siege of Calais in 1436; in 1438 Bruges was the scene of a revolt where he was nearly made prisoner; and in 1451 Ghent revolted. But the duke overcame all these obstacles to his ambition and, through his victory of Gavre in 1453, obtained possession of the commune of Ghent, the most intractable of all. The people of Liège were now the only ones who resisted him, but in 1465 he conquered them at Montenaeken and imposed upon them very severe conditions. A twelvemonth later he destroyed the city of Dinant. During his last years Philip's faculties became impaired and Louis XI of France not only made trouble between him and his son but even influenced the duke into giving up the cities of the Somme. However, in 1465 Philip became reconciled to his son, Charles, and confided to him the administration of affairs, dying 15 June, 1467. A shrewd man and cunning politician, Philip was likewise ostentatious, irascible, and licentious. The splendour of his court was unequalled, and the founding of the Order of the Golden Fleece at Bruges in 1430, on the occasion of his third marriage, this time with Isabella of Portugal, marks, to some extent, the culmination of the luxury of the time.

Charles the Bold.—Inheriting neither the astuteness nor the vices of his father, Charles the Bold was industrious, eager for justice, and irreproachable in his private life; but his boldness amounted to rashness and his ability was not at all commensurate with his unbounded ambition. In his earlier years all was well. During his father's lifetime he placed himself at the head of the "League of the Public Weal" which gathered about him the French lords who were unfavourably disposed toward Louis XI. Charles was victorious over Louis at Montlhéry, after which triumph the Peace of Conflans (1465) gave him the cities of the Somme. He humbled the cities of Ghent and Mechlin for having dared to oppose him, fought the people of Liège at Brusthem, and deprived them of their freedom. King Louis XI, who strove to combat the duke by dint of intrigue, was destined to become the victim of his own trickery. While he was visiting Charles in Péronne, the latter sovereign learned that the people of Liège were again in revolt, having been excited thereto by the king's agents. Furious at this intelligence, he kept Louis prisoner and forced him to accompany him to Liège where the wretched monarch witnessed the total destruction of the unfortunate city to which he had promised assistance (1468). Although the conqueror of all his enemies Charles still entertained mighty projects, and in 1469 he obtained possession of the landgraviate of Alsace and the county of Ferrette (Pfirt) as security for a loan made to Sigismund. He prevailed upon Duke Arnoul to sell him the Duchy of Guelderland, the duke being at war with his son Adolphus (1472). He then marched against the King of France, but was stopped before the walls of Beauvais by the heroic resistance of its citizens (1472) and made to sign the truce of Senlis. Nor was he any more successful in his attempt to obtain a king's crown from the Emperor Frederick III, to whose son, Maximilian, he had promised the hand of his own daughter, Mary. Later, however, the emperor and the duke met at Trier for the approaching coronation, when the emperor, whom the agents of Louis XI had succeeded in alarming, hastily disappeared. At the same time Louis stirred up further hostilities against Charles on the Upper Rhine where a confederacy, including the Alsatian villages and Swiss cantons, was already plotting against him. Meanwhile Charles had been wasting his troops on the tedious, fruitless siege of the little city of Neuss on the Rhine, and was therefore in no condition to rejoin his ally, Edward IV of England, who had just landed in France. In order to have full sway along the Rhine he signed the truce of Soluvre (1475) with Louis XI and profited by it to take possession of Lorraine, which till then had separated his Burgundian domains from those of the Netherlands (*provinces de par deça*). He then advanced upon the Swiss who defeated him most mercilessly at Granson and Morat and fairly annihilated his army. René, the young Duke of Lorraine, recovered his country and when Charles afterwards laid siege to Nancy, its capital city, he lost courage, and betrayed by one of his own hirelings, was defeated and killed in a sortie. The next day his frozen corpse was found in a pond,

having been half devoured by wolves (5 January, 1477).

Mary and the "Great Privilege".—This catastrophe left the Burgundian estates in a most critical condition. The sole heir to all these provinces, Mary of Burgundy, who was then barely twenty years old, beheld storms gathering both within and without. The King of France seized the Duchy of Burgundy as a male fief of the Crown and also the cities of the Somme and held up the other provinces to tempt the cupidity of neighbouring princes. The large cities of Flanders roused by Louis' confederates, grew restless and the States-General, convened in February, 1477, obliged the young duchess to grant the "Great Privilege". This famous act was a violent reaction not only against the despotic tendencies of preceding governments, but also against all their work of unification; it destroyed central institutions and reduced the Burgundian States to nothing but a sort of a federation of provinces combined under the regime of personal union. Not content with this, the people of Ghent brought to the scaffold Hugonet and d'Humbercourt, Mary's two faithful counsellors, whom they looked upon as representatives of the deceased duke's absolutist regime. Satisfied that the country was sufficiently weakened and disorganized, Louis XI threw off the mask and ordered his army into Artois and Hainault. The imminence of danger seemed to revive a spirit of loyalty in the Burgundian provinces and the marriage of Mary and Maximilian of Hapsburg, son of Frederick III, was hastened. This marriage saved the inheritance of the young princess but, as we shall see, it resulted in thereafter making the Netherlands dependent upon foreign dynasties. Meanwhile Maximilian vigorously repulsed the French in the battle of Guinegate (1479). Unfortunately Mary of Burgundy died in 1482 from injuries sustained in a fall from her horse, and Maximilian's claim to the right of governing the provinces in the capacity of regent during the minority of his son Philip, roused the indignation of the States-General, which were led by the three large Flemish cities of Ghent, Bruges, and Ypres. Duped by Louis XI they concluded with him the second Peace of Arras (1482) which gave the hand of their Princess Margaret to the Dauphin, with Artois and Burgundy for her dower, and Maximilian was deprived of his children who were provided with a regency council. This was the origin of a desperate struggle between himself and the States-General during which he was made prisoner by the people of Bruges, and it was with the greatest difficulty that he obtained his freedom. Immediately upon his release he began again to contend with the States, which eventually were obliged to submit to his power (1492), and the treaty of Senlis with France restored Artois to Maximilian with his daughter Margaret (1493). In this same year Maximilian became emperor and liberated his son Philip who assumed the government of the Netherlands.

Philip the Handsome.—The reign of Philip the Handsome, which lasted thirteen years, promised Belgium an era of self-government and independence, but his marriage with Joanna of Castile only paved the way for its dependence on a foreign sovereign as, on the death of the son of Ferdinand the Catholic and Isabella, it was Philip who, in the name of his wife, became King of Castile. However, he died in 1506 and as his father-in-law, Ferdinand, soon followed him to the tomb, it was Charles, son of Philip the Handsome, who inherited all the great Spanish monarchy "on which the sun never set", the Netherlands being thenceforth only a dependency of his chief kingdom. But at first this was not noticeable. Charles, who was also an emperor (with the title of Charles V), travelled much and paid frequent visits to the Netherlands, showing a special predilection for his Flemish fellow-countrymen and knowing how to make himself popular among them. He confided their country to the care of his aunt, Margaret of Austria, and later to that of his sister, Mary of Hungary (1531–55), both talented women and of great service to him. Charles' reign represents the maximum of political and commercial prosperity in the Netherlands to which he annexed the city of Tournai (1521), the provinces of Friesland (1523), Utrecht and Overyssel (1528), Groningen and Drenthe (1536), and the Duchy of Guelderland (1543). Thus the patrimony was definitively settled and known thereafter as the Seventeen Provinces. By his Pragmatic Sanction of 1549 Charles V declared this domain an indivisible whole and nothing contributed more to the formation of national unity. He sundered the ties of vassalage that bound Flanders to the Kingdom of France, and although emperor, permitted the authority of the empire to come to naught in the provinces west of the Scheldt. Beginning with 1548 they in truth formed the "Circle of Burgundy", a title which implied little or no duty toward the empire. In the interior Charles V organized a central government by creating three councils, called collateral, and established with a view to simplifying matters for the female ruler; they were the council of state for general affairs, the privy council for administrative purposes, and the council of finance. He introduced the Inquisition, issued extremely severe "placards" prohibiting heresy, and harshly suppressed Ghent, his native city, which had refused to vote certain subsidies and had given itself up to acts of violence (1540). It was deprived of all its freedom and at this time communal government may be said to have received its death-blow in the Netherlands.

Philip II.—However, Charles V was sincerely regretted when, during a solemn session held at Brussels before representatives of the States, 25 October, 1555, he renounced the government of the Netherlands in favour of his son, Philip II. Strictly speaking, with Charles V ended the Burgundian era in this country which was subsequently known as the Spanish Netherlands. But as yet these states had no national name, the dukes generally alluding to them as their *provinces de par deça* in contradistinction to the Duchy and Countship of Burgundy which were territorially separated from them. Nevertheless, although this duchy and countship had been conquered by France, from the fifteenth century it had been customary to call them Burgundy and their inhabitants Burgundians. Even the French spoken at the ducal court was called Burgundian. In spite of the efforts made at bringing about unification, the spirit of particularism prevailed in the various provinces in matters of legislation, each according political rights to its own inhabitants exclusively and opposing central institutions as much as possible. From the time of Philip the Good the Netherlands had been the centre of a luxurious and brilliant civilization, and Antwerp, which had replaced Bruges, whose harbour had become sand-filled, was recognized as the chief commercial city of Europe. Nothing could equal the sumptuousness of the court which was the rendezvous of many literary men and artists, and it was during the reign of Philip the Good that the Bruges school of painting sprang up and prospered, boasting of such famous members as the brothers John and Hubert Van Eyck, Hans Memling, and Gerard David, whilst Brussels, Ghent, Louvain, and Antwerp gloried in artists like Roger Van den Weyden, Hugo Van der Goes, Thierry Bouts, Quentin Metsys, and in the great sculptor Claus Sluter. Although literature did not flourish to the same extent as the arts, the historians Philippe de Comines, Molinet, Chastelain, and Olivier de la Marche are certainly deserving of mention and were far superior to the French historians of the same epoch.

For the public ecclesiastical history of Burgundy see articles BESANÇON, DIJON, LYONS, MÂCON. Also Antoine Mille, "Abrégé chronologique de l'histoire ecclésiastique civile et littéraire de Bourgogne, depuis l'établissement des Bourguignons dans les Gaules jusqu'à l'année 1772" (Dijon, 1771–73); and the histories of various religious orders established in Burgundy, e. g. J. Foderé, "Narration historique et topographique des couvents de l'ordre de St-François et de Ste-Claire érigés en la province anciennement appelée de Bourgogne", etc. (Lyons, 1619); Lavirotte, "Mémoire statistique sur les établissements des Templiers et des Hospitaliers de St-Jean de Jérusalem en Bourgogne" (Paris, 1853); "Pèlerinages en Bourgogne" in "Congrès scient. France" (Autun, 1876–78), II, 90; Quantin, "Mémoire sur l'influence des monastères des ordres de St-Benoît et de Cîteaux en Bourgogne", in same collection (Auxerre, 1858–59), II, 390; J. Simonnet, "Le clergé en Bourgogne" (XIV, XV siècles) in "Mém. de l'Acad. de Dijon" (1866), XIII, 21–143; C. Seignobos, "Le régime féodal en Bourgogne jusqu'en 1360, étude sur la société et les institutions d'une province française au moyen-âge", etc. (Paris, 1881).

KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE, *Chroniques relatives à l'histoire de Belgique sous la domination des ducs de Bourgogne* (Brussels, 1870–76); CHASTELAIN, *Chronique*, ed. KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE (Brussels, 1863–66); DE LA MARCHE, *Mémoires*, ed. BEAUNE AND D'ARBAUMONT (Paris, 1883–88); MOLINET, *Chronique*, ed. BUCHON (Paris, 1827–28); PHILIPPE DE COMINES *Mémoires*, ed. DE MANDROT (Paris, 1901–03); DE BARANTE, *Hist. des ducs de Bourgogne de la maison de Valois* (Paris, 1824–26), republished several times in Belgium; FRÉDÉRICQ, *Essai sur le rôle politique et social des ducs de Bourgogne dans les Pays-Bas* (Ghent, 1875); PIRIENNE, *Hist. de Belgique* (1907), III; VON LÖHER, *Jakobäa von Bayern und ihre Zeit* (1869); KIRK, *History of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy* (1863–68); TOUTEY, *Charles le Téméraire et la ligue de Constance* (1902).

GODEFROID KURTH.

Burial, CHRISTIAN, the interment of a deceased person with ecclesiastical rites in consecrated ground. The Jews and most of the nations of antiquity buried their dead. Amongst the Greeks and Romans both cremation and interment were practised indifferently. That the early Christians from the beginning used only burial seems certain. This conclusion may be inferred not only from negative arguments but from the direct testimony of Tertullian, "De Coronâ" (P. L., II, 92, 795; cf. Minucius Felix, "Octavius", xi in P. L., III, 266), and from the stress laid upon the analogy between the resurrection of the body and the Resurrection of Christ (I Cor., xv, 42; cf. Tertullian, "De Animâ", lv; Augustine, "De civitate Dei", I, xiii). In the light of this same dogma of the resurrection of the body as well as of Jewish tradition (cf. Tob., i, 21; xii, 12; Ecclus., xxxviii, 16; II Mach., xii, 39), it is easy to understand how the interment of the mortal remains of the Christian dead has always been regarded as an act of religious import and has been surrounded at all times with some measure of religious ceremonial. The motives of Christian burial will be more fully treated in the article CREMATION. As to the latter practice, it will be sufficient to say here that, while involving no necessary contradiction of any article of faith, it is opposed alike to the law of the Church and to the usages of antiquity. In defense of the Church's recent prohibitions, it may be urged that the revival of cremation in modern times has in practice been prompted less by considerations of improved hygiene or psychological sentiment than by avowed materialism and opposition to Catholic teaching.

THE LAW OF THE CHURCH REGARDING BURIAL.—According to the canon law every man is free to choose for himself the burial ground in which he wishes to be interred. It is not necessary that this choice should be formally registered in his will. Any reasonable legal proof is sufficient as evidence of his wishes in the matter, and it has been decided that the testimony of one witness, for example his confessor, may be accepted, if there be no suspicion of interested motives. (S. C. Concilii, 24 March, 1871, Lex, 189.) Where no wish has been expressed it will be assumed that the interment is to take place in any vault or burial place which may have belonged to the deceased or his family, and failing this the remains should be buried in the cemetery of the parish in which the deceased had his domicile or quasi-domicile. Certain exceptions, however, are recognized in the case of cardinals, bishops, canons, etc. Formerly monastic and other churches claimed and enjoyed under certain conditions the privilege of interring notable benefactors within their precincts. It may be said that no such privilege is now recognized as a matter of right to the detriment of the claim of the parish. If a man die in a parish which is not his own, the canon law prescribes that the body should be conveyed to his own parish for interment if this is reasonably possible, but the parish priest of the place where he died may claim the right of attending the corpse to the place of burial. In fine, the principle is recognized that it belongs to the parish priest to bury his own parishioners. The canon law recognizes for regular orders the right to be buried in the cemetery of their own monastery (Sägmüller, 453; L. Wagner in "Archiv f. kath. Kirchenrecht", 1873, XXXIX, 385; Kohn, ibid., XL, 329).

Originally, as burial was a spiritual function, it was laid down that no fee could be exacted for this without simony (Decretum Gratiani, xiii, q. ii; c. viii, ix; Extrav. de sim., V, 3). But the custom of making gifts to the Church, partly as an acknowledgment of the trouble taken by the clergy, partly for the benefit of the soul of the departed, gradually became general, and such offerings were recognized in time as *jura stolæ* which went to the personal support of the parish priest or his curates. It was, however, distinctly insisted upon that the carrying out of the rites of the Church should not be made conditional upon the payment of the fee being made beforehand, though the parish priest could recover such fee afterwards by process of law in case it were withheld. Moreover in the case of the very poor he is bound to bury them gratuitously. If a parishioner elected to be buried outside his own parish, a certain proportion, generally a fourth part, of the fee paid or the gifts that might be made in behalf of the deceased on occasion of the burial was to go to the priest of his own parish. Where an old custom existed, the continuance of the payment of this fourth part under certain conditions was recognized by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, De ref., c. xiii). Nowadays the principle is still maintained, but generally the payment to the *proprius parochus* takes the form of the fourth part of a definite burial-fee which is determined according to some fixed tariff (S. C. Ep. et Reg., 19 January, 1866; S. C. Conc., 16 February, 1889), and which may be exacted by the parish priest for every burial which takes place in his district. He has, however, no right to any compensation if a non-parishioner dies and is taken back to his own parish for burial, nor again when one of his own parishioners dies away from home and has to be buried in the place of his demise.

Only baptized persons have a claim to Christian burial and the rites of the Church cannot lawfully be performed over those who are not baptized. Moreover no strict claim can be allowed in the case of those persons who have not lived in communion with the Church, according to the maxim which comes down from the time of Pope Leo the Great (448) "quibus viventibus non communicavimus mortuis communicare non possumus" (i. e. we cannot hold communion in death with those who in life were not in communion with us). It has further been recognized as a principle that the last rites of the Church constitute a mark of respect which is not to be shown to those who in their lives have proved themselves unworthy of it. In this

way various classes of persons are excluded from Christian burial—pagans, Jews, infidels, heretics, and their adherents (Rit. Rom., VI, c. ii) schismatics, apostates, and persons who have been excommunicated by name or placed under an interdict. If an excommunicated person be buried in a church or in a consecrated cemetery the place is thereby desecrated, and, wherever possible, the remains must be exhumed and buried elsewhere. Further, Christian burial is to be refused to suicides (this prohibition is as old as the fourth century; cf. Cassian in P. L., XL, 573) except in case that the act was committed when they were of unsound mind or unless they showed signs of repentance before death occurred. It is also withheld from those who have been killed in a duel, even though they should give signs of repentance before death. Other persons similarly debarred are notorious sinners who die without repentance, those who have openly held the sacraments in contempt (for example by staying away from Communion at Easter time to the public scandal) and who showed no signs of sorrow, monks and nuns who are found to have died in the possession of money or valuables which they had kept for their own, and finally those who have directed that their bodies should be cremated after death. In all such cases, however, the general practice of the Church at the present day has been to interpret these prohibitions as mildly as possible. Ordinarily the parish priest is directed to refer doubtful cases to the bishop, and the bishop, if any favourable construction can be found, allows the burial to proceed.

Many complications are caused in the administration of the canon law by the political conditions under which the Church exists in modern times in most countries of the world. For instance, the question may often arise whether a non-Catholic can be buried in a consecrated cemetery belonging, not to the civil administration, but to the Church, and perhaps adjoining the sacred building itself; or again in such a case whether non-Catholic worshippers can perform their own rites at the interment. As it often happened that a Catholic graveyard was the only available place of burial in a large district, it has been decided as a matter of necessity that in such cases it was possible to allow Protestants to be buried in a consecrated graveyard (S. C. Inquis., 23 July, 1609). In some instances a special portion of ground has been set aside for the purpose and non-Catholic ritual is permitted to be used there. In cases of necessity the Catholic parish priest may preside at such an interment, but he must not use any ritual or prayers that would be recognized as distinctively Catholic. It hardly needs saying that at the present day in almost every part of the world the prescriptions of the canon law regarding burial are in conflict with secular legislation in more than one particular. In such cases the Church is often compelled to waive her right, in order to prevent greater evils. On the other hand, we may notice that the Church's claim to exercise control over the burial of her members dates back to an age anterior even to the freedom given to Christianity under Constantine. From the beginning the principle seems to have been insisted upon that the faithful should be buried apart from the pagans. Thus St. Cyprian of Carthage makes it a matter of reproach against a Spanish bishop Martial that he had not sufficiently attended to this, and that he had tolerated "filios exterarum gentium more apud profana sepulchra depositos et alienigenis consepultos" (Cyprian, Ep. lxvii, 6). In the same way St. Hilary, a century later, considers that Our Saviour warned His disciples against a similar profanation "Admonuit non admisceri memoriis sanctorum mortuos infideles" (Hilary, in S. Matt., vii). So also the Donatists when they gained the upper hand were so deeply imbued with this principle of exclusive sepulture that they would not allow the Catholics to be buried in the cemeteries they had seized upon. "Ad hoc basilicas invadere voluistis ut vobis solis cœmeteria vindicetis, non permittentes sepeliri corpora Catholica" (Optatus, VI, vii). With regard to the exclusion of suicides from the consecrated burial grounds it would appear that some similar practice was familiar to the pagans even before Christianity had spread throughout the empire. Thus there is a well-known pagan inscription of Lanuvium of the year 133: "Quisquis ex quâcunque causâ mortem sibi asciverit eius ratio funeris non habebitur." Probably this was not so much a protest of outraged morality as a warning that in the matter of burial no man had a right to make himself prematurely a charge upon the community. The time of burial is, generally speaking, between sunrise and sunset; any other hour requires the permission of the bishop (Ferraris, s. v., 216, 274, 279). For the rest the diocesan statutes, regulations of the local ecclesiastical authority, and custom are to be considered, also the civil law and the public sanitary regulations.

THE RITUAL OF BURIAL.—Speaking first of the usages of the Catholic Church at the present day it will probably be convenient to divide the various religious observances with which the Church surrounds the mortal remains of her faithful children after death into three different stages. The prayers and blessings which are provided by the "Rituale" for use before death will best be considered under the heading DEATH, PREPARATION FOR, but in the rites observed after death we may distinguish first what takes place in the house of the deceased and in bringing the body to the church, secondly the function in the church and thirdly the ceremony by the grave side. In practice it is the exception for the whole of the Church's ritual to be performed, especially in the case of the burial of the laity in a large parish; but in religious houses and where the facilities are at hand the service is generally carried out completely.

With regard to the observances prescribed before the body is conveyed to the church it may be noted that according to the rubrics prefixed to the title "De exsequiis" in the "Rituale Romanum" a proper interval (*debitum temporis intervallum*) ought to elapse between the moment of death and the burial, especially where death has occurred unexpectedly, in order that no doubt may remain that life is really extinct. In southern climates it is not unusual to celebrate the funeral the day after the decease or even upon the day itself, but the practice both in pagan and Christian times has varied greatly. Among the ancient Romans it would seem that the bodies of persons of distinction were commonly kept for seven days, while the poor were interred the day after death. In these matters the Church has generally been content to adopt the usages which were already in possession. The washing of the corpse is so frequently spoken of both in secular and monastic rituals as to wear almost the aspect of a religious ceremony, but no special prayers are assigned to it. Minute directions are given as to the clothing of the dead in the case of all clergy. They are to be attired in ordinary ecclesiastical costume and over this they are to wear the vestments distinctive of their order. Thus the priest or bishop must be clad in amice, alb, girdle, maniple, stole and chasuble. His biretta should be placed upon his head and the tonsure should be renewed. The deacon similarly wears his dalmatic and stole, the subdeacon his tunicle, and the cleric his surplice. In practice it is usual in the case of a priest to place upon the coffin lid a chalice and paten at one end with the biretta at the other; but this is not ordered in the rubrics of the "Rituale". For the laity it is directed that the body should be decently laid out, that a light should be kept burning, that a small cross should, if possible, be placed in the

hands, failing which the hands are to be arranged in the form of a cross, and that the body should occasionally be sprinkled with holy water. The burning of more than one candle beside the body is not directly enjoined for all, but it is mentioned in the "Cæremoniale" in the case of a bishop and is of general observance. On the other hand, it is mentioned that the *debita lumina*, the candles which according to ancient custom are carried in the procession, ought to be provided by the parish gratuitously in the case of the very poor, and it is very distinctly enjoined that in exacting such fees as custom prescribes on these occasions the clergy ought sedulously to avoid all appearance of avarice. It is also laid down that the laity, even in the case of crowned heads, are never to be carried to the grave by the hands of the clergy—a prescription which can be traced back to a synod of Seville in 1512 and is probably much older. But in the Early Church this does not seem to have been observed, for we have several recorded instances in which ladies who died in repute of sanctity, as for example St. Paula or St. Macrina, were carried to the grave by bishops.

The first stage in the obsequies of a deceased person according to the rite now in use is the conveyance of the body to the church. At an appointed hour the clergy are directed to assemble in the church, a signal being given by the tolling of a bell. The parish priest in surplice and black stole, or if he prefer it wearing a black cope as well, goes to the house of the deceased with the rest of the company, one cleric carrying the cross and another a stoup of holy water. Before the coffin is removed from the house it is sprinkled with holy water, the priest with his assistants saying beside it the psalm De Profundis with the antiphon Si iniquitates. Then the procession sets out for the church. The cross-bearer goes first, religious confraternities, if such there be, and members of the clergy follow, carrying lighted candles, the priest walks immediately before the coffin and the friends of the deceased and others walk behind. As they leave the house the priest intones the antiphon Exsultabunt Domino, and then the psalm Miserere is recited or chanted in alternate verses by the cantors and clergy. On reaching the church the antiphon Exsultabunt is repeated, and as the body is borne to its place "in the middle of the church" the responsory Subvenite (Come to his assistance ye Saints of God, come to meet him ye Angels of the Lord, etc.) is recited. The present rubric directs that if the corpse be that of a layman the feet are to be turned towards the altar; if on the other hand the corpse be that of a priest, then the position is reversed, the head being towards the altar. Whether this exceptional treatment of priests as regards position is of early date in the West is open to considerable doubt. No earlier example seems so far to have been quoted than the reference to it in Burchard's "Diary" noted by Catalani. Burchard was the master of ceremonies to Innocent VIII and Alexander VI, and he may himself have introduced the practice, but his speaking of it as the customary arrangement does not suggest this. On the other hand, the medieval liturgists apparently know no exception to their rule that both before the altar and in the grave the feet of all Christians should be pointed to the East. This custom we find alluded to by Bishop Hildebert at the beginning of the twelfth century (P. L., CLXXI, 896), and its symbolism is discussed by Durandus. "A man ought so to be buried", he says, "that while his head lies to the West his feet are turned to the East, for thus he prays as it were by his very position and suggests that he is ready to hasten from the West to the East" (Ration. Div. Off., VII, 35). But if Roman medieval practice seems to offer no foundation for the distinction now made between the priest and the layman, it is noteworthy that in the Greek Church very pronounced differences have been recognized from an early date. In the "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" of Pseudo-Dionysius, which belongs to the fifth century, we learn that a priest or bishop was placed before the altar (*ἐπίπροσθεν τοῦ θείου θυσιαστηρίου*), while a monk or layman lay outside the holy gates or in the vestibule. A similar practice is observed to the present day. The corpse of a layman during the singing of the "Pannychis" (the equivalent of the "Vigiliæ Mortuorum" or Vigil of the Dead) is usually deposited in the narthex, that of a priest or monk in the middle of the church, while in the case of a bishop he is laid during a certain portion of the service in different positions within the sanctuary, the body at one point being placed behind the altar exactly in front of the bishop's throne and the head towards the throne (Maltzew, Begräbniss-Ritus, 278). It is possible that some imitation of this practice in Dalmatia or in Southern Italy may have indirectly led to the introduction of our present rubric. The idea of both seems to be that the bishop (or priest) in death should occupy the same position in the church as during life, i. e. facing his people whom he taught and blessed in Christ's name.

Supposing the body to have been brought to the church in the afternoon or evening, the second portion of the obsequies, that carried out in the church, may begin with the recital of the Vespers for the Dead. This, however, is not prescribed in the "Rituale Romanum", which speaks only of Matins and Lauds, though Vespers are mentioned in the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" in the case of a bishop. If the Vespers for the Dead are said they begin with the antiphon Placebo, and the Office of Matins, if we exclude the invitatory, begins with the antiphon Dirige. For this reason the "Placebo and Dirige," of which we so constantly find mention in medieval English writers, mean simply the Vespers and Matins for the Dead. It is from the latter of these two words that the English term *dirge* is derived. Candles are lighted round the coffin and they should be allowed to burn at least during the continuance of the Office, Mass, and Absolutions. Throughout the Office for the Dead each psalm ends with Requiem æternam (Eternal rest give unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them) in the place of the Gloria Patri. It is interesting perhaps to note here that the liturgist, Mr. Edmund Bishop, after minute investigation has come to the conclusion that in this familiar formula, *Requiem æternam dona eis, Domine; et lux perpetua luceat eis*, we have a blending of two distinct liturgical currents; "the second member of the phrase expresses the aspiration of the mind and soul of the Roman, the first the aspiration of the mind and soul of the Goth" (Kuypers, Book of Cerne, 275). It is true that it has been maintained that the words are borrowed from a passage in IV Esdras (Apocrypha), ii, 34–35, but we may doubt if the resemblance is more than accidental.

With regard to the Office and Mass which form the second portion of the *Exsequiæ*, the Matins after a preliminary *invitatorium:* "Regem cui omnia vivunt, venite adoremus", consist of nine psalms divided as usual into three nocturns by three sets of lessons and responsories. The first nocturn, as already noted, begins with the antiphon "Dirige, Domine Deus meus, in conspectu tuo vitam meam", and is made up of the three psalms, Verba mea, Ps. v, Domine ne in furore, Ps. vi, and Domine Deus meus, Ps. vii, each having its own antiphon, which is duplicated. The lessons both in this and in the following nocturns are all taken from the Book of Job, chapters vii, x, xiii, xiv, xvii, and xix, in which the sufferer expresses the misery of man's lot, but above all his unalterable trust in God. The lessons are read without the usual absolution and blessing, but each is followed by a

responsory, and some of these responsories in their picturesque conciseness deserve to be reckoned among the most striking portions of the liturgy. We may quote for example the last responsory of the third nocturn which occurs again before the absolution. It is thus translated in the Roman Breviary of the late Marquess of Bute:

"Deliver me, O Lord, from eternal death in that awful day when the heavens and earth shall be shaken, and Thou shalt come to judge the world by fire.

"*Verse.* Quaking and dread take hold upon me, when I look for the coming of the trial and the wrath to come.

"*Answer.* When the heavens and the earth shall be shaken.

"*Verse.* That day is a day of wrath, of wasteness and desolation, a great day and exceeding bitter.

"*Answer.* When Thou shalt come to judge the world by fire.

"*Verse.* O Lord, grant them eternal rest, and let everlasting light shine upon them.

"*Answer.* Deliver me, O Lord, from eternal death in that awful day, when the heavens and the earth shall be shaken and Thou shalt come to judge the world by fire." There seems reason to believe that this responsory is not of Roman origin (Batiffol, Roman Breviary, 198) but it is of considerable antiquity. At present, if the whole three nocturns (the second of which consists of Pss. xxii, xxiv, xxvi; and the third of Pss. xxxix, xl, and xli) are not said owing to lack of time or for any other cause, then another responsory, Libera me de viis inferni, is sung in place of that just quoted. Lauds follow immediately, in which the psalms Miserere and Te decet hymnus replace those usually said at the beginning and the Canticle of Ezechias is sung instead of the Benedicite. The Benedictus is recited with a special antiphon from John, xi, 25–26. This is familiar to many as having been retained in the burial service of the Church of England, "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die". Finally after certain *preces* follows the impressive collect Absolve, which is also said in the Mass, "Absolve, we beseech Thee, O Lord, the soul of thy servant N. that being dead to this world he may live to Thee, and whatever sins he may have committed in this life through human frailty, do Thou of Thy most merciful goodness forgive; through our Lord Jesus Christ", etc.

The "Rituale" directs that if all three nocturns of the office cannot be said, it would be desirable to say at least the first. But it is even more emphatic in urging that Mass should not be omitted except on certain privileged festivals of the highest class which exclude a Mass for the dead *præsente cadavere*, i. e. even when the body is present. These days include the feasts of Christmas, the Epiphany, Easter, the Ascension, Whitsunday, Corpus Christi, The Annunciation, Assumption and Immaculate Conception, Nativity of St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, Sts. Peter and Paul, All Saints, the last three days of Holy Week, the Quarant' Ore, or Forty Hours, and certain patronal feasts. On all other days, roughly speaking, the Church not only permits but greatly desires that the Holy Sacrifice should be offered for the deceased as the most solemn part of the rite of interment. To secure this the severer regulations of earlier centuries have in many respects been greatly relaxed in recent times. For example it is not now of obligation that the Mass should be sung with music. In the case of poor people who cannot defray the expenses incident to a Mass celebrated with solemnity, a simple low Mass of Requiem is permitted even on Sundays and other prohibited days, provided that the parochial Mass of the Sunday be also said at another hour. Moreover this one *Missa in die obitus seu depositionis* may still be offered in such cases, even when on account of contagious disease or other serious reason the body cannot be brought to the church. As in the case of the Office, the Mass for the Dead is chiefly distinguished from ordinary Masses by certain omissions. Some of these, for example that of the Psalm Judica and of the blessings, may be due to the fact that the *Missa de Requie* was formerly regarded as supplementary to the Mass of the day. In other cases, for instance in the absence of hymns from the Office for the Dead, we may perhaps suspect that these funeral rites have preserved the tradition of a more primitive age. On the other hand, the suppression of the Gloria in excelsis, etc., as of the Gloria Patri seems to point to a sense of the incongruity of joyful themes in the presence of God's searching and inscrutable judgments. Thus a tractate of the eighth or ninth century printed by Muratori (Lit. Rom. Vet., II, 391) already directs that in the Vigils for the Dead "Psalms and lessons with the Responsories and Antiphons belonging to Matins are to be sung without Alleluia. In the Masses also neither Gloria in exelsis Deo nor Alleluia shall be sung." (Cf. Ceriani, Circa obligationem Officii Defunctorum, 9.)

In the early Christian ages, however, it would seem that the Alleluia, especially in the East, was regarded as specially appropriate to funerals. Another omission from the ordinary ritual of high Mass is that of the kiss of peace. This ceremony was always associated in idea with Holy Communion, and as Communion was not formerly distributed to the faithful at Masses for the Dead, the kiss of peace was not retained. A conspicuous feature of the Requiem Mass is the singing of the sequence, or hymn, "Dies iræ". This masterpiece of medieval hymnology is of late introduction, as it was probably composed by the Franciscan Thomas of Celano in the thirteenth century. It was not designed for its present liturgical use but for private devotion—note the singular number throughout *voca me cum benedictis quid sum miser tunc dicturus*", etc., as also the awkwardness of the added *pie Jesu Domine dona eis requiem*"; but the hymn appears printed in the "Missale Romanum" of 1485, though apparently not in the earlier edition of 1474. However the use of the "Dies irae" in connexion with the *exsequiæ mortuorum* is much more ancient, and Dr. Ebner has found it, musically noted as at present, in a Franciscan Missal of the thirteenth century. (Ebner, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Missale Romanum, 120). During the Mass it is customary, though not a matter of precept, to distribute tapers of unbleached wax to the congregation or at least to those assisting within the sanctuary. These are to be lighted during the Gospel, during the latter part of the Holy Sacrifice from the Elevation to the Communion, and during the absolution which follows the Mass. As already remarked the association of lights with Christian obsequies is very ancient, and liturgists here recognize a symbolical reference to baptism (the illumination, φωτισμός) whereby Christians are made the children of Light, as well as a concrete reminder of the oft repeated prayer *et lux perpetua luceat eis.* (Cf. Thalhofer, Liturgik, II, 529.)

After Mass follows the absolution or *Absoute*, to use the convenient term by which the French designate these special prayers for pardon over the corpse before it is laid in the grave. These prayers of the *Absoute*, like those said by the grave side, ought never to be omitted. The subdeacon bearing the processional cross, and accompanied by the acolytes, places himself at the head of the coffin (i. e. facing the altar in the case of a layman, but between the coffin and the altar in the case of a priest), while the celebrant, exchanging his black chasuble for a cope of the same colour, stands opposite at the foot. The

assisting clergy are grouped around and the celebrant without preamble begins at once to read the prayer *Non intres in judicium cum servo tuo*, praying that the deceased "may deserve to escape the avenging judgment, who, whilst he lived, was marked with the seal of the holy Trinity". This is followed by the responsory "Libera me Domine", which, as occurring in the Matins for the Dead, has already been quoted above. Then after the Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison the priest says aloud the Pater Noster and while this is repeated in silence by all, he makes the round of the coffin, sprinkling it with holy water and bowing profoundly before the cross when he passes it. After which, taking the thurible, he incenses the coffin in like manner; where we may note that the use of incense at funerals is derived from the earliest Christian centuries, though no doubt our manner of waving the censer towards persons and objects is relatively modern. Moreover it is possible that the incense was originally employed on such occasions for sanitary reasons. Finally after finishing the Pater Noster and repeating one or two short versicles to which answer is made by the clergy, the celebrant pronounces the prayer of absolution, most commonly in the following form: "O God, Whose attribute it is always to have mercy and to spare, we humbly present our prayers to Thee for the soul of Thy servant N. which Thou hast this day called out of this world, beseeching Thee not to deliver it into the hands of the enemy, nor to forget it for ever, but to command Thy holy angels to receive it, and to bear it into paradise; that as it has believed and hoped in Thee it may be delivered from the pains of hell and inherit eternal life through Christ our Lord. Amen." Although this prayer in its entirety cannot be surely traced to an earlier date than the ninth century, it contains several elements that recall the phraseology of primitive times. It is to be found in most of our existing manuscripts of the Gregorian Sacramentary. At the burial of bishops, cardinals, sovereigns, etc., not one but five absolutions are pronounced according to the forms provided in the "Pontificale Romanum". These are spoken by five bishops or other "prelates", each absolution being preceded by a separate responsory. In these solemn functions the prayer just quoted is not said, but most of the responsories and prayers used are borrowed from the Office for the Dead or from the Masses in the Roman Missal. It may be noted that all these absolutions are not in the declaratory but in the deprecatory form, i. e. they are prayers imploring God's mercy upon the deceased.

After the absolution the body is carried to the grave and as the procession moves along the antiphon "In paradisum" is chanted by the clergy or the choir. It runs thus: "May the angels escort thee to paradise, may the martyrs receive thee at thy coming and bring thee into the holy city Jerusalem. May the choir of angels receive thee, and with Lazarus, who once was poor, mayst thou have eternal rest." According to the rubric "the tomb (*sepulchrum*) is then blessed if it has not been blessed previously"; which has been ruled to mean that a grave newly dug in an already consecrated cemetery is accounted blessed, and requires no further consecration, but a mausoleum erected above ground or even a brick chamber beneath the surface is regarded as needing blessing when used for the first time. This blessing is short and consists only of a single prayer after which the body is again sprinkled with holy water and incensed. Apart from this the service at the grave side is very brief. The priest intones the antiphon: "I am the Resurrection and the Life", after which the coffin is lowered into the grave and the Canticle Benedictus is meanwhile recited or sung. Then the antiphon is repeated entire, the Pater Noster is said secretly, while the coffin is again sprinkled with holy water, and finally after one or two brief responses the following ancient prayer is said: "Grant this mercy, O Lord, we beseech Thee, to Thy servant departed, that he may not receive in punishment the requital of his deeds who in desire did keep Thy will, and as the true faith here united him to the company of the faithful, so may Thy mercy unite him above to the choirs of angels. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Then with the final petition: "May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace", the little procession of cross-bearer, surpliced clerics, and priest return to the sacristy reciting the De Profundis as they go. In some places the custom prevails that the officiating priest before retiring should offer the holy-water sprinkler to the relatives of the deceased who are present, in order that they may cast holy water upon the coffin in the grave. In others it is usual for the priest himself and for all present to throw down upon the coffin a handful of earth. This custom symbolical no doubt of "dust to dust" is certainly ancient and even in the "Rituale Romanum" a rubric is to be found prescribing that "in obsequies which have of necessity to be performed only in private and at the house of the deceased, blessed earth is put into the coffin while the Canticle Benedictus is being said". This no doubt is to be regarded as the nearest available equivalent to interment in a consecrated grave. In other localities, more particularly in Germany, it it customary for the priest to deliver a short discourse (*Leichenrede*) before leaving the cemetery. This is the more appropriate because nearly everywhere in Germany the civil law forbids the corpse to be taken to the church except in the case of bishops and other exalted personages. The result is that Mass and Office are performed with a catafalque only, and seem even in those rare cases in which they are retained to have nothing to do with the burial, instead of forming, as they should do, its most essential feature. On the other hand the service at the grave side is apt to appear strangely brief and perfunctory unless impressiveness be given to it by the discourse of the officiating priest. It may be noted that many local customs are still allowed to continue without interference in the ritual observed by the grave side. Before the Reformation there was an extraordinary variety of prayers and responsories commonly recited over the grave especially in Germany. The extreme simplicity of the "Rituale Romanum" represents no doubt a reaction against what threatened to become an abuse. Of the peculiar rites which so long survived locally, the Ritual of Brixen may be taken as an illustration. In this when the priest blesses the corpse with holy water, he is directed to say: "Rore cœlesti perfundat et perficiat animam tuam Deus". As the body is lowered into the ground he says: "Sume terra quod tuum est, sumat Deus quod suum est, corpus de terrâ formatum, spiritus de cœlo inspiratus est". Then the priest scatters earth upon the body with a shovel three times, saying, "Memento homo quia pulvis es et in pulverem reverteris". After this the Magnificat is recited and the psalm Lauda anima mea Dominum, with various prayers, and then with a wooden cross the priest signs the grave in three places, at the head, in the middle, and at the feet, with the words; "Signum Salvatoris Domini nostri Jesu Christi super te, qui in hac imagine redemit te, nec permittat introire, [and here he plants the wooden cross at the head of the grave] angelum percutientem in æternum". It is interesting to note that after once more blessing the grave with holy water he recites a prayer over the people in the vernacular. The clergy and all others present also sprinkle holy water on the grave before they depart.

THE BURIAL OF LITTLE CHILDREN.—The "Rituale

Romanum" provides a separate form of burial for infants and children who have died before they have reached years of discretion. It directs that a special portion of the cemetery should be set aside for them and that either the bells should not be tolled or that they should be rung in a joyous peal. Further, custom prescribes that white and not black should be used in token of mourning. The priest is bidden to wear a white stole over his surplice and a crown of flowers or sweet foliage is to be laid upon the child's brow. The processional cross is carried, but without its staff. The body may be borne to and deposited temporarily in the church, but this is not prescribed as the normal arrangement and in any case no provision is made for either Office or Mass. One or two psalms of joyous import, e. g. the Laudate pueri Dominum (Ps. cxii), are appointed to be said while the body is borne to the church or to the cemetery, and holy water and incense are used to bless the remains before they are laid in the ground. Two special prayers are included in the ritual, one for use in the church, the other by the grave side. The former, which is certainly ancient, runs as follows: "Almighty and most compassionate God, Who upon all little children that have been born again in the fountain of Baptism, when they leave this world without any merits of their own, straightway bestowest everlasting life, as we believe that Thou hast this day done to the soul of this little one, grant we beseech Thee, O Lord, by the intercession of Blessed Mary ever Virgin and of all Thy saints, that we also may serve Thee with pure hearts here below and may consort eternally with these blessed little ones in paradise, Through Christ our Lord, Amen." On the way back to the church the Canticle Benedicite is recited, and the prayer "Deus qui miro ordine angelorum ministeria hominumque dispensas", which is the collect used in the Mass of St. Michael's day, is said at the foot of the altar. The cross without the handle which is carried in the procession is considered to be symbolical of an incomplete life. Many other peculiarities are prevalent locally. Thus in Rome in the eighteenth century, as we learn from Catalani, the dead child was generally clothed in the habit known as St. Philip Neri's. This is black in colour but sprinkled all over with gold and silver stars. A tiny biretta is placed upon the child's head and a little cross of white wax in its hands. Miniature habits of the different religious orders are also commonly used for the same purpose.

History of our Present Ritual.—With regard to the burial of the dead in the early Christian centuries we know very little. No doubt the first Christians followed the national customs of those peoples amongst whom they lived, in so far as they were not directly idolatrous. The final kiss of farewell, the use of crowns of flowers, the intervals appointed for recurring funeral celebrations, the manner of laying out the body and bearing it to the grave, etc., show nothing that is distinctive of the Christian Faith, even though later ages found a pious symbolism in many of these things. Moreover the use of holy water and incense (the latter originally as a sort of disinfectant) was also no doubt suggested by similar customs among the pagans around them. Perhaps we should add that the funeral banquets of the pagans were in some sense imitated by the *agapæ* or love-feasts of the Christians which it seems to have been usual to celebrate in early times (see Marucchi, Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne, I, 129), also that the anniversary Masses and "months minds" of the Church undoubtedly replaced a corresponding pagan usage of sacrifices. (See Dublin Review, July, 1907, p. 118.) But of the existence of some distinctively religious service we have good evidence at an early date. Tertullian refers incidentally to the corpse of a woman after death being laid out *cum oratione presbyteri*. St. Jerome in his account of the death of St. Paul the Hermit speaks of the singing of hymns and psalms while the body is carried to the grave as an observance belonging to ancient Christian tradition. Again St. Gregory of Nyssa in his detailed description of the funeral of St. Macrina, St. Augustine in his references to his mother St. Monica, and many other documents like the Apostolical Constitutions (Bk. VII) and the "Celestial Hierarchy" of Pseudo-Dionysius make it abundantly clear that in the fourth and fifth centuries the offering of the Holy Sacrifice was the most essential feature in the last solemn rites, as it remains to this day. Probably the earliest detailed account of funeral ceremonial which has been preserved to us is to be found in the Spanish Ordinals lately published by Dom Ferotin. It seems to be satisfactorily established that the ritual here described represents in substance the Spanish practice of the latter part of the seventh century. We may accordingly quote in some detail from "the Order of what the clerics of any city ought to do when their bishop falls into a mortal sickness". After a reference to Canon iii of the seventh Council of Toledo (646) enjoining that a neighbouring bishop should if possible be summoned, the directions proceed: "At what hour soever the bishop shall die whether by day or night the bell (*Signum*) shall at once be rung publicly in the cathedral (*ecclesia seniore*) and at the same time the bell shall ring in every church within a distance of two miles.

"Then while some of the clergy in turn recite or chant the psalms earnestly and devoutly, the body of the bishop deceased is stripped by priests or deacons. After washing the body . . . it is clothed with his usual vestments according to custom, i. e. his tunic, his breeches, and his stockings, and after this with cap (*capello*) and face-cloth (*sudario*). Thereupon is put upon him an alb, and also a stole (*orarium*) about his neck and before his breast as when a priest is wont to say Mass. Also a cruet is placed in his hand. Then the thumbs of his hands are tied with bands, that is with strips of linen or bandages. His feet are also fastened in the same way. After all this he is robed in a white chasuble (*casulla*). Then after spreading beneath a very clean white sheet, the body is laid upon the bier and all the while the priests, deacons and all the clergy keep continually reciting or chanting and incense is always burned. And in this wise he is laid in the choir of the church over which he ruled, lights going before and following behind and then a complete text of the gospels is laid upon his breast without anything to cover it, but the gospel itself rests upon a cloth of lambswool (*super pallium agnavum*—this can hardly be the archiepiscopal pallium in its technical sense) which is placed over his heart. And so it must be that whether he die by night or day the recitation of prayers or chanting of psalms shall be kept up continuously beside him until at the fitting hour of the day Sacrifice may be offered to God at the principal altar for his repose. Then the body is lifted up by deacons, with the gospel book still lying on his breast, and he is carried to the grave, lights going before and following after, while all who are of the clergy sing the antiphons and responsories which are consecrated to the dead (*quæ solent de mortuis decantare*).

"After this when Mass has again been celebrated in that church in which he is to be buried, salt which has been exorcised is scattered in the tomb by deacons, while all other religious persons present sing the antiphon, In sinu Abrahæ amici tui conloca eum Domine. And then when incense has a second time been offered over his body, the bishop who has come to bury him advances and opening the dead man's mouth he puts chrism into it, addressing him thus: 'Hoc pietatis sacramentum sit tibi in participatione omnium beatorum'. And then by the same

bishop is intoned the antiphon: In pace in idipsum dormiam et requiescam. And this one verse is said, 'Expectans, expectavi Dominum et respexit me'; and the chanting is so arranged that the verses are said one by one while the first is repeated after each. When Gloria has been said the antiphon is repeated but not a second time." Two impressive collects are then said and another prayer which is headed "Benedictio". After which "the tomb is closed according to custom and it is fastened with a seal".

Probably this rather elaborate ceremony was a type of the funerals celebrated throughout Spain at this epoch even in the case of the lower clergy and the laity. Of the final prayer we are expressly told that it may also be used for the obsequies of a priest. Further it is mentioned that when the priest is laid out he should be clothed just as he was wont to celebrate Mass, in tunic, shoes, breeches, alb, and chasuble.

The rite of putting chrism into the bishop's mouth, as mentioned above, does not seem to be known elsewhere, but on the other hand, the anointing the breast of a dead person with chrism was formerly general in the Greek Church, and it seems to have been adopted at Rome at an early date. Thus in certain directions for burial and for Masses for the dead contained in the Penitential of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury (c. 680) we meet the following: "(1) According to the Church of Rome, it is the custom, in the case of monks or religious men, to carry them after their death to the church, to anoint their breasts with chrism, and there to celebrate Masses for them; then to bear them to the grave with chanting, and when they have been laid in the tomb, prayer is offered for them; afterwards they are covered in with earth or with a slab. (2) On the first, the third, the ninth, and also the thirtieth day, let Mass be celebrated for them, and furthermore, let this be observed after a year has passed, if it be wished."

It seems natural to conjecture that the Spanish custom of putting the chrism into the mouth of the dead may have been meant to replace the practice which certainly prevailed for a while in Rome of administering the Blessed Eucharist either at the very moment of death or of leaving it with the corpse even when life was extinct. A clear example of this is forthcoming in the "Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great (II, xxiv,) and see the Appendix on the subject in Cardinal Rampolla's "Santa Melania Giuniore" (p. 254). There is some reason to believe that the inscription *Christus hic est* (Christ is here), or its equivalent, occasionally found on tomb-stones (see Leblant, Nouveau Recueil, 3) bears reference to the Blessed Eucharist placed on the tongue of the deceased. But this practice was soon forbidden.

The custom of watching by the dead (the wake) is apparently very ancient. In its origin it was either a Christian observance which was attended with the chanting of psalms, or if in a measure adopted from paganism the singing of psalms was introduced to Christianize it. In the Middle Ages among the monastic orders the custom no doubt was pious and salutary. By appointing relays of monks to succeed one another orderly provision was made that the corpse should never be left without prayer. But among secular persons these nocturnal meetings were always and everywhere an occasion of grave abuses, especially in the matter of eating and drinking. Thus to take a single example we read among the Anglo-Saxon canons of Ælfric, addressed to the clergy: "Ye shall not rejoice on account of men deceased nor attend on the corpse unless ye be thereto invited. When ye are thereto invited then forbid ye the heathen songs (tha haethenan sangas) of the laymen and their loud cachinnations; nor eat ye nor drink where the corpse lieth therein, lest ye be imitators of the heathenism which they there commit" (Thorpe, Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, 448). We may reasonably suppose that the Office for the Dead, which consists only of Vespers, Matins, and Lauds, without Day-hours, originally developed out of the practice of passing the night in psalmody beside the corpse. In the tenth Ordo Romanus which supplies a description of the obsequies of the Roman clergy in the twelfth century we find the Office said early in the morning, but there is no mention of praying beside the corpse all night. In its general features this Roman Ordo agrees with the ritual now practised, but there are a good many minor divergences. For example the Mass is said while the Office is being chanted; the *Absoute* at the close is an elaborate function in which four prelates officiate, recalling what is now observed in the obsequies of a bishop, and the service by the grave side is much more lengthy than that which now prevails. In the earliest Ambrosian ritual (eighth or ninth century) which Magistretti (Manuale Ambrosianum, Milan, 1905, I, 67 sqq.) pronounces to be certainly derived from Rome we have the same breaking up of the obsequies into stages, i. e. at the house of the deceased, on the way to the church, at the church, from the church to the grave, and at the grave side, with which we are still familiar. But it is also clear that there was originally something of the nature of a wake (*vigiliæ*) consisting in the chanting of the whole Psalter beside the dead man at his home (Magistretti, ib., I, 70).

A curious development of the *Absoute*, with its reiterated prayers for pardon, is to be found in the practice (which seems to have become very general in the second half of the eleventh century) of laying a form of absolution upon the breast of the deceased. This is clearly enjoined in the monastic constitutions of Archbishop Lanfranc and we have sundry historical examples of it. (Cf. Thurston, Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln, 219.) Sometimes a rude leaden cross with a few words scratched thereupon was used for the purpose and many such have been recovered in opening tombs belonging to this period. In one remarkable example, that of Bishop Godfrey of Chichester (1088), the whole formula of absolution may be found in the same indicative form which meets us again in the so-called "Pontifical of Egbert". It is noteworthy that in the Greek Church to this day a long paper of absolution, now usually a printed form, is first read over the deceased and then put into his hand and left with him in the grave.

The only other point among the many peculiar features of medieval ritual which seems to claim special notice here is the elaborate development given to the offertory in the funeral of illustrious personages. Not only on such occasions were very generous offerings made in money and in kind, with a view, it would seem, of benefiting the soul of the deceased by exceptional generosity, but it was usual to lead his war-horse up the church fully accoutred and to present it to the priest at the altar rails, no doubt to be afterwards redeemed by a money payment. The accounts of solemn obsequies in early times are full of such details and in particular of the vast numbers of candles burned upon the hearse; this word hearse in fact came into use precisely from the resemblance which the elaborate framework erected over the bier and bristling with candles bore to a harrow (*hirpex*, *hirpicem*). Of the varying and protracted services by the grave side, which at the close of the Middle Ages were common in many parts of Germany and which in some cases lasted on until a much later period, something has already been said.

Ritual of the Greek Church.—The full burial

service of the Greek Church is very long and it will be sufficient here briefly to call attention to one or two points in which it bears a close resemblance to the Latin Rite. With the Greeks as with the Latins we find a general use of lighted candles held by all present in their hands, as also holy water, incense and the tolling of bells. With the Greeks as in the Western Communion, after a relatively short service at the house of the deceased, the corpse is borne in procession to the church and deposited there while the *Pannychis*, a mournful service of psalmody, is recited or sung. In the burial of a bishop the Holy Sacrifice or divine liturgy is offered up, and there is in any case a solemn absolution pronounced over the body before it is borne to the grave. Black vestments are usually worn by the clergy, and again, as with us, the dead man, if an ecclesiastic, is robed as he would have been robed in life in assisting at the altar. There are, however, a good many features peculiar to the Eastern Church. A crown, in practice a paper band which represents it, is placed upon the dead layman's head. The priest is anointed with oil and his face is covered with the *aer*, the veil with which the sacred species are covered during the Holy Sacrifice. Also the open Gospel is laid upon his breast as in the early Spanish ordinal. The Alleluia is sung as part of the service and a symbolical farewell is taken of the deceased by a last kiss. Upon the altar stands a dish with a cake made of wheat and honey, emblematic of the grain which falling to the ground dies and bringeth forth much fruit. Moreover many differences are made in the service according as the dead person is layman, monk, priest, or bishop, and also according to the ecclesiastical season, for during paschal time white vestments are worn and another set of prayers are said. The burial rite of the Greeks may be seen in Goar, "Euchologium Græcorum" (Paris, 1647), 423 sqq.; also in the new Russian edition by Al. Dmitrieoski (Kiev, 1895–1901). For the law of the Church of England concerning burial, see Blunt-Phillimore "The Book of Church Law" (London, 1899), 177–87, and 512–17, text of Burial Laws Amendment Act of 1880.

BURIAL CONFRATERNITIES.—It would take us too far to go into this subject at length. Even from the period of the catacombs such associations seem to have existed among the Christians and they no doubt imitated to some extent in their organization the pagan *collegia* for the same purpose. Throughout the Middle Ages it may be said that the guilds to a very large extent were primarily burial confraternities; at any rate the seemly carrying out of the funeral rites at the death of any of their members together with a provision of Masses for his soul form an almost invariable feature in the constitutions of such guilds. But still more directly to the purpose we find certain organizations formed to carry out the burial of the dead and the friendless as a work of charity. The most celebrated of these was the "Misericordia" of Florence, believed to have been instituted in 1244 by Pier Bossi, and surviving to the present day. It is an organization which associates in this work of mercy the members of all ranks of society. Their self-imposed task is not limited to escorting the dead to their last resting-place, but they discharge the functions of an ambulance corps, dealing with accidents as they occur and carrying the sick to the hospitals. When on duty the members wear a dress which completely envelops and disguises them. Even the face is hidden by a covering in which only two holes are left for the eyes. See CEMETERY; CREMATION; REQUIEM.

CATALANI, *Commentarius in Rituale Romanum* (1756); THALHOFER, *Liturgik*, II, Pt. II; IDEM, in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten* (Mainz, 1838), VI, Pt. III, 362–514; MARTÈNE, *De antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus*, II and IV; RULAND, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Leichenfeier* (Ratisbon, 1902); ALBERTI, *De sepultura ecclesiasticâ* (1901); PROCÈS, *La sépulture dans l'église catholique*, in *Précis historiques* (Brussels, 1882); MURCIER, *La sépulture chrétienne en France* (Paris, 1855); PROBST, *Die Exsequien* (Mainz, 1856); MARUCCHI, *Eléments d'archéologie chrét.* (Rome, 1899), I, 129–131; PÉTRIDÈS, in *Dict. d'arch. et lit.* s. v. *Absoute.*—On the Canon Law of burial, see especially LEX, *Das kirchliche Begräbnissrecht* (Ratisbon, 1904); also SÄGMÜLLER, *Kirchenrecht* (Freiburg, 1904), Pt. III; FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca*, s. v. *sepultura;* VON SCHERER, *Kirchenrecht*, II, 601.—On Burial in the Greek Church: MALTZEW, *Begräbniss-Ritus* (Berlin, 1896).—On Absolution Crosses: CHEVREUX, in *Bulletin archéol.* (Paris, 1904), 391–408; COCHET, *La Normandie souterraine;* IDEM, *Sépultures gauloises* (Paris, 1855 and 1857); DELISLE, *Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de la France* (1857), 71 sqq.; KRAUS, *Kunst und Alterthum in Lothringen* (Strasburg, 1889), 604–612. See also the bibliography of the article CEMETERY.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Buridan, JEAN, French scholastic philosopher of the fourteenth century, b. at Béthune, in the district of Artois towards the end of the thirteenth century; date of death unknown. He studied at the University of Paris under the Nominalist, William of Occam, became professor in the faculty of arts, procurator of the Picardy "Nation", and (in 1327) rector of the university. In 1345, he was one of the ambassadors sent by the university to the papal court at Avignon. He is also said to have assisted in founding the University of Vienna. It is probable, however, that Buridan never went to Vienna, for it is certain that he was in Paris in 1358, and Father Denifle has shown (Chartul. Univ., Paris, II, 646) that the University of Vienna was not founded until 1365, when Buridan was so old that he could hardly have undertaken such a journey. His principal works are "Compendium Logicæ", "Summa de Dialecticâ", and "Commentaries" on the works of Aristotle, the most important of the last being those on the "Politics". A complete edition was published by Dullard, Paris, 1500, and has frequently been reprinted, e. g. Oxford, 1637, London, 1641.

Buridan was not a theologian. In philosophy he belonged to the Nominalist, or Terminist school of Occam, to which he adhered in spite of reiterated condemnation. He adhered, also, to that peculiar form of scepticism which appeared in Scholastic philosophy at that time, and which arose from the growing sense of the inadequacy of reason to solve the highest problems of thought. In his "Compendium Logicæ" he developed at length the art of finding the middle term of a demonstration, and this, in the course of time (it is first mentioned in 1514), came to be known as "The Bridge of Asses", i. e. the bridge by which stupid scholars were enabled to pass from the minor or major, to the middle, term of syllogism. Still better known is the phrase "Buridan's Ass", which refers to the "case" of a hungry donkey placed between two loads of hay, equal as to quantity and quality and equally distant. The animal so placed, argued the dialectician, could never decide to which load of hay he should turn, and, in consequence, would die of hunger. The "case" is not found in Buridan's writings (though the problem it proposes is to be found in Aristotle), and may well have been invented by an opponent to show the absurdity of Buridan's doctrine.

That doctrine began by denying the distinction between the different faculties of the soul. Will and intellect, said Buridan, are the same. Hence, to say that the will is free in any sense except that in which the intellect also is free, is to say that the will is freer than itself. The freedom of the will is the freedom of the whole soul. Human freedom consists, then, in the power of choosing between two or more desirable alternatives (*libertas oppositionis*). When the intellect presents one alternative as better (higher) than the other, the will must choose the former. When the will presents two alternatives as equally desirable, there can be no

choice. (Here, probably, the opponent introduced the example of the ass, to ridicule Buridan's position.) The will, however, has still an expedient. It can postpone its decision, direct the intellect to consider one alternative only, and when the other alternative, even though it be better (higher), has dropped out of consciousness, the will can come to a decision and choose, if, indeed, its act can now be called a choice at all. Buridan, therefore, maintains that in a conflict of motives the stronger motive always prevails—the will is "determined" by the strongest motive. He is not a voluntarist. The will, he says, is inferior to the intellect, because the former presupposes the action of the latter, and depends on it. And it is by means of the intellect, and not by means of the will, that man lays hold of supreme happiness.

STÖCKL, *Gesch. der Phil. des Mittelalters* (Mainz, 1865), II, 1023 sqq.; ID., *Lehrb. der Gesch. der Phil.* (Mainz, 1888), I, 478; tr. FINLAY (Dublin, 1903), 427; TURNER, *Hist. of Phil.* (Boston, 1903), 408; UEBERWEG, *Gesch. der Phil.* (Berlin, 1905), II, 347; tr. MORRIS (New York, 1890), I, 465.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Burigny, JEAN LÉVESQUE DE, historian, b. at Reims, 1692; d. at Paris, 1785. In 1713, with his brothers, Champeaux and Lévesque de Pouilly, he began to compile a dictionary of universal knowledge, a kind of encyclopedia, which comprised twelve large manuscript folios, and afforded Burigny ample material for his subsequent works. In 1718, at The Hague, he worked with Saint-Hyacinthe on "L'Europe savante", in twelve volumes, of which he contributed at least one-half. On his return to Paris, he devoted his time to historical research and published several works which stamped him as a conscientious scholar. Burigny, although sharing the ideas of the philosophers of his time, was by no means an extremist. He was a modest, peace-loving man, whose only ambition was to be a scholar, and his works show a great amount of learning; some, for instance his lives of Grotius and Erasmus, give very interesting data not elsewhere found. Among his works are: "Traité de l'autorité du pape" (Paris, 1782) which reduces papal authority to a primacy of honour, "Théologie païenne" (Paris, 1754); "Histoire générale de Sicile" (The Hague, 1745); "Histoire des révolutions de l'empire de Constantinople" (The Hague, 1750); "Traité de Porphyre touchant l'abstinence de la chair, avec la vie de Plotin" (tr. from Greek; Paris, 1740); "Vie de Bossuet" (Paris, 1761); "Vie du cardinal Duperron" (Paris, 1768).

DACIER, *Eloge de Burigny* (Paris, 1786); WALCKENAER, *Recueil de notices historiques* (Paris, 1850); CONSTANTIN, in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, 1264–65.

PIERRE J. MARIQUE.

Burkard, FRANZ, the name of two celebrated German jurists. One died suddenly at Rain, 9 December, 1539. He began to teach canon law at the University of Ingoldstadt in 1519, where he stoutly opposed every endeavour to introduce Lutheranism. In the trial which sentenced Andreas Seehofer, who had taught the new doctrine, to retire to a monastery, Franz and his brother Peter, a professor at the same institution, were the chief prosecutors. As this action was resented by the Lutherans, he defended himself before the university with John Eck and Hauer. The other d. at Bonn, 6 August, 1584. For many years he served the Bavarian chancellor, August Loesch of Petersdorf, as legal adviser. Later the Elector of Cologne, Ernest of Bavaria, made him his private counsellor and chancellor. His stanch defence of Catholicity merited the praise of Blessed Peter Canisius. To quell the religious war resulting from the declaration of tolerance for Protestant worship, a volume over his name, "De Autonomiâ", appeared at Munich in 1586. Its real author, the private secretary of the king, Andreas Erstenberger, in order to save his name, position, and family, was induced by William V of Bavaria to conceal his identity behind the name of the deceased Burkard, as Rudolph II would not countenance any opposition to the Protestants. This book was bitterly assailed by Protestants, but its main positions have not been refuted.

PRANTL, *Geschichte der Universität in Ingoldstadt*, etc., I, passim; SCHREIBER, *Geschichte Bayerns*, II, 587; JANNSEN, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, V, 421–428.

THOS. M. SCHWERTNER.

Burke, EDMUND, first Vicar Apostolic of Nova Scotia, b. in the parish of Maryborough, County Kildare, Ireland, in 1753; d. at Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1820. He was compelled by existing political conditions in Ireland to pursue his studies in Paris, where his talents and character gave promise of his future career. Ordained priest, he returned to his native diocese. Here trouble had just arisen over the appointment of a vicar-general, and Father Burke was blamed by some partisans for espousing the cause of his superior. The unpleasant conditions led young Burke to follow the advice of Dr. Carpenter, Archbishop of Dublin, and go to Canada. He arrived in Quebec in the summer of 1786, and in September of that year was made professor of philosophy and mathematics in the seminary of Quebec. His work in the seminary led to his appointment as a director of that institution, but he craved for missionary work north and west of the Great Lakes, where, in scattered villages, there were many Catholics who had not seen a missionary since the conquest (1759). In 1794 he gained his object and was sent into the missionary field with the title of Vicar-General and Superior of the Missions of Upper Canada. For seven years he laboured faithfully, enduring all the hardships of a pioneer missionary priest; and he suffered, too, from lack of sympathy and support in his work. He saw clearly and made known to his ecclesiastical superiors the loss to religion resulting from race prejudices and misunderstandings. His plain statements made in the cause of religion and truth brought him enemies and many accusations. He met them fearlessly and these trials but prepared him for his important work of the future as Vicar-General of Nova Scotia, i. e. the ecclesiastical direction of most of the English-speaking population of Canada. He went to Halifax, Nova Scotia, as Vicar-General of Quebec in 1801, was made Vicar-General of Nova Scotia in 1815, and consecrated Bishop of Zion in 1818. The work done by this prelate for religion, for education, and for the State in Nova Scotia, during the first twenty years of the nineteenth century are fully treated in the work (quoted below) of one of his successors. The Protestant historian Campbell thus closes his biographical sketch of Bishop Burke: "The Dominion of Canada in its wide extent has seen few, if any, of its prelates who died more respected and regretted by all classes; more beloved and idolized by his own flock; and whose memory as a great, enlightened, and liberal-minded prelate is looked up to with so much veneration." His most important writings are "The First Principles of Christianity" and "The Ministry of the Church" (Dublin, 1817).

O'BRIEN (Archbishop of Halifax), *Memoirs of Bishop Burke* (Ottawa, 1894); CASGRAIN, *Mémoire sur les Missions de la Nouvelle-Ecosse, du Cap Breton et de l'île du Prince Edouard de 1760 à 1820; Réponse aux "Memoirs of Bishop Burke" par Mgr. O'Brien* (Quebec, 1895); MURDOCK, *History of Nova Scotia* (Halifax, 1867), 219, 421, 461; CAMPBELL, *Nova Scotia in its Historical, Mercantile, and Industrial Relations* (Montreal, 1873); BOURINOT, *Builders of Nova Scotia.*

ALEXANDER MCNEIL.

Burke, MAURICE. See ST. JOSEPH, DIOCESE OF.

Burke, THOMAS. See ALBANY, DIOCESE OF.

Burke (DE BURGO), THOMAS, Bishop of Ossory, b. at Dublin, Ireland, about 1709; d. at Kilkenny, 25 September, 1776. He went to Rome in 1723 and there was placed under the care of his namesake and kinsman, a Dominican, Father Thomas Burke,

who prepared him for admission into the order. A dispensation was obtained from the Sacred Congregation, and on 14 June, 1724, he was clothed with the Dominican habit before he had attained his fifteenth year. Young Burke showed special aptitude for study and with the permission of the master general was allowed to begin his course during his novitiate. Two years were given to philosophy and five to theology. So marked was his progress in studies and letters that he was singled out, even though yet a novice, by special marks of affection from Benedict XIII. During the reconstruction of St. Sixtus' in 1727 and 1728, the pontiff visited the Irish Dominicans once a week, taking part in their community exercises, becoming familiar with the friars and especially with Burke. He was gradually promoted to the highest theological honours of the order, being charged successively with all the official duties in a regular Dominican studium. He held the office of regent of studies for six years. In 1742 the Master General, Thomas Ripoll, personally conferred on him the degree of Master of Theology. The following year he returned to Dublin where he took up the work of the ministry. A general chapter of the order held at Bologna in 1748 passed an ordinance that in all the immediately following provincial chapters a historiographer should be appointed in every province. This order did not reach Ireland from Rome in time for the provincial chapter which was convened the following year at Dublin, and to which assembly Father Burke had been elected by his brethren as Definitor. At the subsequent chapter, however, of 1753 he was appointed historian of his province. The same honour of Definitor was conferred again in 1757.

Father Burke while in Rome was commissioned by the Irish clergy, through Bishop MacDonough of Kilmore, to obtain from the Holy See ten new offices of Irish saints. After his return to Ireland, he was entrusted with a similar commission by the Archbishop of Dublin, the Most Rev. John Linegar, and the Bishops of Ireland for fourteen other feasts of the Irish saints. The decrees were given respectively 8 July, 1741 and 1 July, 1747. Both original documents are preserved in the archives of St. Clement's, Rome. Father Burke was promoted by Clement XIII in 1759, to the See of Ossory which he governed for seventeen years. His talents, learning, culture, and piety fitted him for the pastoral office, united with his noble and fearless character. An accurate portrait of Bishop Burke is possessed by the Dominican nuns of Drogheda, Ireland. He is known to posterity more on account of his learned work "Hibernia Dominicana", than by any other claim. The work was nominally published at Cologne, but in reality it came from the press of Edmund Finn of Kilkenny, in 1762. The author gave to it four years of incessant labour, and in 1772 he added a "Supplementum" which was a vindication of Rinuccini, the nuncio of Pope Innocent X, of the charges brought against him by the supreme council of Confederate Catholics during his residence in Ireland. Question of the oath of allegiance and fear of subverting "that fidelity and submission which we acknowledge ourselves to owe from duty and from gratitude to his Majesty King George III" caused seven of the Irish Bishops to condemn the "Hibernia Dominicana" and "Supplementum". (For defense of Bishop Burke see Coleman, Ir. Eccl. Record.) "Promptuarium dogmatico canonico morale", a work of the celebrated Spanish Dominican Larrago, enlarged and accommodated to its day by Father Burke, was about to be published in 1753 when his appointment as historian interrupted it.

BURKE, *Hibernia Dominicana* (Cologne, 1762), I; WEBB, *A Compendium of Irish Biography* (Dublin, 1878); *Anthropologia Hibernica, February I* (4 vols., 1793–94); COLEMAN, *Thomas de Burgo* in *Ir. Eccl. Record*, 1892; MORAN, *Spicilegium Ossoriense* (Dublin, 1884), gives the MSS. collected by Bishop Burke for a second edition of the *Hibernia Dominicana*.

JOHN T. MCNICHOLAS.

Burke, THOMAS NICHOLAS, a celebrated Dominican orator, b. 8 September, 1830, in Galway; d. 2 July, 1882, at Tallaght, Ireland. His parents, though in moderate circumstances, gave him a good education. He was placed at first under the care of the Patrician Brothers, and was afterwards sent to a private school. An attack of typhoid fever when he was fourteen years old, and the harrowing scenes of the famine year (1847), had a sobering effect on the quick-witted and studious lad, and turned his thoughts into more serious channels. Toward the end of that year he asked to be received into the Order of Preachers, and was sent to Perugia in Italy, to make his novitiate. On 29 December, he was clothed there in the habit of St. Dominic and received the name of Thomas. Shortly afterward he was sent to Rome to begin his studies in the Convent of the Minerva. He passed thence to the Roman convent of Santa Sabina, where he won such esteem by his fervour, regularity, and cheerfulness, that his superiors sent him, while yet a student, as novice-master to Woodchester, the novitiate of the resuscitated English Province. He was ordained priest 26 March, 1853, and on 3 August, 1854, defended publicly the theses *in universâ theologiâ*, and took his Dominican degree of Lector. Early in the following year Father Burke was recalled to Ireland to found the novitiate of the Irish Province at Tallaght, near Dublin. In 1859 he preached his first notable sermon on "Church Music"; it immediately lifted him into fame. Elected Prior of Tallaght in 1863, he went to Rome the following year as Rector of the Dominican Convent of San Clemente, and attracted great attention in the Eternal City by his preaching. He returned to Ireland in 1867, and delivered his oration on O'Connell at Glasnevin before fifty thousand people. Bishop Leahy took him as his theologian to the Vatican Council in 1870, and the following year he was sent as Visitor to the Dominican convents in America. His fame had preceded him, and he was besieged with invitations to preach and lecture. The seats were filled hours before he appeared, and his audiences overflowed the churches and halls in which he lectured. In New York he delivered the discourses in refutation of the English historian Froude. In eighteen months he gave four hundred lectures, exclusive of sermons, the proceeds amounting to nearly $400,000. His mission was a triumph, but the triumph was dearly won, and when he arrived in Ireland on 7 March, 1873, he was spent and broken. Yet during the next ten years we find him preaching continually in Ireland, England, and Scotland. He began the erection of the church in Tallaght in 1882, and the following May preached a series of sermons in the new Dominican church, London. In June he returned to Tallaght in a dying condition, and preached his last sermon in

THOMAS N. BURKE, O. P.

the Jesuit church, Dublin, in aid of the starving children of Donegal. A few days afterwards he breathed forth his soul to God, in Whose service he had laboured so valiantly. Father Burke possessed all the qualities of a great orator: a rich, flexible, harmonious voice, great dramatic power, and a vivid imagination. He is buried in the church of Tallaght, now a memorial to him. Many of his lectures and sermons were collected and published in various editions in New York, as were also the four lectures in reply to Froude (1872) the latter with the title "The Case of Ireland Stated".

FITZPATRICK, *Life of Fr. Tom Burke* (London, 1885); *Inner Life of Fr. Burke*, by a Friar Preacher, and, *Father Burke*, in the Publications of the English and Irish Catholic Truth Societies.

STANISLAUS HOGAN.

Burleigh, or BURLEY (BURLÆUS), WALTER, Friar Minor and medieval philosopher, b. in 1275 and d. in 1337. It is impossible to determine with certainty that Burleigh was a Franciscan, as some say that he was an Augustinian; and Franciscans "can do no less than lay a claim to him", as Parkinson remarks, "leaving the matter to be disputed by such as are disposed to contend". He was preceptor to Edward, Prince of Wales, who afterwards ascended the throne as Edward III in 1327. At Oxford he was the school-fellow of William of Occam, both being disciples of Duns Scotus. He taught at Paris for some time and was known as the Plain and Perspicuous Doctor (*Doctor planus et perspicuus*). Burleigh figured prominently in the dispute concerning the nature of universals. Following the doctrine of Scotus in this regard, he became, on the one hand, the adversary of William of Occam, the father of nominalism—that is, the doctrine which holds that universals are empty words, or *nomina*, having no real existence whatever; and on the other, the opponent of the extreme realists who taught that the universal, as such, has actual or formal existence outside of the mind. In this connexion it should be remembered that, as in the question of universals, so in others of greater importance in philosophy, Scotus can be understood and interpreted only by one who has mastered by diligent and well-directed study the peculiar terminology of the Subtle Doctor and grasped his sometimes abstruse concepts of metaphysical principles.

Scotus was undoubtedly a moderate realist, that is, he taught that the *universale in actu*, to use his own words, *non est nisi in intellectu*, though having a foundation in extra-mental reality; and Burleigh followed his master. But when the disciples of Scotus endeavoured to construct on his principles a doctrine of exaggerated realism, Burleigh's opposition to this mistaken interpretation of Scotus' doctrine was vigorous and uncompromising. He then, at least in this point, was the adversary of the Scotists rather than of Scotus himself. Burleigh's only work on theology is a commentary "in Magistrum Sententiarum". His philosophical writings include (1) "De intentione et remissione formarum"; (2) "Expositio in libros Ethicorum Aristotelis"; (3) "De vitis et moribus philosophorum"; (4) "De potentiis animæ"; (5) "Summa totius logicæ"; (6) "Commentaria in libros Posteriorum Aristotelis"; (7) "Tractatus de materiâ et formâ et relativis"; (8) "De fluxu et refluxu maris anglicani".

PARKINSON, *Collectanea Anglo-Minoritica, ad. an. 1337* (London, 1726), 151; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1893), IV, 425; JEILER in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1542.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Burlington, DIOCESE of (BURLINGTONENSIS), established 14 July, 1853, comprises the whole State of Vermont, U. S. A., an area of 9135 square miles. The territory now making up the State of Vermont was not only discovered but first settled by Catholics. Champlain bestowed on the State in 1609 the name it bears and the first Mass said within its boundaries was offered up in 1666 by a Sulpician priest from Montreal, in the chapel of the little fort of St. Anne on Isle Lamothe—now the site of a shrine of pilgrimage—where a few soldiers upheld the authority of the King of France. In 1668 Bishop Laval of Quebec went there and thus gave to Vermont the honour of the first episcopal visitation and ministration in New England and probably in the United States. During the years that followed, Jesuit and other missionaries traversed the State and left the evidences of their zeal in the converted Indians and the Catholic settlers in many villages. In 1734 there were fourteen Catholic families grouped about a chapel at Alburgh. After Canada had been ceded to the English in 1760 many New England emigrants went to Vermont, but the Bishops of Quebec still continued to look after the Catholics there. When the Diocese of Boston was created in 1810 the State of Vermont was included within its jurisdiction, and the venerable Father Matignon of Boston visited Burlington in 1815 and found about one hundred Catholic Canadians there without a priest or church. Father Migneault of Chambly, Canada, was a frequent visitor for a number of years, ministering to the scattered families along the border. Father James Fitton of Boston was another pioneer priest. The first resident priest in Vermont was the Rev. Jeremiah O'Callaghan, a native of Cork, Ireland, whose eccentric notions on the question of usury got him into difficulties with the bishop of his native diocese; he was sent to Burlington in 1830 by Bishop Fenwick and remained there until 1854, his influence and pastoral zeal radiating far and wide. He built St. Peter's church, Burlington, in 1832. He died at Holyoke, Massachusetts, 23 February, 1861. In 1837 the Rev. John D. Daly, another eccentric but learned man, commenced to care for the missions in the southern part of the State and laboured until 1854, when he retired to New York where he died in 1870. Notable also among the priests ministering in the State during this early period were Fathers William Ivers, George Hamilton, Edward McGowan, James Walsh, M. Petithomme, P. Drolet, and M. Chevalier. In 1843 the Catholics of the State numbered 4940, but the building of railroads and the establishment of numerous public works soon brought a steady increase.

LOUIS DE GOESBRIAND

In 1853 on the petition of the bishops of the Province of New York, the pope erected Vermont into a diocese with Burlington as the titular city. The Very Rev. Louis De Goesbriand, then Vicar-General of the Diocese of Cleveland, Ohio, was named the first bishop and consecrated in New York by Archbishop Bedini, 30 October, 1853. He was born 4 August, 1816, at Saint-Urbain, Finistère, France. He studied at Saint-Sulpice, Paris, and was ordained priest at St. Louis, U. S. A., 30 July, 1840. He found on his arrival in Vermont five priests, ten churches, and about 20,000 Catholics. In January, 1855, he went to Europe to secure priests in Ireland and France and with the aid of those who answered his appeal for volunteers, new parishes were organized, churches built, schools opened, and the work of

evangelizing went on vigorously. The first diocesan synod was held in Burlington, 4 and 5 October, 1855, at which nine priests attended. On 17 July, 1890, Bishop De Goesbriand celebrated the golden jubilee of his ordination and in 1892 he asked for a coadjutor. The choice fell on the Rev. John Stephen Michaud, then pastor at Bennington, the son of an Irish mother and a Canadian father and born at Burlington, 24 November, 1843. He made his studies at St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, New York, and was ordained priest, 7 June, 1873. He was consecrated titular Bishop of Modra and coadjutor of Burlington, 29 June, 1892. Bishop De Goesbriand retired to live in the Orphan Asylum at Burlington and died 3 November, 1899, the dean of the American hierarchy. Bishop Michaud immediately succeeded to the see. Bishop De Goesbriand was one of the prelates who attended the Vatican Council in 1869.

The religious communities now represented in the diocese are the Fathers of Saint Edmond (C. S. E.), the Brothers of St. Gabriel, Sisters of Charity of Providence, Sisters of the Holy Cross and of the Seven Dolours, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, Ladies of St. Joseph, Sisters of St. Joseph, Hospital Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Congregation of Notre Dame, of the Presentation, of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and of the Assumption. There are in the diocese 99 priests, 88 secular, 11 regular; 95 churches, 70 with resident pastors, and 27 missions with churches; 20 stations; 275 women in religious communities; 15 ecclesiastical students in the diocesan seminary; 3 academies for boys, 9 for girls; 21 parish schools with 6096 pupils; 2 orphanage schools with 260 pupils, 220 orphans in the diocesan asylum; 2 colleges for boys; 2 hospitals; Catholic population estimated 75,953; children under Catholic care 6175. The hospital at Winooski Park is named after Fanny Allen, daughter of General Ethan Allen of Revolutionary fame, and the first woman of New England birth to become a nun. (See ALLEN, FRANCES.)

DE GOESBRIAND, *Catholic Memoirs of Vermont and New Hampshire* (Burlington, Vt., 1886); MICHAUD in *History of the Cath. Ch. in the New England States* (Boston, 1899), II; SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1904); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Directory*, 1907.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Burma.—Before its annexation by the British Burma consisted of the kingdoms of Ava and Pegu. In 1548 St. Francis Xavier petitioned Father Rodriguez for missionaries to go to Pegu, but nothing is known as to the outcome of his request. In 1699 the Vicar Apostolic of Siam and the Bishop of Meliapur had a dispute concerning the jurisdiction over Pegu, and Cardinal de Tournon, *Legatus a latere*, decided against the vicar Apostolic. The actual work of evangelizing Ava and Pegu did not begin until the pontificate of Innocent XIII, who, in 1722, sent Father Sigismond de Calchi, a Barnabite, and Father Vittoni, of the same order, to Burma. After many trials and tribulations they succeeded in obtaining permission to preach with full liberty the Gospel of Christ. In 1741 Benedict XIV definitely established the mission, appointing Father Galizia vicar Apostolic, and placing the Barnabites in charge of the work; but in the wars which distracted those regions during the eighteenth century the last two members of the order who had remained in the country were killed. The Barnabites having given up the mission, Pius VIII sent Monsignor Frederic Cao, a member of the Congregation of Pious Schools, and titular Bishop of Zama (18 June, 1830). Gregory XVI placed the mission under the Oblates of Pinerolo, Italy, by appointing (5 July, 1842) Monsignor Giovanni Ceretti, a member of this institute, and titular Bishop of Adrianople, as first vicar Apostolic. About this date (1845) the Catholics of the two kingdoms numbered 2500. In 1848 Monsignor John Balma succeeded as vicar Apostolic (5 September, 1848), but the war with the British rendered his labours ineffectual, and the mission was abandoned about 1852.

The British had in reality begun to assume control of Burma in 1824, but it was not until 20 December, 1852, that the East India Company, after a bloody war, annexed the entire kingdom of Pegu, a territory as large as England. Many years later the kingdom of Ava was also taken by the British, and with the conquest of Rangoon the whole of Burma came into the possession of Great Britain. The Oblates of Pinerolo having withdrawn from the mission, the vicariate was placed, in 1855, under the control of the Vicar Apostolic of Siam. At this date the kingdoms of Ava and Pegu contained 11 priests and 5320 Catholics.

Burma is bounded on the east by China and Siam, on the west by Assam and Bengal. Its area is approximately 171,430 square miles, while that of Great Britain and Ireland is 120,947 square miles. Notwithstanding this large extent of territory, Burma has a population of only 8,000,000 inhabitants. For some ten years the mission remained under the administration of the Vicar Apostolic of Siam; but such a condition could not be indefinitely prolonged without compromising its future. A decree of Propaganda (27 November, 1866) accordingly divided Burma into three vicariates, named respectively, with reference to their geographical positions, Northern, Southern, and Eastern Burma. The boundaries then fixed were abrogated (28 June, 1870) by another decree of Propaganda, which constituted these three vicariates as they now are.

NORTHERN BURMA.—This vicariate, which has been entrusted to the Missions Etrangères of Paris, is bounded on the north by the Chinese province of Yun-nan, on the east by the River Salwen, on the south by Karenni and Lower Burma, and on the west by Manipur, the Garo Hills, and the independent territories of Tipperah and Assam. In a population of 3,500,000 there are 7248 Catholics, whose spiritual needs are served by 22 European clergy of the Missions Etrangères of Paris and 3 native priests, with 47 churches or chapels. The vicariate also possesses 18 schools with 754 children, a seminary with 22 students, 2 boarding-schools with 160 pupils, and 6 orphanages with 315 orphans. This is the most considerable of the Burman vicariates, being equal in importance to the other two combined. The residence of the vicar Apostolic is at Mandalay. The stations having one chapel and a resident missionary are Pyinmana, Yamèthin, Magyidaw, Chanthagon, Myokine, Chaung-u, Nabet, Shwebo, Chanthaywa, Monhla, Bhano, and Maymyo. At Mandalay there are, besides the cathedral, the Tamil church of St. Xavier, a Chinese church, and that of St. John's Asylum. The language commonly used in this vicariate is Burmese, but residents ordinarily employ their respective native tongues, which accounts for the Chinese church at Mandalay. This city of 188,000 inhabitants is a bustling centre of traffic between Lower Burma and the Province of Yun-nan; hence the large Chinese element in the population.

EASTERN BURMA.—This vicariate is entrusted to the Milan Seminary of Foreign Missions. Its boundaries, determined by decree of 26 August, 1889, are: on the north, the Chinese Province of Yun-nan; on the east, the Mekong, the subsequent course of which bounds Cambodia and Annam; on the south, Karenni and Shan; on the west, the River Salween and part of the course of the Sittang. The vicariate is made up of two quite distinct portions connected almost at right angles by a somewhat narrow strip of territory. The first of these portions comprises Toungoo and the regions lying between the Sittang and the Salween as far as 20 north latitude; from this paral-

lel of latitude the second portion stretches north to the Tropic of Cancer, bordered on the east and south by China, Annam, and Siam, and on the west by the River Salween.

The beginnings of the mission go back to 1868, when the Milan Seminary of Foreign Missions sent thither Monsignor Biffi as prefect Apostolic, accompanied by Sebastian Carbode, Conti, and Rocco Tornatori. The last named of these is the present vicar Apostolic, and has resided forty years in the vicariate. There are 10,300 Catholics in this vicariate, the population of which is not exactly known, but amounts to something like 2,000,000. The vicar Apostolic resides in the Leitko Hills and visits 130 villages in the Karenni district, where there are 10,000 Catholics—almost the whole Catholic population of the vicariate. There is a school, with 65 children, a convent of the Sisters of Nazareth of Milan, with 40 girls, and, in some of the villages, the beginnings of schools with a few pupils. Toungoo, in the south of the vicariate, with 300 Catholics, has an English school of 130 children of various races, a Native school of 100 children, and a convent of the Sisters of the Reparation of Nazareth of Milan with 70 girls. There are 10 priests. In 1902 there were 140 conversions from Paganism and 6 from Protestantism. The stations provided with priests are, besides the residence of the vicar Apostolic, Toungoo, Northern Karenni, Yedashe, and Karenni.

SOUTHERN BURMA.—This vicariate, entrusted to the Missions Etrangères of Paris, comprises all the territory included in British (Lower) Burma before the annexation of Upper Burma, with the exception, however, of the province of Arakan (attached in 1879 to the Diocese of Dacca) and the Toungoo district (assigned to the Vicariate of Eastern Burma). It is, therefore, bounded on the east by the Diocese of Dacca, on the north by Eastern Burma, on the west by Siam, and on the south by the sea. It extends from the nineteenth to the tenth parallel of north latitude, and, beginning from Moulmein, forms a long and rather narrow strip of land shut in between Siam on the one side and the sea on the other.

In a population estimated at 4,000,000 as many as 45,579 Catholics are found distributed among 23 stations, the most important of which in respect of Catholic population are: Rangoon, with 2336 Catholics; Moulmein, 1400; Bassein, 1040; Myaung-mya, 4000; Kanaztogon, 4482; Mittagon, 3000; Maryland, 2412; Gyobingauk Tharrawady, 2200. The seat of the vicariate Apostolic is at Rangoon. The clergy number 49 European priests and 8 native priests, and the vicariate has 231 churches and chapels. The schools are conducted by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, of St. Joseph of the Apparition, and of St. Francis Xavier, those known under this last name being natives. The vicariate supports 12 Anglo-native schools, with 4501 children, and 65 Burman or Tamil schools which give instruction to 2200 pupils. The Little Sisters of the Poor, 9 in number, take care of 55 old people at Rangoon, and the Missionaries of Mary have an asylum sheltering 100 children, besides which there are 21 orphanages, containing 790 children, under the care of the above mentioned religious communities. This vicariate, therefore, is further advanced in Christianity than the other two, a condition due to its greater accessibility and the British influence, which is more fully developed in these regions. In 1845, as has been seen, there were only 2500 Catholics in Burma, sixty years later there are 59,127—a proof of the activity of the missionaries and a pledge for the future.

Monsignor Alexander Cardot, Bishop of Limyra, Vicar Apostolic of Southern Burma, was born at Fresse, Haute-Saône, France, 9 January, 1859, and educated in the seminaries of Luneuil and Vesoul and of the Missions Etrangères. Monsignor Cardot began his labours in the mission field in 1879, and in 1893 was appointed coadjutor to Bishop Bigandet, his predecessor in the vicariate, who consecrated him at Rangoon (24 June, 1893). He succeeded to the vicariate on the death of Bishop Bigandet, 19 March, 1894.

STREIT, *Atlas des Missions* (Steyl, 1906); *Madras Catholic Directory* (1907); *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 232–237.

ALBERT BATTANDIER.

Burnett, PETER HARDEMAN, first American Governor of California, U. S. A., b. in Nashville, Tennessee, 15 Nov., 1807, of Virginian ancestry; d. at San Francisco, California, 16 May, 1895. At an early age he was taken by his father to Missouri, where amid primitive conditions of life he succeeded in obtaining an elementary education. At the age of nineteen he returned to Tennessee, and soon after married Harriet W. Rogers, to whom he attributed much of the success of his later career. After his marriage he started in business for himself, studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1839. He also edited "The Far West", a weekly paper published at Liberty, Missouri. About this time he became a member of the Church of the Disciples, or Campbellites, founded by Alexander Campbell, a seceder from the Baptists. In 1843, removing with his family to Oregon, he took a prominent part in the formation of the territorial government and was a member of the legislature from 1844 to 1848. During this period the published debate between Campbell and Bishop Purcell of Cincinnati fell into his hands, and though after reading it he still remained a Protestant, his confidence in Protestantism was considerably shaken. He then began a systematic investigation of the true religion, became convinced of the truth of the Catholic claims, and in June, 1846, was received into the Church at Oregon City by Father De Vos.

In the year 1848 Burnett went to California, where he was elected a member of the Legislative Assembly and took a leading part in its proceedings. He was appointed judge of the superior tribunal in August, 1849 and did good work in the framing of the State Constitution. In September he was chosen chief justice, and on the thirteenth of November of the same year he was elected the first American Governor of California, though California was not admitted as a State into the Union till September, 1850. He resigned the governorship in 1851 and resumed the practice of law until his appointment in 1857 as a Justice of the Supreme Court of California by Gov. J. Neely Johnson. His term expired in October, 1858. He was also President of the Pacific Bank from 1863 to 1880, after which he retired from active business. In 1860 Judge Burnett wrote his famous book "The Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church" (New York, 1860), wherein he bases his conversion on clear-cut logical principles. With regard to this work Dr. Brownson says "In writing his book, Judge Burnett has rendered a noble homage to his new faith. . . . Through him, California has made a more glorious contribution to the Union than all the gold of her mines, for truth is more precious than gold, yea, than fine gold" (Brownson's Review, April, 1860). This was followed by his work on "The American Theory of Government, Considered with Reference to the Present Crisis" (2d ed., New York, 1861). During the period of his retirement he published "Recollections and Opinions of an Old Pioneer" (New York, 1860), which "is especially valuable in connexion with the early political and constitutional history of the Pacific coast" (Nation, XXX, 389), and "Reasons Why We Should Believe in God, Love God and Obey God" (New York, 1884).

The Ave Maria (Notre Dame, 1–29 Oct., 1898); *Catholic News*, files (New York, 5 June, 1895); *The Pilot*, files (Boston, 1 June, 1895); *Brownson's Review* (New York, April, 1863).

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Burns, JAMES, publisher and author, b. near Montrose, Forfarshire, Scotland, 1808; d. in London, 11 April, 1871. During the last half of the nineteenth century his work in the cause of Catholic literature and Catholic church music contributed much to the rapid advancement of the Church in Great Britain and to the many conversions that were made throughout that period. His father was a Presbyterian minister and sent him to a college in Glasgow with the idea that he should follow the same calling. But feeling no inclination for it, he left the school in 1832 and went to London where he found employment with a publishing firm. He acquired a thorough knowledge of this trade and then set up for himself in a modest way. He soon won success, and the ministers of the Established Church adopted him as an active auxiliary in their literary campaign of tracts and polemic publications. He then became a "Puseyite", or high-churchman. From his press were issued many interesting and instructive books of a high literary tone in the series he called "The Englishman's Library" and "The Fireside Library". The Oxford Movement under Newman of course drew him within its range, with the result that, in spite of the great worldly sacrifice it meant, he followed the example of many of his friends and became a convert in 1847.

The change was one of the sensations of the time and involved for him the making of a new business life and fortune. The Anglican publications of the old house were sold off and he set to work, and succeeded, in a comparatively brief time, in building up an equally enviable reputation as an enterprising and prolific publisher of good and wholesome Catholic literature. To his "Popular Library" Cardinal Wiseman contributed "Fabiola" and Cardinal Newman, "Callista". Other volumes from a host of well-known writers, prayer books, and books of devotion soon made the name of the firm of Burns & Oates a household word throughout the English-speaking world. Mr. Burns also wrote constantly on church music and edited and republished many compositions of the best masters. He continued his busy life in spite of a painful internal malady which ended in cancer, from which he died. His widow, who was also a convert, survived him twenty-two years, dying a member of the Ursuline community at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, U. S. A., January, 1893. Of his five daughters, four entered the Ursuline Order and the other became a Sister of Charity. His only son was ordained a priest, serving for a long time as chaplain at Nazareth House, Hammersmith, London.

Catholic Family Annual (New York, 1884); *London Tablet* and *Weekly Register*, files (15 April, 1871).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Burnt Offering. See SACRIFICE.

Burse (βύρσα, "hide", "skin"; whence "bag" or "purse"), a receptacle in which, for reasons of convenience and reverence, the folded corporal is carried to and from the altar. In Roman form the burse is ordinarily made of two juxtaposed pieces of cardboard about twenty-five centimetres (or ten inches) square, bound together at three edges, leaving the fourth open to receive the corporal. One outer side of the burse is of the same material and colour as the vestments with which it is used; the rest is lined with linen or silk. The use of the burse is relatively recent. When the corporal reached its present small dimensions, it was carried to the altar, sometimes in the missal, sometimes in a special receptacle, a box or bag, which finally took the present form of burse. Just when this custom began cannot be determined. The "Chronicon vetus rerum Moguntinarum" (1140–1251) mentions a precious corporal-case; this may have been, however, only a box for the continual safe-keeping of the corporal. St. Charles Borromeo describes a *sacculus corporalis* distinct from the case in which corporals were preserved (Acta Mediolan., 1683, I, 524). From the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries the use of the burse spread, and in 1692 it was universally illicit to celebrate Mass without one (Decreta S. R. C., 1866, ad 2^{m}).

GIHR, *The Sacrifice of the Mass* (St. Louis, 1902), 264, 265; GAVANTUS-MERATI, *Thesaurus sac. rituum* (Venice, 1762), I, 90.

JOHN B. PETERSON.

Bursfeld, THE ABBEY OF.—In the Middle Ages one of the most celebrated Benedictine monasteries in Germany was the Abbey of Bursfeld, situated directly west of Göttingen, on the River Weser, in what is now the Prussian Province of Hanover. It was founded in 1093 by Duke Henry of Nordheim and his wife Gertrude, who richly endowed it. Henry IV of Germany granted it numerous privileges and immunities. Its first abbot, Almericus, came from the neighbouring Abbey of Corvey, bringing thence a band of monks. Following the Benedictine tradition, Almericus opened a school in connexion with the abbey, which soon became famous, and under the next four abbots its fame continued to increase. But in 1331, under the worthless Abbot Henry Lasar, monastic discipline began to relax; the school was neglected, and the rich possessions were dissipated. From 1331 to 1424 no records of the abbey were kept. When, in 1424, the aged Albert of Bodenstein became Abbot of Bursfeld, church and school had fallen almost into ruins, the monastery itself was in a dilapidated condition, and but one old monk remained there. Albert would gladly have restored Bursfeld to its former splendour, but was too old to undertake the gigantic task. He resigned the abbacy in 1430.

During the fifteenth century a strong desire for monastic and other ecclesiastical reforms made itself felt throughout the Catholic world. One of the first Benedictine reformers was the pious and zealous John Dederoth, of Münden or Nordheim. Having effected notable reforms at Clus, where he had been abbot since 1430, Dederoth was induced by Duke Otto of Brunswick, in 1433, to undertake the reform of Bursfeld. Obtaining four exemplary religious from the monastery of St. Matthias, he assigned two of them to the monastery of Clus, to maintain his reformed discipline there, while the other two went with him to Bursfeld. Being still Abbot of Clus, he was able to recruit from that community for Bursfeld. Dederoth succeeded beyond expectation in the restoration of Bursfeld and began the reform of Reinhausen, near Göttingen, but died 6 February, 1439, before his efforts in that quarter had borne fruit.

THE BURSFELD UNION.—Although the monasteries reformed by him never united into a congregation, still Dederoth's reforms may be looked upon as the foundation of the renowned Bursfeld Union, or Congregation. Dederoth, indeed, intended to unite the reformed Benedictine monasteries of Northern Germany by a stricter uniformity of discipline, but the execution of his plan was left to his successor, the celebrated John of Hagen (not to be confounded with the Carthusian John of Hagen, otherwise called Johannes de Indagine). In 1445 John of Hagan obtained permission from the Council of Basle to restore the Divine Office to the original form of the old Benedictine Breviary and to introduce liturgical and disciplinary uniformity in the monasteries that followed the reform of Bursfeld. A year later (11 March, 1446) Louis d'Allemand, as Cardinal Legate authorized by the Council of Basle, approved the Bursfeld

Union, which then consisted of the six abbeys: Bursfeld, Clus, Reinhausen, Cismar in Schleswig-Holstein, St. Jacob near Mainz, and Huysburg near Magdeburg. The cardinal likewise decreed that the Abbot of Bursfeld should always ex officio be one of the three presidents of the congregation, and that he should have power to convoke annual chapters. The first annual chapter of the Bursfeld Congregation convened in the monastery of Sts. Peter and Paul at Erfurt in 1446. In 1451, while on his journey of reform through Germany, the Cardinal Legate, Nicholas of Cusa, met John of Hagen at Würzburg, where the Benedictine monasteries of the Mainz-Bamberg province held their triennial provincial chapter. The legate appointed the Abbot of Bursfeld visitor for this province, and in a bull, dated 7 June, 1451, the Bursfeld Congregation was approved, and favoured with new privileges. Finally, on 6 March, 1458, Pope Pius II approved the statutes of the congregation and gave it all the privileges which Eugene IV had given to the Italian Benedictine Congregation of St. Justina since the year 1431. In 1461 this approbation was reiterated, and various new privileges granted to the congregation. Favoured by bishops, cardinals, and popes, as well as by temporal rulers, especially the Dukes of Brunswick, the Bursfeld Congregation exercised a wholesome influence to promote true reform in the Benedictine monasteries of Germany during the second half of the fifteenth, and the first half of the sixteenth, century. At the death of Abbot John of Hagen thirty-six monasteries had already joined the Bursfeld Congregation, and new ones were being added every year. During its most flourishing period, shortly before the Protestant revolt, at least 136 abbeys, scattered through all parts of Germany, belonged to the Bursfeld Union.

The religious revolution, and especially the consequent risings of the peasants in Germany, greatly retarded the progress of the Bursfeld Reform. In 1579, Andrew Lüderitz, the last Abbot of Bursfeld, was driven from his monastery by the Lutheran Duke Julius of Brunswick, and, after an existence of almost five hundred years, Bursfeld ceased to be a Catholic monastery. The possessions of the abbey were confiscated, and the abbot was replaced by an adherent of Luther. About forty other Benedictine abbeys belonging to the Bursfeld Congregation were wrested from the Church, their possessions confiscated by Lutheran princes, and their churches demolished or turned to Protestant uses. Though greatly impeded in its work of reform, the Bursfeld Congregation continued to exist until the compulsory secularization of all its monasteries at the end of the eighteenth, and the beginning of the nineteenth, century. Its last president was Bernard Bierbaum, Abbot of Werden in the Rhine Province, who died in 1798. Bursfeld (Bursfelde) is at present a small village with about 200 inhabitants, for whom a Lutheran minister holds services in the old abbey church.

THITHEMIUS, *Chronicon Hirsaugiense* (St. Gall, 1690), II, 350; LEUCKFELD, *Antiquitates Bursfeldenses* (Leipzig and Wolfenbüttel, 1703); EVELT, *Die Anfänge der Bursfelder Benedictiner-Congregation* (Münster, 1865); BIEDENFELD, *Mönchs- und Klosterfrauen-Orden* (Weimar, 1837), I, 281; BROCKHOFF, *Die Klöster der ht. kath. Kirche* (Oberhausen); HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1896), I, 141; LINNEBORN, *Die Reformation der westfälischen Benedictinerklöster im 15. Jahrh. durch die Bursfelder Congregation* in *Studien u. Mittheilungen aus dem Benedictiner-Orden*, XX–XXII; BERLIÈRE, *Les origines de la congrégation de Bursfeld* in *Revue Bénédictine*, XVI.

MICHAEL OTT.

Burton, GEORGE A. See CLIFTON, DIOCESE OF.

Bury St. Edmund's, THE ABBEY OF.—The first religious foundation there was established by Sigebert, King of the East Angles, who resigned his crown to found a monastery about 637. It became celebrated when the relics of the martyred King Edmund were brought there in 903, after which time the town, till then called Beodericsworth, became known as St. Edmund's Town or St. Edmund's Bury. During the reign of Canute (1016–35) the secular canons were replaced by Benedictines. In 1095 there was a solemn translation of the saint's relics to the new church built by Abbot Baldwin. The shrine grew in fame, wealth, and magnificence till the monastery was considered second only to Glastonbury, but in 1465 a terrible fire caused irreparable loss to the church, from which it never recovered. The abbot had a seat in Parliament and possessed full jurisdiction over the town and neighbourhood. There was accommodation for eighty monks, but more than two hundred persons resided in the Abbey. At the dissolution, the revenues were valued at £2,366, equivalent to more than £20,000 in present money. It was in the abbey church that the memorable meeting of barons took place in the year 1214, when Cardinal Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, standing at the high altar, read out the proposed Charter of Liberties, which in the form of Magna Charta was signed by King John in 1215. The abbey was finally dissolved by Henry VIII in 1539, when the abbey church and the monastic buildings were in large measure destroyed, the gateway, an ancient

THE NORMAN TOWER

ABBEY HILL AT PRESENT DAY

bridge, and other scattered ruins alone now remaining. The fate of the saint's relics has never been decided. According to one tradition, they were abstracted by Prince Louis of France in 1217. Relics purporting to be those of the saint were long preserved at Toulouse, until in 1901, Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster, obtained leave to translate them to England. Doubts having been thrown on the authenticity of the relics, a commission of investigation was appointed by the Holy See, but no report has been published. Among the famous monks of the Abbey were Abbot Sampson and his chronicler

Jocelin of Brakelond (d. 1211); John Boston de Bury, author and bibliographer (d. 1430); John Lydgate, poet (d. 1446), and Byfield who was burnt for heresy in 1530.

THOMPSON, *Records of St. Edmund's;* DUGDALE, *Monasticon* (London, 1821), III, 98–176; JOCELINI DE BRAKELONDA, *De rebus gestis Samsonis Abbatis* (Camden Society, 1840); TYMMS, *Handbook of Bury St. Edmund's* (8th ed., 1905). See also CARLYLE, *Past and Present* (1843).

EDWIN BURTON.

Bus, CÉSAR DE, VENERABLE, a priest, and founder of two religious congregations, b. 3 February, 1544, at Cavaillon, Comtat Venaissin (now France); d. 15 April, 1607, at Avignon. At eighteen he joined the king's army and took part in the war against the Huguenots. After the war he devoted some time to poetry and painting, but soon made up his mind to join the fleet which was then besieging La Rochelle. Owing to a serious sickness this design could not be carried out. Up to this time de Bus had led a pious and virtuous life, which, however, during a sojourn of three years in Paris was changed for one of pleasure and dissipation. From Paris he went back to Cavaillon. Upon the death of his brother, a canon of Salon, he succeeded in obtaining the vacated benefice, which he sought for the gratification of his worldly ambitions. Shortly after this, however, he returned to a better life, resumed his studies, and in 1582 was ordained to the priesthood. He distinguished himself by his works of charity and his zeal in preaching and catechizing, and conceived the idea of instituting a congregation of priests who should devote themselves to the preaching of Christian doctrine. In 1592, the "Prêtres séculiers de la doctrine chrétienne", or "Doctrinaires", were founded in the town of L'Isle and in the following year came to Avignon. This congregation was approved by Pope Clement VIII, 23 December, 1597. Besides the Doctrinaires, de Bus founded an order of women called "Filles de la doctrine chrétienne" and later Ursulines. Pope Pius VII declared him Venerable in 1821. Five volumes of his "Instructions familières" were published (Paris, 1666).

DE BEAUVAIS, *Vie du P. César de Bus* (Paris, 1645); DUMAS, *Vie du P. de Bus* (Paris, 1703); HELYOT, *Histoire des ordres religieux*, revised ed. by BADICHE in MIGNE, *Encyclopédie théologique* (Paris, 1848), XXI; BRISCHAR in *Kirchenlex.*, III, 1873, s. v. *Doctrinarier;* BAILLET, *Les vies des saints* (Paris, 1739), III, 617; HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der kathol. Kirche* (Paderborn, 1897), II, 338.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Busche, HERMANN VON DEM. See HUMANISTS.

Busée (BUSÆUS or BUYS), PIERRE, a Jesuit theologian, b. at Nimwegen in 1540; d. at Vienna in 1587. When twenty-one years old he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Cologne, where, six years later (1567), he became master of novices. In addition to this office he was appointed to give religious instruction to the higher classes in the Jesuit college at Cologne. He then undertook to complete the large catechism of Canisius by adding to it the full text of the Scriptural and patristic references cited by the author. St. Peter Canisius himself encouraged this undertaking. The first volume appeared at Cologne in 1569, under the title: "Authoritates sacræ Scripturæ et sanctorum Patrum, quæ in summâ doctrinæ christianæ doctoris Petri Canisii citantur". The following year, 1570, the work was completed, and was received at once with much favour. It consists of four volumes; for some unknown reason the last volume is lacking in the fine edition of the catechism, with notes by Busée, which was issued in 1571 by the celebrated house of Manutius, of Venice, the descendants of Aldus Manutius. In 1577 a new edition, revised and augmented by another Jesuit, Jean Hase, was published at Cologne in one folio volume, under another title: "Opus catechisticum . . . D. Petri Canisii theologi S. J. præclaris divinæ Scripturæ testimoniis, sanctorumque Patrum sententiis sedulo illustratum operâ D. Petri Bussæi Noviomagi, ejusd. Soc. theologi, nunc vero primum accessione novâ locupletatum atque restitutum". Six years before this Father Busée had left Cologne and gone to Vienna, where he lectured on the Holy Scriptures in the university and taught Hebrew at the college of the Jesuits. In 1584 Busée went to Rome at the command of the General of the Society, Father Acquaviva, who had appointed him a member of a commission to draw up a system or plan of studies (*Ratio Studiorum*) for the entire Society. On his return to Vienna Busée was made Rector of the College of Nobles and died while holding this position.

DE BACKER AND SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la c. de J.*, II, col. 439–442; BRAUNSBERGER, *Entstehung und erste Entwicklung der Katechismen des S. Petrus Canisius* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1893); BRUCKER in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, col. 1265, 1266.

A. FOURNET.

Busembaum, HERMANN, moral theologian, b. at Notteln, Westphalia, 1600; d. at Münster, 31 January, 1668. He entered the Society of Jesus in his nineteenth year. After completing his studies he taught the classics, philosophy, and moral and dogmatic theology, in various houses of the order. He was rector of the colleges of Hildesheim and Münster, socius to the provincial, and again rector at Münster, where he died. His prudence, keenness of intellect, firmness of will, large-heartedness, and tact combined to form a rare character. These natural gifts were heightened by a singular innocence of life and constant communion with God. Hence we are not surprised to learn that he was eminently successful as a director of souls. He was chosen by Christoph Bernhard von Galen, the Prince-Bishop of Münster, as his confessor and became his most trusted adviser; and much of the growth and enduring spiritual activity of that diocese is due to these two men. Towards the end of his life Busembaum was attacked by a lingering and extremely painful sickness. He died peacefully and with sentiments of great piety. He was a holy man; but it is as a great theologian that he is especially remembered. In 1645 as Southwell says, or according to De Backer in 1650, appeared his principal work: "Medulla theologiæ moralis facili ac perspicuâ methodo resolvens casus conscientiæ ex variis probatisque auctoribus concinnata". This work is a classic; its conciseness, clearness, method, depth, vastness of theological lore compressed into so small a volume, sanity of judgment, and practical utility proclaimed its author to be a man gifted in a superlative degree with the moral instinct and the powers of a great teacher. Busembaum's name became in a short while one of the important ones in moral theology. In his preface to the first edition he acknowledges his indebtedness to two Jesuits, Hermann Nünning and Friedrich Spe, whose manuscripts he had before him while composing his own work, and he claims for them a share in whatever good his "Medulla" was to effect. The author lived to see the fortieth edition of his little book. Up to the year 1845, over two hundred editions had appeared, which gives us an average of more than one edition for every year of its existence. The book was printed in all the great centres of the Catholic world, Münster, Cologne, Frankfort, Ingolstadt, Lisbon, Lyons, Venice, Padua, and Rome; it was used as a textbook in numberless seminaries for over two centuries. This success is certainly phenomenal. Nor was Busembaum less fortunate in his commentators. Three of the greatest moralists of their respective periods, La Croix, St. Alphonsus Liguori, and, in our own days, Ballerini, took the "Medulla" as their text and commented on it in their masterly volumes. St. Alphonsus wished to put into the hands

THE ABBEY OF ST. EDMUND, BEFORE THE REFORMATION

of the students of his congregation the book that would help them most to master in a limited time and with order the difficult science of moral theology. During several years he had read very many authors, but his choice finally fell on Busembaum.

The foregoing statements give full assurance of Busembaum's orthodoxy and authority. For it is incredible that the Church would have tolerated in the schools in which her future priests were being trained for the sacred ministry a book that taught a morality which was not her own. The attacks made on Busembaum have been singularly futile. He was accused of teaching doctrine that is subversive of authority and of the security of kings. This charge was founded on the following proposition: "Ad defensionem vitæ et integritatis membrorum licet filio et religioso et subdito se tueri, si opus sit, cum occisione, contra ipsum parentem, abbatem, principem, nisi forte propter mortem hujus secutura essent nimis magna incommoda, ut bella" (Lib. III, Pt. I. tr. iv, dub. 3, "De homicidio"). Busembaum lays down this principle: According to the natural law it is permitted to repel by force an unjust aggressor, and, if it be necessary for the saving of one's life, to kill him. In such cases, however, the person attacked should have the intention of defending himself, and should not inflict greater harm or use more force than is necessary for self-defence. Then according to his method Busembaum applies the principle to various cases; and among them is the one to which the adversaries object. So that the proposition which caused the trouble is merely an application of a principle of the natural law to an individual case. This proposition is taken almost verbatim from St. Antoninus. It is essentially the same as the doctrine of St. Thomas, who says: "And therefore as it is permitted to resist robbers so also is it permitted to resist evil rulers in similar circumstances, unless perchance to avoid scandal, should it be feared that any serious disturbance might result" (II–II, Q. lxix, a. 4). St. Alphonsus refers to this proposition of Busembaum in a letter to his editor, Redmondini, 10 March, 1758, and remarks "the proposition is not at all condemnable". The truth of the matter is that our author is here following in the footsteps of very eminent theologians and the doctrine is not singular. Another objection is that Busembaum defends the principle, the end sanctions the means; the sense of the objection being that when the end is lawful, means in themselves unlawful are justified; that is, if the end is good, one may do something that is against the natural law to attain that end. Now the truth is, that Busembaum teaches the opposite: "Præceptum naturale negativum, prohibens rem intrinsece malam non licet violare ne quidem ob metum mortis". (A negative precept of the natural law which prohibits a thing intrinsically evil can never be lawfully transgressed not even under the influence of the fear of death, Lib. I, tr. ii, c. iv. dub. 2, n. 1.) So that it is not lawful to do a thing which is wrong in itself, even to escape death. The incriminated passage occurs under the question which Busembaum puts: "Quid liceat reo circa fugam pœnæ" (Lib. IV, c. iii, d. 7, a. 2). He answers: "It is lawful for the accused even when really guilty to escape before and after the sentence of death or of some punishment equal to death, v. g. life imprisonment, has been passed. The reason is because man's right to the preservation of his life is so great that no human power can oblige him not to preserve it, if there be well-grounded hope of his doing so; unless indeed the public weal demand otherwise. Hence the accused may escape . . . unless indeed charity urge him not to do so, when the harm to the guards is greater than that which would come to himself. (1) Much more so may he flee so as not to be captured . . . but he must use no violence by wounding or striking the ministers of justice. (2) He may also, at least before the tribunal of conscience, deceive the guards—excluding violence and injury—by giving them, for instance, food or drink to induce sleep, or by bringing it about that they will be absent; he may snap his chains, or break open the prison; because when the end is lawful, the means are also lawful." Here therefore we have the explicit exclusion of unlawful means, and the sense of the phrase is only this: when the end is lawful then is the use of means in themselves indifferent, i. e. not unlawful, permitted. We must here remark that there is in the "Medulla" a very small number of solutions taken from and defended by other authors, which were afterwards rejected by Alexander VII and Innocent XI. But these solutions are not peculiar to Busembaum. Nor should we be surprised that an author who solves almost numberless practical cases should err at times in his application of laws and principles to particular, intricate instances. The real wonder is that the mistaken applications in Busembaum's great work are so very few.

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II, 259; THOELEN, *Menologium* (Roermond, 1901), 73; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* (Paris, 1891), II, 445; FRITZ in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Busembaum;* DUHR, *Jesuitenfabeln* (Freiburg im Br., 1899), 432, 524; REICHMANN, *Der Zweck heiligt die Mittel* (Freiburg im Br., 1903), 13, 22, 121; *Letters of St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori* (New York, 1896), Pt. II, *Special Correspondence*, I, let. xxxvi.

TIMOTHY B. BARRETT.

Busiris, a titular see taking its title from one of the many Egyptian cities of the same name. This particular Busiris was situated in the middle of the Delta, on the Pathmitish, or Damietta Branch of the Nile. The ancient Egyptian name, *Pa-osiri*, means "House of Osiris", the god being supposed to be buried there; hence the Coptic *Pousiri*, Greek Πούσιρις and Βούσειρις, Arabic *Abusīr*. It now exists as a village under the last of these names and is to be distinguished from another similarly named town on the coast of Lydia. Busiris was the chief town of the Busirite *nomos* (Hierocles, Synecdemos 725, 7) and became a see of Ægyptus Secunda. Its bishop, Hermæon, is mentioned at Nicæa (325) by Meletius, as one of his partisans. About this time there was united to the title of Busiris that of Kynos, from the important city of Lower Kynos (Athanas., "Apol. c. Arianos", lxxviii, in P. G., XXV, 376). Its bishop, Athanasius, defended Dioscorus at the Latrocinium of Ephesus in 449, but apologized publicly at Chalcedon (Liberatus, Breviarium, xiv). From the seventh century on, the see is mentioned in the lists of the Greek patriarchate (Georgius Cyprius, 736), though its titulars belong really to the Jacobite patriarchate. Thus, in 742, its bishop, James, takes a part in the election of the Patriarch Michael I (Renaudot, "Hist. Patriarch. Alexandrin.", 207); a little later, under the same patriarch, its bishop, Peter, is mentioned (ibid., 227); we hear also of Severus, under Philotheus (979–1003) and of Chaïl, or Michael, and Mohna in the thirteenth century (ibid., 458, 569).

LEQUIEN, *Or. Christ.*, II, 569, 570; GAMS, *Series episcop.*, 461. For the ruins at Abusîr, see NAVILLE in the *Seventh Mem. of the Egyptian Exploration Fund* (London, 1890), 27.

L. PETIT.

Buskins (*caligæ*), ceremonial stockings of silk, sometimes interwoven with gold threads, and even heavily embroidered, worn by the celebrant of a pontifical Mass. Originally worn by priests, they were reserved about the eighth century for the exclusive use of bishops, a privilege recently extended to lesser prelates. In colour they correspond to the chasuble, but are never worn with black.

CATALANI, *Cerem. Episcop. Comm. Illus.* (Paris, 1860), I, 197–199; BERNARD, *Le Pontifical* (Paris, 1902), I, 17–18; MACALISTER, *Ecclesiastical Vestments* (London, 1896), 104–105.

JOHN B. PETERSON.

Buss, Franz Joseph, Ritter von, jurist, b. 23 March, 1803, at Zell in Baden; d. 31 January, 1878, at Freiburg im Breisgau. He studied at the University of Freiburg where he took the doctor's degree in philosophy, law, and medicine. After a short stay at the Universities of Bonn and Göttingen he returned to Freiburg, passed a brilliant examination and was appointed attorney for that city. He became ordinary professor at the university in 1836, where he soon obtained a large following among the students, because in the face of strong opposition he treated fearlessly vexed social, and ecclesiastical questions. To meet his many opponents Buss often lectured four, even five, times a day. Throughout his life he warmly advocated the interests of the people, whom he habitually reached through the press and his public discourses. Besides a modern language club of which he was the founder and president, he gave much of his time to creating at Freiburg a centre for the comparative study of European legislation and jurisprudence. A large collection of valuable material was already in his hands, and his extensive knowledge of law and of the principal languages of Europe seemed to promise success. He soon found, however, that the means of international correspondence were inadequate to the enterprise. Some of the material collected appeared in book form (1835–46), the sole fruit of this great scheme.

In 1837 Buss was elected to the Lower House of Baden and addressed himself at once to such subjects as the social question, the liberty of the Church, a uniform customs system, and closer commercial union between the States of Germany. Unfortunately, Buss met from the beginning a hostile majority, deaf to all his propositions and bent on his defeat. He was reproached in open Parliament with the errors and false steps into which the liberalism and restless activity of his youth had betrayed him. Unable to make the least impression on the assembly he resigned his seat. Elected again in 1846, Buss opposed vigorously the "Deutschkatholicismus" of Ronge. This brought out his opponents in full force. Extensive petitions in his favour compelled the Government to dissolve the Parliament; but the new election brought no improvement. Buss was still the only champion of the Church in the Lower House, whilst in the upper the whole weight of the opposition fell on Baron von Andlau and his colleague, Hirscher.

Buss now directed his irrepressible activities to more profitable work. The "Methodology of Canon Law" (1842), the "Influence of Christianity on Law and State" (1844), the "Difference between Catholic and Protestant Universities in Germany" (1846), the "German Union and the Love for Prussia", the "Re-establishment of Canon Law", and the "Defence of the Jesuits" (1853) appeared in rapid succession, each to do the work of the hour. But these publications did not absorb all his energy. He introduced the Sisters of Charity into the Grand Duchy of Baden; transformed his own house into an ecclesiastical college; during the famine of the winter of 1846 he fed thousands of starving people in the Black Forest; and he organized the Catholics politically and formed them into societies. In 1848 Buss had the honour of presiding over the first general assembly of the German Catholic associations in Mainz. He represented Ahaus-Steinfurt in the German Parliament at Frankfort. There, as in the Erfurt Union Parliament, where he was the leader of the Greater-Germany Party, he favoured Austria as against Prussia. When the opposition to the Church in Baden developed into open hostility, Buss was at the side of the archbishop, Hermann von Vicari. He now very opportunely published (1855) his "Life of St. Thomas of Canterbury", and dedicated it to the persecuted archbishop. He was elected for the third time to the Baden Landtag when the Concordat between Baden and the Holy See was in jeopardy. He at once organized a popular deputation to the sovereign, comprising representatives from all the parishes of Baden. But the old opposition prevented the demonstration, invalidated his election, and ejected him from the Landtag, and finally, at the next election, his constituents forsook him. Buss now, more than ever, turned his face towards Austria. During the Austro-Italian war he was so active and successful at the head of an association for the relief of the German prisoners that in acknowledgment of his services the emperor conferred on him the Order of the Iron Crown. He also organized at Vienna a great manifestation in favour of the temporal power of the pope, for which he was decorated by Pius IX with the Order of Gregory the Great.

Under the strain of excessive work and some bitter disappointments, Buss broke down completely in 1866. A grave attack of melancholy unbalanced his mind. After long treatment he recovered, but events had meanwhile advanced so rapidly that he no longer recognized the old Fatherland. His long cherished hopes for the hegemony of Austria were blasted. He rejoiced at the victories of the German armies in the Franco-Prussian war, but remained averse to the new German Empire. Elected a fourth time to the Lower House of Baden, Buss maintained his former reputation. In 1874 he was sent to the Reichstag by a very large vote and took his seat with the Centre Party. In 1877, after the death of his youngest child, he withdrew from public life and died soon after. In spite of failures Buss achieved a great success in keeping Catholics alive to current events and their bearing on the Church. He set Catholic Germany a stimulating example by organizing and binding together no less than four hundred Catholic associations, while to the Catholics of Baden he gave what they most needed, a consciousness of their strength, and the determination to fight for their civic and religious rights.

Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse* (Paris, 1905), II, 269 sqq.; Hägele in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1556–61.

Charles B. Schrantz.

Bustamante, Carlos María, Mexican statesman and historian, b. at Oaxaca, Mexico, 4 November, 1774; d. in Mexico, 29 September, 1848. Although constantly concerned in the politics of Mexico, and occupying several very responsible positions during the most trying times of the Mexican Republic until the close of the war with the United States, Bustamante found time and leisure to secure a prominent position in the historical literature of his country. In 1796 he took up the study of law, participated in the attempts to secure independence from Spain, and, when that was finally achieved, opposed the designs of Iturbide to transform the newborn republic into a hereditary monarchy. Repeatedly imprisoned and banished, he was nevertheless appointed to important positions in the Government. The American war was a source of deep grief to him, and he felt so keenly the disastrous results of it for his country that he survived its close only about one year. His historical sketch of that war is a sad record of the decay and disintegration which afflicted Mexico at that time. He writes with the greatest frankness, and unsparingly, about the conduct of the war on the Mexican side. His autobiography, published in 1833, is also valuable as a fragment of contemporary history.

Bustamante distinguished himself by publishing historical works on colonial times, till then in manuscript and partly forgotten. Above all, his publication of the "Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España", by Fray Bernardino de Sahagún of the second half of the sixteenth century, was a service

to historical research. It is open to grave criticism, being defective and sometimes slovenly, but it should not be forgotten that it is the first of its kind and was published during a most troubled period of the editor's life. It must be condemned as unreliable in many respects, and yet it has opened the road to more exhaustive, and hence more valuable, investigations. In addition to the work of Sahagún, Bustamante printed the chronicle of Gomara, the work of Veytia on Tezcuco, the dissertations of Gama on two large Mexican sculptures, and others. To the history by Sahagún he added one of the *relaciones* of Ixtlilxochitl, selected by him for the passionate spirit which it displays against the Spaniards. Bustamante's anti-Spanish feelings influence even his scientific publications and detract from their value.

Any modern history of Mexico touches on the life and writings of Bustamante. In addition to the autobiography mentioned (Lo que se dice, y lo que se hace, 1833), and the light shed by his other works, the "Diccionario universal de Historia y Geografía" (Mexico, 1853), contains an exhaustive account of the man. Alamán has written about him in terms of great eulogy, putting in relief especially his private character and the virtues of his domestic life.

ALAMÁN, *Historia de México* (Mexico, 1848); IDEM, *Disertaciones sobre la Historia de la República Mexicana* (Mexico, 1848); *Diccionario hispano-americano*.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Buston (or BUSTEN), THOMAS STEPHEN, Jesuit missionary and author, b. 1549, in the Diocese of Salisbury, England; d. at Goa, 1619. He entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus on 11 October, 1576, and in the following year sailed for India, landing at Goa on 24 October, 1578. He settled in the island of Salsette, on the west coast of the peninsula, and in 1584 he became superior of the Jesuits in that district, retaining the office until his death thirty-five years later. Buston wrote several works to further the instruction and conversion to Christianity of the natives; his writings are the earliest known to have been printed in Hindustan. Buston's published works are: "Arte da lingoa canarina", a grammar of the language spoken in Canara, a district on the Malabar coast. It is written in Portuguese, the language used by Europeans on that coast. Father Diogo de Ribeiro had the work printed, with his own additions, at Goa, in 1640. "Doutrina christã em lingua bramana" (1632); "Discurso sobre a vida de Jesus Christo" (Rachol, 1649); "Purana", a collection of poems written in the Indian language, illustrating the chief mysteries of Christianity. Buston, at the time of his death, was held in general repute as an apostle and a saint.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliographie des écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus*, II, 469, 470; JÖCHER, *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, I.

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Bute, JOHN PATRICK CRICHTON-STUART, THIRD MARQUESS OF, b. at Mountstuart, Bute, 12 September, 1847; d. at Dumfries House, Ayrshire, 9 October, 1900, was the only child of the second Marquess by his second wife, Lady Sophia Hastings, and succeeded to the family honours when only six months old. His mother died in 1859, and after some disputes between his guardians he was sent to Harrow and subsequently to Christ Church, Oxford. Here he came under the influence of the advanced section of the Anglican Church, whose tenets his keen and logical intellect quickly saw to be inconsistent with non-communion with the Catholic Church. Bute's letters to one of his very few intimate friends during his Oxford career show with what conscientious care he worked out the religious question for himself. On the 8th of December, 1868, he was received into the Church by Monsignor Capel at a convent in Southwark, and a little later was confirmed by Pius IX, in Rome. He was present in Rome during part of the sittings of the Vatican Council, travelled afterwards in the East, and then returned home to settle down on his extensive estates in Scotland and Wales.

In April, 1872, he married the Hon. Gwendolen Howard, eldest daughter of the first Lord Howard of Glossop, and had by her three sons and a daughter. A scholar and somewhat of a recluse by temperament, Bute had a high sense of public duty, and admirably fulfilled his functions as a great landowner and employer of labour. The first peer in modern times to undertake municipal office, he served both as Mayor of Cardiff and (twice) as Provost of Rothesay, in his titular island. His munificence was in proportion to his vast wealth (derived chiefly from his property in Cardiff), and innumerable poor Catholic missions throughout Britain, as well as private individuals, could testify to his lavish, though not indiscriminate generosity. A patron of learning throughout his career, he expended large sums in the assistance of impecunious scholars and in the publication of costly and erudite works. He was for several years Lord Rector of St. Andrews University, to which, as well as to Glasgow University, he was a munificent benefactor. Bute was a Knight of the Thistle, and also a Knight Grand Cross of St. Gregory and of the Holy Sepulchre. His personal habits were simple; but as a lover of art, with means to gratify his taste, he surrounded himself in his various splendid homes with much that was artistic and beautiful. His last years were clouded by a long and trying illness, patiently borne; and he died as he had lived, a devout and humble Catholic, a few weeks after his fifty-third birthday.

Bute's chief published works are: "The Roman Breviary translated into English" (2 vols., 1879); "Ancient Language of the Natives of Teneriffe" (1891); "The Alleged Haunting of B—— House" (1899); "The Altus of St. Columba" (1882); "Early Days of Sir William Wallace" (1876); "David, Duke of Rothesay" (1894); "Form of Prayers, Christmas Services, etc." (1875, 1896); many articles in the "Scottish Review"; "Address at St. Andrews University" (published in Knight's "Rectorial Addresses").

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Buteux, JACQUES, French missionary in Canada b. at Abbeville, in Picardy, 11 April, 1600; slain by the Iroquois savages, 10 May, 1652. He entered the Society of Jesus in October, 1620, studied at La Flèche (1622–25), was an instructor at Caen (1625–29), and after his course of theology at La Flèche (1629–33) became prefect at the College of Clermont. In 1634 he went to Canada and was sent to the new settlement of Three Rivers, where he remained for eighteen years, ministering with extraordinary zeal to the Montagnais and Algonquin tribes. Though of frail and delicate physique, his soul was fired with an ardent desire for suffering, which nothing could satisfy. It was this trait in his character which most distinguished him from the other heroic men who had devoted their lives to the same work. In truth, no peril, however great, ever blanched his cheek or stayed his hand when there was question of serving God or saving a soul. He was endowed with a very special grace for instilling sentiments of piety into the hearts of the Indians, and those under his care were recognized by a tenderness of devotion and a spirit of faith which were lasting and altogether remarkable. Buteux himself has drawn a vivid picture of one of his apostolic journeys through a Canadian wilderness at the end of winter, of traversing almost pathless forests, crossing mountains, lakes, and rivers, wading knee deep in melting snow, and being unable on account of all these difficulties to carry enough food for more than "warding off

death, rather than supporting life". His death occurred on one of his journeys to the Attikamègues, a Montagnais tribe dwelling on the upper St. Maurice River. A troop of Iroquois lying in ambush riddled his right arm and breast with bullets, while the blows of their tomahawks completed the sacrifice. Mother Mary of the Incarnation writes that "his death was an incredible loss to the mission". Father Buteux has left, besides other documents, an interesting account of the captivity of Father Isaac Jogues.

ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1896), I, 264, 265; THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations*, VI, 326; IX, 307; XXXVII, 9, 19–67; LXXII, 114, 115; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliographie des écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus*, II, 471; VII, 1953.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Butler, ALBAN, historian, b. 10 October, 1710, at Appletree, Northamptonshire, England; d. at St-Omer, France, 15 May, 1763. He shares with the venerable Bishop Challoner the reputation of being one of the two most prominent Catholic students during the first half of the dreary eighteenth century, when the prospects of English Catholics were at their lowest. After the death of his father in 1712, he was sent to the celebrated "Dame Alice's School", at Fernyhalgh, in Lancashire. From thence while still young he was transferred to the English College at Douai, where he went through the full course, and was ordained priest in 1735. He had already gained a reputation for extraordinary diligence and regularity, and was asked to remain at the college as professor, first of philosophy, later on of theology. During his years at Douai, he devoted himself to what became the great work of his life, "The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and Other Principal Saints". His mastery of ancient and modern languages fitted him specially for a task which involved such wide reading, while his unremitting industry and steady perseverance enabled him to overcome all obstacles. He also assisted Dr. Challoner, by preparing matter for the latter's "Memoirs of Missionary Priests", the standard work on the martyrs of the reign of Elizabeth and later. Butler's notes are still preserved at Oscott College.



ALBAN BUTLER

In 1745 Alban Butler was chosen to accompany the Earl of Shrewsbury and his two brothers, James and Thomas Talbot, both afterwards bishops, on a tour through Europe. On his return he acted as mission priest in various parts of the Midland District, to which he belonged by origin. Though ever seeking leisure for study, we are told that he was precise in the discharge of all his duties, and his time was always at the disposal of the poor or others who had a claim upon him. We next find him acting as chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk, whose nephew (and heir presumptive), the Hon. Edward Howard, he accompanied to Paris as tutor. During his residence there, Butler at length completed his work on the "Lives of the Saints", on which he had been engaged nearly thirty years. It contains biographies of more than 1,600 saints arranged in order of date; and is a monument of work and research. It was published anonymously, in London, in 1756–59, nominally in four, really in seven octavo volumes. This was the only edition which appeared during the author's lifetime; but there have been many others since, and the work has been translated into Italian and French.

In 1766 the presidency of the English College at St-Omer, in France, falling vacant by the elevation of Thomas Talbot to the episcopate, Alban Butler was appointed to succeed his former pupil, no doubt that he might be placed where he would have greater facilities for study. The college had formerly belonged to the Jesuits, but had been handed over to the secular clergy by the French Government when the Society of Jesus was banished from France. The Douai authorities accepted the college in order to save it from being confiscated, with the intention of restoring it to its owners should circumstances ever permit. The Jesuits, however, resented their action, and under these circumstances Alban Butler hesitated about accepting the position offered him; but we are told by his nephew and biographer, Charles Butler, that having taken counsel of the Bishops of Amiens and Boulogne, he was advised that he could accept the post with a safe conscience. A few years later the general suppression of the Society of Jesus throughout the world put an end to any doubt on the matter. Butler found, however, that his hopes of leading a studious life were doomed to disappointment, for his reputation by this time was such that no less than four bishops of neighbouring dioceses, Arras, Boulogne, St-Omer, and Ypres, continually sought his advice, and invested him with faculties as vicar-general. Thus during the concluding years of his life he had to devote himself to active work more than at any previous time. He was buried in the parish church of St-Denis almost opposite to the English College at St-Omer. Since the Revolution, all traces of his tomb have disappeared. His works include: "Letters to a Gentleman on Bower's Lives of the Popes" (1754); "Lives of the Saints" (1756–59; many times republished); "Life of Mary of the Holy Cross" (1767). After his death Bishop Challoner published "The Movable Feasts and Fasts"; and Charles Butler edited: "Travels" (1791), "Meditations" (1791) and, "Life of Sir Tobie Matthews" (1795).

BUTLER, *Life;* COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.;* GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.;* KIRK, *Biog. Collections*, MS.

BERNARD WARD.

Butler, CHARLES, one of the most prominent figures among the English Catholics of his day, b. in London, 1750; d. 2 June, 1832. He belonged to an ancient Northamptonshire family, and was a nephew of the Rev. Alban Butler, the author of "The Lives of the Saints". After spending two or three years at a private school at Hammersmith, he was sent to the preparatory house at Equerchin, dependent on the English College at Douai, then to the college itself, where he went through the full course. On his return to England he gave himself to the study of law. Owing to his religion, he was unable to become a barrister; so he followed the example of a large class of Catholics of that day, who became conveyancers and practised in chambers. He studied successively under Mr. Duane and Mr. Maire, both conveyancers of eminence, and Catholics. In 1775 he began to practise, and continued for over forty years. From the first he was very successful, and for more than half the period named he was acknowledged as the first conveyancer of the day. Among his pupils were some distinguished men, notably Sir Thomas Denman, afterwards attorney-general. Butler was not, however, content with his position. The fact that he could not be called to the Bar was a continual mortification to him, and it was chiefly this which led him to take an active part in the efforts of Catholics to obtain the repeal

of the Penal Laws. He was elected secretary to the committee of laymen appointed for this end, and he put his heart and soul into the work. This brought him into the dissensions which unhappily existed at that time between laymen and the bishops. From the first Butler sided with the former, and the "Blue Books", which were the official publications of the committee, were almost entirely written by him. Notwithstanding the internal dissensions among the Catholic body, the bill for their partial relief was passed through Parliament in 1791, and Butler, the first to profit by the enactment, was called to the Bar that year. The disputes connected with the Catholic Committee brought Butler into direct conflict with Milner, then a simple priest. Early in the nineteenth century, when the Veto Question arose, Milner, by this time a bishop, became the strong opponent of Butler, against whom he wrote and spoke for many years. In the end, by the aid of O'Connell, Catholic Emancipation was passed in 1829, without the concession of any kind of veto.

With such an active life, both professional and political, we may wonder how Charles Butler could have found time for any literary pursuits; but by a habit of early rising, a systematic division of his time, and unceasing industry, he contrived, as he himself tells us, to provide himself with an abundance of literary hours. His writings were many, and their variety indicate an extraordinary versatility of talent. He could write with facility on such different subjects as law, history, music, social questions, and Holy Scripture. Among his own profession his work on Coke-Littleton, on which he collaborated with Mr. Hargrave, is best known; among the general Catholic public his "Historical Memoirs of English, Scottish and Irish Catholics" was most read. This work brought him again into conflict with Bishop Milner, who replied with his "Supplementary Memoirs".

Charles Butler was married in 1776 to Mary, daughter of John Eyston, of Hendred, Berks, by whom he had one son, who died young, and two daughters. In private life he was a devout Catholic; even Milner admitted that he might with truth be called an ascetic. Every Catholic work of importance numbered him among its chief subscribers. He survived his opponent, Dr. Milner, and lived to see Catholic emancipation. One of the consolations of his declining years was his elevation to the dignity of King's Counsel after the passing of the Act, an occasion on which he received a special message of congratulation from the king.

There are two miniatures of him in possession of his grandson, Judge Stonor, one of which is the original of the engraving in the first edition of the "Historical Memoirs"; there is also an oil painting of him as a boy at Douai, and a bust at Lincoln's Inn. His chief works are: "Hargrave's Coke on Littleton" (eight editions, 1775–1831); "On Impressing Seamen" (1777); "Horæ Biblicæ" (1797–1802); "Life of Alban Butler" (1800); "Horæ Juridicæ Subsecivæ" (1804); Lives of Fénelon (1811) and Bossuet (1812); "Trappist Abbots and Thomas à Kempis" (1814); "Symbols of Faith of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Protestant Churches" (1816); "The French Church" (1817); "Church Music" (1818); "Historical Memoirs of English, Scottish, and Irish Catholics" (three editions, 1819–22); "Reminiscences" (1822); "Continuation of Alban Butler's Saints' Lives" (1823); "Life of Erasmus" (1825); "Book of the Roman Catholic Church" (1825); vindication of preceding (1826); appendix to same (1826); "Life of Grotius" (1826); "The Coronation Oath" (1827); "Reply to Answers" to same (1828); "Memoirs of d'Aguesseau and Account of Roman and Canon Law" (1830).

BUTLER, *Reminiscences;* COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.;* GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.;* AMHERST, *Cath. Emancipation;* MILNER, *Supplem. Memoirs;* HUSENBETH, *Life of Milner;* WARD, *Catholic London a Century Ago; Cath. Magazine* (1832); STONOR in *Law Review* (1836).

BERNARD WARD.

Butler, MARY JOSEPH, first Irish Abbess of the Irish Benedictine Abbey of Our Lady of Grace, at Ypres, Flanders, b. at Callan, County Kilkenny, Ireland, in Dec., 1641; d. at Ypres, 22 Dec., 1723. Sent to be educated under the care of her aunt, Lady Abbess Knatchbull of the English Benedictine Dames at Ghent, she petitioned, when twelve years old, to be received into the order, a request granted two years later. She made her religious profession 4 Nov., 1657 at the English Benedictine convent at Boulogne, at the age of sixteen. In 1665 the mother-house of Ghent made another foundation, at Ypres, with Dame Beaumont as abbess, but as the house did not thrive under her auspices, it was decided, upon her death in 1682, to convert the house at Ypres into a national foundation for the Irish Benedictine nuns of the various houses founded from Ghent. Dame Butler accordingly was sent to Ypres in 1683, and, on the death of the second abbess, in 1686, was elected Abbess of the Irish Dames of Ypres, 29 August. Soon after her election she was called upon to take a leading part in a new Benedictine foundation in Dublin, set on foot by King James II. By letters-patent or charter, which is dated in the sixth year of his reign, and still preserved in the convent of Ypres, King James confers upon this his "first and chief Royal Monastery of Gratia Dei", an annuity of one hundred pounds sterling to be paid forever out of his exchequer, and appoints his "well-beloved Dame Mary Butler" first abbess. Her brother was King James's Chief Cupbearer for Ireland, a title hereditary in the Butler family, as their name implies. Having overcome many difficulties Abbess Butler set out for Dublin in the year 1688, and in passing through London was presented with her nuns in the Benedictine habit to the Queen at Whitehall. Towards the end of the year she arrived in the Irish capital, and took up her abode in a house in Great Ship Street. Here the Divine Office and regular observance were at once begun and a school opened. About thirty young girls of the first families were entrusted to the nuns for their education and no less than eighteen of them expressed a wish to become religious. But the good work was rudely interrupted by the entry of the usurper William's forces into Dublin, after the battle of the Boyne (1 or 11 July, 1690). The convent was sacked by his soldiery, and the nuns forced to seek refuge in a neighbouring house, but the church plate and other treasures were saved by the presence of mind of a lay sister, Placida Holmes, who disguised herself in secular clothes, and mingled with the plunderers. On the closing of the Dublin convent, the Duke of Ormonde assured his cousin, Abbess Butler, of his special protection, should she consent to remain in Ireland, but she decided to return to Ypres, upon which the duke procured for her, from the Prince of Orange, a passport (still preserved at Ypres) permitting her and her nuns to leave the country without molestation.

On her arrival at Ypres she resumed conventual life in extreme poverty with only a few lay sisters to assist her. So great indeed was their destitution that the bishop strongly urged her to sell the house and retire whithersoever she pleased, but she would not abandon the work, and her faith was rewarded, for at length in the year 1700, she had the happiness of professing several new subjects (among them two Irish ladies from the French Court) who assisted her in keeping up the choir and regular observance. She continued to govern her flock with much wisdom and discretion until the year 1723, when she died in the sixty-sixth year of her religious profession, and

the thirty-sixth year of her abbatial dignity. King James II, and more especially his Queen, Mary of Modena, were great benefactors and friends of Abbess Butler, and of the Irish convent of Ypres, which she saved from extinction and which has survived ever since. It enjoys the distinction of being the only religious house in all the Low Countries which remained standing during the storms of the French Revolution and of being the only Irish Abbey of the Benedictine Order.

NOLAN, *Hist. of Royal Irish Abbey of Ypres* (from MSS. in Convent archives).

PATRICK NOLAN.

Buttress, a pilaster, pier, or body of masonry projecting beyond the main face of the wall and intended to strengthen the wall at particular points and also to counterbalance the thrust of a roof or its vaulting. The term "counterfort" is used when the projection is on the inside. A flying buttress is an arch, resting at one end on a detached pier and it carries the thrust of the nave vault over the aisles or cloister. THOMAS H. POOLE.

Buxton, CHRISTOPHER, VENERABLE, priest and martyr, b. in Derbyshire; d. at Canterbury, 1 October, 1588. He was a scholar of Ven. Nicholas Garlick at the Grammar-School, Tideswell, in the Peak District, studied for the priesthood at Reims and Rome, and was ordained in 1586. He left Rome the next year, and soon after his arrival in England was apprehended and condemned to death for his priesthood. He suffered at Oaten Hill, Canterbury, together with Venerables Robert Wilcox and Edward Campion. Being so young, it was thought that his constancy might be shaken by the sight of the barbarous butchery of his companions, and his life was offered him if he would conform to the new religion, but he courageously answered that he would not purchase a corruptible life at such a price, and that if he had a hundred lives he would willingly surrender them all in defence of his faith. While in the Marshalsea Prison he wrote a "Rituale", the MS. of which is now preserved as a relic at Olney, Bucks. He sent this MS. to a priest, as a last token of his friendship, the day before he was taken from the prison to suffer martyrdom.

CHALLONER, *Memoirs;* FOLEY, *Records; Roman Diary* (London, 1880); MORRIS, *Catholics of York.*

BEDE CAMM.

Buxtorf, FAMILY OF. See HEBREW LANGUAGE.

Buys, PIERRE. See BUSÉE.

Byblos, a titular see of Phœnicia. Byblos is the Greek name of Gebal "The mountain", one of the oldest cities in Phœnicia Prima, quoted in an Egyptian inscription as early as 1550 B. C. Its inhabitants were skilled in stone and wood-working (III Kings, v, 18) and in shipbuilding (Ezech., xxvii, 9). It was governed by kings, the last of whom was dethroned by Pompey. It is celebrated chiefly for its temple of Adonis, or Thammouz, whose voluptuous worship spread thence over Greece and Italy. It was the native place of Philo, a Greek historian and grammarian. As a Christian see it was suffragan to Tyre and according to one tradition, its first bishop was John Mark, the companion of St. Paul and St. Barnabas. Five other bishops are known before 553 (Lequien, Or. Chr., II, 821). The city was destroyed by an earthquake in 551 (Malalas, Chronogr., XVIII, P. G., XCVII, 704) and was in ruins as late as 570 (Pseudo-Antoninus, ed. Geyer, 159). The Crusaders took it in 1104; it then had a Greek bishop, but he was obliged to yield his see to a Latin successor, and from 1130 to 1500 about twenty Latin bishops are known (Lequien, Or. Chr., III, 1177; Eubel, Hier. Cath., I, 139; II, 119). Many Latin bishops are mentioned in "Revue Bénédictine", 1904, 98, sqq.; 1907, 63, sq. The modern Arabic name is Gebaïl. It is a mere village with about 1,000 inhabitants, almost all Christians (650 Maronites). There are thirteen churches; three of them are very beautiful and trace their origin to the Crusades. There is also at Byblos a castle of the same time, likewise some ruins of temples of Adonis and Isis. Gebaïl is yet a diocese for the Orthodox Greeks. For the Catholic or Melchite Greeks, the title of Byblos is united with Beirut, and for the Maronites with that of Batroun (Botrys).

RENAN, *Mission de Phénicie* (Paris, 1864), 153–218; *Le Mois littéraire et pittoresque* (Paris, July, 1906); REY, *Étude sur les monuments de l'architecture des Croisés en Syrie* (Paris, 1871), 217–219; ROUVIER, *La nécropole de Gebal-Byblos* in *Revue biblique*, VIII, 553–565.

S. VAILHÉ.

Bye-Altar.—An altar that is subordinate to the central or high altar. The term is generally applied to altars that are situated in the bay or bays of the nave, transepts, etc. THOMAS H. POOLE.

Byllis, a titular see of Epirus Nova (Albania), whose title is often added to that of Apollonia among the suffragans of Dyrrachium (Durazzo). It was situated west of Avlona, on the coast, near the modern village Gradica, or Gradiste, a Slav name substituted in later episcopal "Notitiæ" for the old Illyrian name Byllis (Not. episc. III, 620; X, 702). Hierocles (653, 4) knows only of Byllis. Felix, Bishop of Apollonia and Byllis, was present at the Council of Ephesus, in 431. At Chalcedon in 451, Eusebius subscribes simply as Bishop of Apollonia; on the other hand, Philocharis subscribes as Bishop of Byllis only in the letter of the bishops of Epirus Nova to the Emperor Leo, (458).

LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christ.*, II, 248; FARLATI, *Illyricum sacrum*, VII, 395; GAMS, *Series episcop.*, 394.

L. PETIT.

Byrd, WILLIAM, English composer, b. in London in 1542 or 1543; d. 4 July, 1623. He was the son of a musician, and studied music principally under Thomas Tallis. He became organist at Lincoln Cathedral in 1563, chorister in the Chapel Royal in 1570, and in 1575 received the title of Organist of the Chapel Royal without being obliged to perform the functions of that office. Byrd was the most distinguished contrapuntist and the most prolific composer of his time in England. Fétis calls him the English Palestrina. He was the first Englishman to write madrigals, a form which originated in Italy in the thirteenth century, and received its highest development in the sixteenth century at the hands of Arcadelt and other masters. An organist and performer of the first order upon the virginals, Byrd wrote for the latter instrument an enormous number of compositions, many of which are played to-day. His chief significance lies, however, in his compositions for the church, of which he produced a great many. In 1607 he published a collection of *gradualia* for the whole ecclesiastical year, among which is to be found a three-part setting of the words of the multitude in the Passion according to St. John. A modern edition of this setting was published in 1899. In 1611 "Psalms, Songs and Sonnets, Some Solemn, Others Joyful, Framed to the Life of the Words, Fit for Voyces or Viols, etc." appeared. Probably in the same year was issued "Parthenia", a collection of virginal music, in which Byrd collaborated with J. Bull and Orlando Gibbons. Three masses, for three, four, and five voices, respectively, belong to the composer's best period. The one for five voices was reprinted by the Musical Antiquarian Society in 1841, and in 1899 the same work was issued by Breitkopf and Härtel. Two of his motets, "Domine, ne irascaris" and "Civitas sanctis tui", with English texts, are in the repertoire of most Anglican cathedrals. In spite of the harrowing religious conditions under which he lived, in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and James I, Byrd remained faithful to his principles and duties as a Catholic, as is shown in his life and by

his works. In his last will and testament he prays "that he may live and dye a true and perfect member of the Holy Catholike Churche withoute which I beleeve there is noe salvacon for me".

The Music Story Series: English Music, 1604 to 1904 (London and New York, 1906); RITTER, *Music in England* (New York, 1833); GROVE, *Dictionary of Music*.

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Byrne, ANDREW, Bishop of Little Rock, Arkansas, U. S. A., b. at Navan, Co. Meath, Ireland, 5 December, 1802; d. at Helena, Arkansas, 10 June, 1862. He was an ecclesiastical student when, in 1820, Bishop England sought volunteers for the mission of the newly created Diocese of Charleston (South Carolina), and he accompanied the bishop to the United States. He was ordained at Charleston, 11 November, 1827, and after active missionary work in South and North Carolina was for several years vicar-general of the diocese. In 1836 he removed to New York City, where he served at St. Patrick's, St. James's and the church of the Nativity, and finally altered, in 1843, the famous Carroll Hall, which might be termed the cradle of the public school system of New York, into St. Andrew's church. While pastor there in 1844, the new Diocese of Little Rock, comprising the State of Arkansas and part of the Indian Territory, was created, and Father Byrne was named its first bishop. He was consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, 10 March, 1844, at the same time that the Rev. John McCloskey (afterwards Cardinal) was consecrated coadjutor of New York, and the Rev. William Quarter, Bishop of Chicago. There were then in Arkansas only about 5,000 Catholics, with four priests and four churches. Shortly before Bishop Byrne died, he claimed that the number of Catholics had increased tenfold, with twenty-four priests, seventeen churches, fifty stations, and twelve schools and academies. He visited Ireland several times to obtain colabourers and assistants in the cause of religion and education. He introduced the Sisters of Mercy from Dublin and at the time of his death had almost completed arrangements for the starting of a college at Fort Smith by the Christian Brothers. He was one of the prelates attending the Sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore in May, 1846, and the First Provincial Council of New Orleans in 1856. At the Second Baltimore Council, in 1833, he acted as Bishop England's theologian.

Catholic Almanac (Baltimore, 1864); SHEA, *The Catholic Church in N. Y. City* (New York, 1878); CLARKE, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1872); BAYLEY, *Brief Sketch of the Early History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York* (New York, 1870).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Byrne, RICHARD, brevet brigadier general, United States Army, b. in Co. Cavan, Ireland, 1832; d. at Washington, 10 June, 1864. He emigrated from his native land to New York in 1844 and five years later enlisted in the regular army of the United States, joining the Second Cavalry, a regiment then commanded by Colonel E. V. Sumner. In this regiment young Byrne distinguished himself in the Indian campaigns in Florida and Oregon. At the breaking out of the Civil War he was, on the recommendation of his old commander, Colonel Sumner, commissioned First Lieutenant in the Fifth Cavalry, one of the new regiments authorized by Congress. During the campaigns of 1861 and 1862 he remained with the regiment of regulars and was then appointed by Governor Andrew, Colonel of the Twenty-Eighth Massachusetts Volunteers, an Irish regiment of which he took command, 18 October, 1862. In the November following, this regiment was attached to the famous Meagher's Irish Brigade and with it participated with special gallantry in all the fierce conflicts in which the Army of the Potomac was subsequently engaged. At its head Colonel Byrne charged up the fatal slope of Marye's Heights at Fredericksburg, and after it, like the other regiments of the brigade, had been almost wiped out in the sanguinary conflicts at Chancellorsville and Gettysburg, he was sent back to Massachusetts to recruit its ranks during the winter and spring of 1863 and 1864. When the campaign reopened in May he returned to the front and as the senior officer took command of the Irish Brigade. Two weeks after assuming command, on 3 June, 1864, he fell, mortally wounded, while leading the brigade at the attack on the entrenchments at Cold Harbor, Virginia. He lived long enough to be conveyed to Washington, where his wife reached him before he died. His commission as brigadier general had just been made out by President Lincoln, but he was dead before it could be officially presented to him. His remains were sent to New York and buried in Calvary Cemetery.

CONYNGHAM, *The Irish Brigade and its Campaigns* (Boston, 1869); *The Emerald*, files (New York, 8 January, 1870).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Byrne, WILLIAM, missionary and educator, b. in County Wicklow, Ireland, in 1780; d. at Bardstown, Kentucky, U. S. A., 5 June, 1833. He was one of a large family for whom he was obliged by the death of his father to become breadwinner. He desired to be a priest, but circumstances denied him more than a common elementary education, imparted to him by a pious uncle. Many of his near relatives were among the ill-starred patriots of the Rebellion of 1798, and the cruel and bloody scenes of that year enacted near his home made a vivid impression on his youthful mind. In his twenty-fifth year came the opportunity to emigrate to the United States, where, shortly after his arrival, he went to Georgetown College and applied for admission into the Society of Jesus. His advanced age and lack of classical education, however, convinced him, after some months' stay there, that he could not reasonably hope to attain in the Society, for many years at least, his ambition for ordination to the priesthood. He therefore left Georgetown, and by advice of Archbishop Carroll went to Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg. Here the Rev. John Dubois, the president, received him with sympathy, pointed out a course of study, and, finding him an excellent disciplinarian, made him prefect of the institution. He was nearly thirty years of age when he began to study Latin, but his zeal and perseverance conquered all obstacles.

In order to advance more rapidly in his studies, he entered St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, but the surroundings were not congenial, and he remained there only a short time. He had been ordained a subdeacon, and Bishop Flaget accepted his offer of service for the Diocese of Bardstown, Kentucky. He made further studies at St. Thomas's Seminary there, and was then ordained priest by Bishop David, 18 September, 1819, with his friend George A. M. Elder, whom he had met at Emmitsburg. They were the first priests ordained at Bardstown, and by Bishop David, who was consecrated 15 August, 1819. Shortly after his ordination Father Byrne was appointed to the care of St. Mary's and St. Charles's missions, visiting also the small congregation of Louisville, sixty miles distant, and labouring at all times with most indefatigable industry. The ignorance of the people and the necessity of establishing some institution for elementary instruction appealed to him strongly, and in the spring of 1821 he opened St. Mary's College, near Bardstown, in an old stone building that stood on a farm he had purchased with money begged from those who sympathized with his project. He had about fifty boys to begin with, one of them being Martin John Spalding, later the famous Archbishop of Baltimore, who even then was so precocious in the display of his abilities that at the age of fifteen he was appointed to teach mathe-

matics to his fellow students. Father Byrne, with indomitable energy, at first filled every office in the school, and attended to his missionary duties as well. His college had become very popular in Kentucky when it was destroyed by fire. This set-back seemed only to give him new energy, and he soon had the college rebuilt. A second fire ruined a large part of the new structure, but, nothing daunted, he went on and again placed the institution on a firm foundation.

It is estimated that from 1821 to 1833, during which time St. Mary's College was under his immediate direction, at least twelve hundred students received instruction there, and carried the benefit of their education to all parts of Kentucky, some of them establishing private schools on their return to their respective neighbourhoods. Father Byrne, after twelve years' management of the college, made a gift of it to the Society of Jesus, believing that, as he had established its success, his old friends, the Jesuits, were better qualified than he was to conduct the school. He thought of founding a new school at Nashville, where one was much needed, and, in spite of his advanced years, wrote to Bishop Flaget that all he required in leaving St. Mary's to embark on this new enterprise was his horse and ten dollars to pay his travelling expenses. Before he could carry out the plan, however, he fell a martyr to charity. An epidemic of cholera broke out in the neighbourhood and, having gone to administer the last sacraments to a poor negro woman who was dying of the disease, he became infected himself, and died on the following day among the Fathers of the Society of Jesus with whom at Georgetown he had begun his remarkable religious life.

SPALDING, *Miscellanea* (Baltimore, 1866), 729–35; WEBB, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.* (New York, 1892), IV, 600; *Messenger of the Sacred Heart Magazine* (New York, Dec., 1891); *Irish Celts* (Detroit, 1884).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Byzantine Architecture, a mixed style, i. e. a style composed of Græco-Roman and Oriental elements which, in earlier centuries, cannot be clearly separated. The form of church used most in the west, a nave supported on columns and an atrium (see BASILICA), appears in many examples of the fifth century in Byzantium as well as in Rome; the sixth century saw such churches erected in other regions outside of Rome, at Ravenna, in Istria and in Africa. In the West this style of building occasionally presents (in S. Lorenzo and S. Agnese at Rome) peculiarities which are ascribed by some authorities to Oriental origin—galleries over the side aisles, spirally channelled columns, and imposts between capitals and arches. Vaulted basilicas are to be found at an early date in Asia Minor, Syria, Africa, and also at Constantinople. But the early Etruscans and Romans were skilful in the art of constructing vaults, even before that time; for instance, the basilica of Constantine. The domical style, with barrel-vaulted side aisles and transepts is a favourite with the Orientals; many of the oldest basilicas of Asia Minor, as well as the Church of St. Irene, Constantinople (eighth century), carried one or more domes. This type leads naturally to the structure in a centralized—circular, octagonal, cruciform—plan. That the Orient had, and still has, a peculiar preference for such a type is well known; nevertheless, Italy also possessed ecclesiastical buildings so planned, of which the oldest examples belong to the fourth and fifth centuries (Sta. Costanza, a circular building; and the baptistery of the Lateran, an octagonal building). In ancient Roman times tombs and baths had this sort of plan. The essential type of all these buildings cannot, therefore, be regarded as purely Oriental, or even specifically Byzantine. There are similar objections in the case of subordinate architectural details. Thus the apse, sometimes three-sided, sometimes polygonal, the narthex (a narrow antechamber, or vestibule), instead of the large rectangular atrium, the invariable facing of the church to the east, the sharp-cut acanthus leaf of the capitals, and similar characteristics of the Eastern churches cannot be definitely ascribed to the East alone or even to Byzantium, nor do they form a new architectural style. Some authorities, it is true, not only go so far as to characterize the architecture of Ravenna (exemplified in the two churches S. Apollinare and S. Vitale) as Byzantine, but even include, without further consideration, examples which in other respects recall the favourite Eastern style, viz. the central portions of S. Lorenzo at Milan and of the round church of S. Stefano Rotondo at Rome. Only this much is certain: that in those early centuries local diversities are found everywhere; and that, even although Italy may have received the most manifold influences from the East, and particularly from Byzantium, still, on the other hand, the language, laws, and customs of Rome prevailed in Byzantium, or at least were strongly represented there.



GROUND PLAN, CHURCH OF ST. THEOSOPHOS, CONSTANTINOPLE

In the church, now the mosque, of St. Sophia (*Hagia Sophia*—"Divine Wisdom"), built by Justinian, all the principal forms of the early Christian churches are represented. A rotunda is enclosed in a square, and covered with a dome which is supported in the direction of the long axis of the building by half-domes over semicircular apses. In this manner a basilica, 236 feet long and 98 feet wide, and provided with domes, is developed out of a great central chamber. This basilica is still more extended by the addition of smaller apses penetrating the larger apses. Then the domical church is developed to the form of a long rectangle by means of two side aisles, which, however, are deprived of their significance by the intrusion of massive piers. In front of all this, on the entrance side, are placed a wide atrium with colonnaded passages and two vestibules (the exonarthex is practically obliterated). The stupendous main dome, which is hemispherical on the interior, flatter, or saucer-shaped, on the exterior, and pierced with forty large windows over the cornice at its spring, has its lateral thrust taken up by these half domes and, north and south, by arched buttresses; the vertical thrust is received by four piers 75 feet high. The ancient system of column and entablature has here only a subordinate significance, supporting the galleries which open upon the nave. Light flows in through the numerous windows of the upper and lower stories and of the domes. But above all, the dome, with its great span carried on piers, arches, and pendentives, constitutes one of the greatest achievements of architecture. (These pendentives are the triangular surfaces by means of which a circular dome can be supported on the summits of four arches arranged on a square plan.) In other respects the baptistery of Sta. Costanza at Rome, for example, with its cylindrical drum under the dome, has the advantage that the windows are placed in the drum instead of the dome.

The architects of St. Sophia were Asiatics: Anthemius of Tralles and Isodorus of Miletus. In other great basilicas, as here, local influences had great power in determining the character of the archi-

ST. SOPHIA, CONSTANTINOPLE

tecture, e. g. the churches of the Nativity, of the Holy Sepulchre, and of the Ascension, built in Palestine after the time of Constantine. This is still more evident in the costly decorations of these churches. The Oriental love of splendour is shown in the piling up of domes and still more in facing the walls with slabs of marble, in mosaics (either *opus sectile*, small pieces, or *opus Alexandrinum*, large slabs cut in suitable shapes), in gold and colour decorations, and in the many-coloured marbles of the columns and other architectural details. Nothing, however, seems to betray the essentially Oriental character of Byzantine architecture so much as the absence of work in the higher forms of sculpture, and the transformation of high into low decoration by means of interwoven traceries, in which the chiselled ornaments became flatter, more linear, and lacelike. Besides the vestibules which originally surrounded St. Sophia, the columns with their capitals recall the antique. These columns almost invariably supported arches instead of the architrave and were, for that reason, re-enforced by a block of stone (impost block) placed on the top and shaped to conform to the arch, as may frequently be seen at Ravenna. Gradually, however, the capital itself was cut to the broader form of a truncated square pyramid, as in St. Sophia. The capitals are at times quite bare, when they serve at the same time as imposts or intermediate supporting blocks, at other times they are marked with monograms or covered with a network of carving, the latter transforming them into basketlike capitals. Flat ornamentations of flowers and animals are also found, or leaves arbitrarily arranged. Much of this reminds one of the Romanesque style, but the details are done more carefully. The fortresslike character of the church buildings, the sharp expression of the constructive forms, the squatty appearance of the domes, the bare grouping of many parts instead of their organic connexion—these are all more in accordance with the coarser work of the later period than with the elegance of the Greek. Two other types of Justinian's time are presented by the renovated church of the Apostles and the church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus. Both churches are in the capital. The latter somewhat resembles S. Vitale in Ravenna. It is a dome-crowned octagon with an exterior aisle. The former church (now destroyed) was built on the plan of a Greek Cross (with four equal arms) with a dome over the crossing and one over each arm.

Capital in Church of St. Sophia, Thessalonica

During the period of the Macedonian emperors, Basil I (867–886) and Leo VI (886–912), an upward trend in politics, literature, and art set in. The Greek basilica, which is a lengthened structure, barrel-vaulted and provided with one or more domes, is also widely represented in this period, while the western form of basilica, with the wooden ceiling, is completely discarded. A type appearing more frequently is the domical church plan or the Greek-cross plan. The Koimesis, or Dormitio, in Nicæa (ninth century) has a clear basilica plan. This is also true of the church of the Holy Mother of God (*Hagia Theotokos*) at Constantinople, dating from the tenth century, and of the churches of Mt. Athos. The church at Skripu in Bœotia, of the same period, has indeed three naves each ending in an apse, but the dome crowns the middle of the building as in the Greek-cross type. The exteriors of these churches, which are usually rather small, are treated with greater care and are artistically elaborated with alternations of stone and brick, smaller domes over the vestibules, a decidedly richer system of domes, and the elevation of these domes by means of drums. The interiors are decorated most gorgeously. It seems that they could not do enough in this respect. This can still be seen in the church of St. Luke in Phocis, at Daphni, in the Nea Moni at Chio, and others. In this period the perfected art of the capital becomes the model for the empire as well as for regions beyond its borders: Syria, Armenia, Russia, Venice, Middle and Southern Italy, and Sicily. For the West, it is only necessary to mention the church of St. Mark at Venice (978–1096).

After its occupation by the Crusaders (1204), Constantinople partly lost its character and at the same time the far-reaching influence of its intercourse with Western nations. There still remained four centres of Byzantine art: the capital itself, Mt. Athos, Hellas, and Trebizond. The architecture of Mt. Athos presents the most faithful reflection of the Byzantine style. The model of the church of the monastery of Laura, belonging to the previous period, is more or less faithfully reproduced. A dome, supported on four sides by barrel vaults, stands directly over the middle of the transept, which is terminated at either end by a round apse. A narthex, or rather two lead into the lengthened main hall. The real architectural ornaments are forced into the background by the frescoes which take the place of the costly mosaics and which practically cover all available wall surface. The architecture of this period remained stationary. It continued unchanged in the countries of the Greek Rite after the fall of Constantinople (1453).

For the bibliography of Byzantine architecture and Byzantine art see Krumbacher, *History of Byzantine Literature* (2nd ed., Munich, 1897), in the appendix; Millet, *L'art byzantin* in Michel, *Hist. de l'art* (Paris, 1905), I; Texier and Pullan, *Byzantine Architecture* (1843–44); Frothingham, *Byzantine Artists in Italy* in *Am. Journal of Archæology* (1894); Strygowski, *Orient und Rom* (Leipzig, 1901), Id., *Kleinasien* (Leipzig, 1903); Bréhier, *Eglises byzantines* (Paris, 1906).

G. Gietmann.

Byzantine Art signifies the art of the Eastern Roman Empire and of its capital Byzantium, or Constantinople. The term denotes more especially those qualities which distinguish this art from that of other countries, or which have caused it to exert an influence upon the art of regions outside of the Eastern Empire. Christian art was dependent for the representation of its new conceptions upon the forms which the time and place of its origin happened to offer. In the beginning, whether at Rome, Ravenna, or Byzantium (Constantinople), it was equally influenced by classical art and by Eastern inclination to allegory. It is a distinguishing characteristic of Constantinople, however, that it was able to maintain a more uniform classical tradition in the face of manifold Oriental influences. These two elements, from the time of Constantine, developed in the Byzantine art more and more of an individual character, though account must also be taken of the friendly intercourse with Western Europe during several hundred years. Beginning with the seventh century, the contrast between the art of the Eastern Empire and that of the Western grew more marked, and Byzantine art underwent a change. It rose to great splendour under the Macedonian emperors (867–1056), then declined up to 1453, and has since existed in the East in a petrified form, so to speak, up to the present time.

The Byzantine Question.—In regard to the first period of Byzantine art, which closed either before the reign of Justinian or at the end of the sixth century, scholars differ greatly. Some, like Schnaase, Strygowski, and Woermann, date Byzantine art

proper from the time of Constantine's establishment of his capital. They base this opinion upon certain differences between the art remains of the first period of the Eastern Roman Empire and those of the Western Roman Empire, which differences they maintain are essential. Other scholars, such as Springer, Kraus, and Kuhn, hold these peculiarities to be unessential, since they find them here and there in Western countries as well, a fact which the former critics ascribe to Oriental influence. Bréhier disagrees with both views. He distinguishes between Oriental art and that specifically Byzantine; that is, between the art of Byzantium, or Constantinople, and that of her dependent provinces, Asia Minor, Syria, Persia, and Egypt. This is a fairly good solution of the "Byzantine question". But as it is difficult to distinguish in detail the combinations of old classic and Christian with Oriental art, we can only group together the principal characteristics of the new style and its materials, with a few examples.

CHARACTERISTICS.—The introduction of Eastern court ceremonial by Constantine was accompanied in the domain of art by the appearance of extraordinary gorgeousness and pomp, expressed, however, with stiffness and formality. The power and pride of the new empire offered the means for great undertakings and gave the impulse to them. The Proconnesian marble, found in the vicinity of the capital, and the stone obtained from other rich quarries provided the material, and, long before this era, the art of working in stone had reached a high state of development, especially in Asia Minor. Moreover, the East had been from ancient times the home of the minor arts. In Constantinople there flourished, along with the art of decorative sculpture, the arts of stone-carving, of working in metal and ivory, of ornamental bronze work, of enamelling, of weaving, and the art of miniature-painting. From classical and ancient Christian art Byzantine genius derived a correct combination of the ideal with truth to nature, harmonious unity along with precision in details, as well as the fondness for mosaics, frescoes, and pictures on panels, in opposition to the dislike of non-Christian and sectarian Orientals to pictorial representation. The iconoclasm of the eighth and ninth centuries wrought great destruction in the domain of art, but these outbreaks were successfully suppressed.

EXAMPLES.—In regard to the influence of the Byzantine style on architecture see BYZANTINE ARCHITECTURE. As to the other arts a few examples may here be given. The church of St. Sophia was adorned in the sixth century with a splendour worthy of Solomon. The interior was sumptuously decorated with mosaics upon a golden background. These mosaics, it is true, with the exception of an "Adoration of Christ by the Emperor", were destroyed, but they were replaced later by others. Some of the walls were ornamented with designs of grape-vines with golden leaves. Pictures of animals decorated the walls of the portico. A silver choir-screen rose above pillars, in the capitals of which medallions of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, saints, and prophets were carved. This is the so-called iconostasis. The altar was of gold inlaid with precious stones; the altar-cloth was of brocaded silk in which were woven pictures of Christ, the prophets, and the apostles. The ambo, according to description, was brilliant with gold, silver, precious stones, and ivory. At Parenzo, in Istria, and at Bauit, in Egypt, superb mosaic pictorial ornamentation dating from the sixth century is still preserved. A gold cross decorated with pictures in hammered work was presented by Justin II to the church of St. Peter and is still preserved at the Vatican. A number of ivory book-covers are also still in existence. The illuminated manuscripts of Rossano and Sinope date from the sixth century.

INFLUENCE.—As regards the influence exerted by Byzantine art in the sixth century there can be no doubt that the architecture of Ravenna, though affected by other Eastern influences, strongly reminds us, in its splendid mosaics, of Constantinople. The Proconnesian capitals and other products of decorative art spread even more easily. Like Ravenna, Southern Italy and Gaul came under the influence of the East and Constantinople. Even more specifically Byzantine is African art. In Rome the traces of Byzantine art are more difficult to discover than other Oriental influences. In the East itself pictorial art met with opposition, and decorative art came to the forefront. In general, however, after the rise of the Macedonian dynasty the Byzantine style gained the supremacy in all branches of art as well as in architecture. The Byzantine style spread in the East as well as in Northern Italy and Sicily. The numerous mosaic pictures, which are to be found everywhere, still strove to imitate classical models; their symbolism reminds us of the general symbolic tendency of early Christianity, and their form gradually becomes more stiff and fixed. (Painter's Book of Mount Athos.) Purely Oriental, however, was the dislike constantly increasing for sculpture in the round, and the preference for the flat ornamentation in architecture. To the same Oriental influence may be attributed the taste for costly and many-coloured stones and woven fabrics, for goldsmith-work, and enamel. For example, in the treasury of San Marco may be seen Byzantine reliquaries, ivory triptychs, chalices, costly fabrics, and specimens of pictorial art. Some are large and some small, but taken altogether they show how a church of the eleventh century was transformed into a veritable treasure-house. The same taste and the same characteristics of the art of Byzantium (Constantinople) have ever since maintained their supremacy in the East. For further bibliography see BYZANTINE ARCHITECTURE.

IVORY RELIQUARY
(Hôtel de Cluny, Paris)

KONDAKOFF, *Hist. de l'art byzantin considéré principalement dans les miniatures* (tr. Paris, 1886–91); IDEM, *Les émaux byzantins* (Paris, 1892); MOLINIER, *Hist. des arts appliqués à l'industrie*, I, s.vv. *Les ivoires; L'orfèvrerie;* TEXIER-PULLAN, *Byzantine Architecture* (London, 1843–64); LETHABY-SWAINSON, *The Church of St. Sophia* (London, New York, 1894); FROTHINGHAM, *Byzantine Artists in Italy* in *Am. Journal of Archæology* (1894–95); MACPHERSON, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre* in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* (1892), VII; WESTWOOD, *Fictile Ivories in the South Kensington Museum* (London, 1886); SCHULTZ-BARNSLEY, *Phocis and the Dependent Monastery of St. Nicolas-in-the-fields near Skripou* (London, 1901); VELUDO, *La pala d'oro di S. Marco*, Eng. and Fr. trs. (Venice, 1887); CAHIER AND MARTIN, *Mélanges d'archéologie* (Paris, 1847–56.)

G. GIETMANN.

Byzantine Empire.—The ancient Roman Empire having been divided into two parts, an Eastern and a Western, the Eastern remained subject to successors of Constantine, whose capital was at Byzantium or Constantinople. The term *Byzantine* is therefor,

employed to designate this Eastern survival of the ancient Roman Empire. The subject will be here treated under the following divisions: I. Byzantine Civilization; II. Dynastic History. The latter division of the article will be subdivided into six heads in chronological order.

I. Byzantine Civilization.—At the distance of many centuries and thousands of miles, the civilization of the Byzantine Empire presents an appearance of unity. Examined at closer range, however, firstly the geographical content of the empire resolves itself into various local and national divisions, and secondly the growth of the people in civilization reveals several clearly distinguishable periods. Taking root on Eastern soil, flanked on all sides by the most widely dissimilar peoples—Orientals, Finnic-Ugrians, and Slavs—some of them dangerous neighbours just beyond the border, others settled on Byzantine territory, the empire was loosely connected on the west with the other half of the old Roman Empire. And so the development of Byzantine civilization resulted from three influences: the first Alexandrian-Hellenic, a native product; the second Roman; the third Oriental. The first period of the empire, which embraces the dynasties of Theodosius, Leo I, Justinian, and Tiberius, is politically still under Roman influence. In the second period the dynasty of Heraclius, in conflict with Islam, succeeds in creating a distinctively Byzantine State. The third period, that of the Syrian (Isaurian) emperors and of Iconoclasm, is marked by the attempt to avoid the struggle with Islam by completely orientalizing the land. The fourth period exhibits a happy equilibrium. The Armenian dynasty, which was Macedonian by origin, was able to extend its sway east and west, and there were indications that the zenith of Byzantine power was close at hand. In the fifth period the centrifugal forces, which had long been at work, produced their inevitable effect; the aristocracy of birth, which had been forming in all parts of the empire, and gaining political influence, at last achieved its firm establishment on the throne with the dynasties of the Comneni and Angeli. The sixth period is that of decline; the capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders had disrupted the empire into several new political units; even after the restoration, the empire of the Palæologi is only one member of this group of states. The expansion of the power of the Osmanli Turks prepares the annihilation of the Byzantine Empire.

St. Helena, Wife of Constantine the Great, from MS., IX Century, in Bibliothèque Nationale

Geographically and ethnographically, the Roman Empire was never a unit. In the western section, comprising Italy and the adjacent islands, Spain, and Africa, the Latin language and Latin culture were predominant. Of these territories, only Africa, Sicily, and certain parts of Italy were ever under Byzantine control for any length of time. To the south-east, the Coptic and Syriac, and, if the name is permitted, the Palestinian nation assumed growing importance and finally, under the leadership of the Arabs, broke the bonds that held it to the empire. In the East proper (Asia Minor and Armenia) lay the heart of the empire. In the south-east of Asia Minor and on the southern spurs of the Armenian mountains the population was Syrian. The Armenian settlements extended from their native mountains far into Asia Minor, and even into Europe. Armenian colonies are found on Mount Ida in Asia Minor, in Thrace, and Macedonia. The coast lands of Asia Minor are thoroughly Greek. The European part of the empire was the scene of an ethnographic evolution. From ancient times the mountains of Epirus and Illyria had been inhabited by Albanians; from the beginning of the fifteenth century they spread over what is now Greece, down towards southern Italy and Sicily. Since the days of the Roman power, the Rumanians, or Wallachians, had established themselves on both sides as well of the Balkan as of the Pindus mountains. This people was divided into two parts by the invasion of the Finnic-Ugrian Bulgars, and the expansion of the Slavs. They lived as wandering shepherds, in summer on the mountains, in winter on the plains. In the fifth century the Slavs began to spread over the Balkan Peninsula. At the beginning of the eighth century Cynuria, in the eastern part of the Peloponnesus, was called a "Slavic land". A reaction, however, which set in towards the end of the eighth century, resulted in the total extermination of the Slavs in southern Thessaly and central Greece, and left but few in the Peloponnesus. On the other hand, the northern part of the Balkan Peninsula remained open to Slavic inroads. Here the Bulgars gradually became incorporated with the Slavs, and spread from Hæmus far to the west, and into southern Macedonia. The valleys of the Vardar and the Morava offered the Serbs tempting means of access to the Byzantine Empire. After the Greeks and Armenians, the Slavs have exercised most influence on the inner configuration of the empire. The Greeks of the islands best preserved their national characteristics. Moreover, they settled in compact groups in the capital of the empire, and on all the coast lands, even to those of the Black Sea. They gained ground by hellenizing the Slavs, and by emigrating to Sicily and lower Italy.

In point of civilization, the Greeks were the predominant race in the empire. From the second half of the sixth century, Latin had ceased to be the language of the Government. The legislation eventually became thoroughly Greek, both in language and spirit. Beside the Greeks, only the Armenians had developed a civilization of their own. The Slavs, it is true, had acquired a significant influence over the internal and external affairs of the empire, but had not established a Slavic civilization on Byzantine soil, and the dream of a Roman Empire under Slavic rule remained a mere fantasy.

In the breaking of the empire on ethnographic lines of cleavage, it was an important fact that at least the Greeks were more solidly united than in former centuries. The dialects of ancient Greece had for the most part disappeared, and the *Koiné* of the Hellenic period formed a point of departure for new dialects, as well as the basis of a literary language which was preserved with incredible tenacity and gained the ascendancy in literature as well as in official usage. Another movement, in the sixth century, was directed towards a general and literary revival of the language, and, this having gradually spent itself without any lasting results, the dialects, unfortunately, became the occasion of a further split in the nation. As the later literary language, with its classic tendencies, was stiff and unwieldy, as well as unsuited to meet all the exigencies of a colloquial language, it perforce helped to widen the breach between the literary and the humbler classes, the latter having already begun to use the new dialects. The social schism which had rent the nation, since the establishment of a distinctively Byzantine landed interest and the rise of a provincial nobility, was aggravated by the prevalence of the literary language among the governing classes, civil and

ecclesiastical. Even the western invasion could not close this breach; on the contrary, while it confirmed the influence of the popular tongue as such, it left the social structure of the nation untouched. The linguistic division of the Greek nation thus begun has persisted down to the present time.

The Middle Ages never created a great centralized economic system. The lack of a highly organized apparatus of transportation for goods in large quantities made each district a separate economic unit. This difficulty was not overcome even by a coastline naturally favourable for navigation, since the carrying capacity of medieval vessels was too small to make them important factors in the problem of freight-transportation as we now apprehend it. Even less effectual were the means of conveyance employed on the roads of the empire. These roads, it is true, were a splendid legacy from the old Roman Empire, and were not yet in the dilapidated state to which they were later reduced under the Turkish domination. Even to-day, for example, there are remains of the Via Egnatia, connecting Constantinople with the Adriatic Sea through Thessalonica, and of the great military roads through Asia Minor, from Chalcedon, past Nicomedia, Ancyra, and Cæsarea, to Armenia, as well as of that from Nicæa through Dorylæum and Iconium, to

RELIQUARY, CONSTANTINE THE GREAT DEPICTED AT FOOT OF CROSS
(Preserved at St. Peter's, Rome)

Tarsus and Antioch. These roads were of supreme importance for the transportation of troops and the conveyance of dispatches; but for the interchange of goods of any bulk, they were out of the question. The inland commerce of Byzantium, like most medieval commerce, was confined generally to such commodities, of not excessive weight, as could be packed into a small space, and would represent great values, both intrinsically and on account of their importation from a distance—such as gems, jewellery, rich textiles and furs, aromatic spices, and drugs. But foodstuffs, such as cereals, fresh vegetables, wine, oil, dried meat, as well as dried fish and fruits, could be conveyed any distance only by water. Indeed, a grave problem presented itself in the provisioning of the capital, the population of which approached, probably, that of a great modern city. It is now known that Alexandria at first supplied Constantinople with grain, under State supervision. After the loss of Egypt, Thrace and the lands of Pontus were drawn upon for supplies. Of the establishment of an economic centre, however, for all parts of the empire, of a centralized system of trade routes radiating from Constantinople, there was no conception. Moreover, Byzantine commerce, strange to say, shows a marked tendency to develop in a sense opposite to this ideal. At first there was great commercial activity; the Byzantines offered to India, Persia, and Central and Eastern Asia a channel of communication with the West. Various districts of the empire strove to promote the export of industrial articles, Syria and Egypt, in particular, upholding their ancient positions as industrial sections of importance, their activity expressing itself chiefly in weaving and dyeing and the manufacture of metals and glass. The Slavonic invasion, moreover, had not entirely extinguished the industrial talents of the Greeks. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, weaving, embroidery, and the fabrication of carpets were of considerable importance at Thebes and Patræ. In the capital itself, with government aid in the form of a monopoly, a new industrial enterprise was organized which confined itself chiefly to shipbuilding and the manufacture of arms in the imperial arsenals, but also took up the preparation of silk fabrics. The Byzantines themselves, in the earlier periods, carried these wares to the West. There they enjoyed a commercial supremacy for which their only rivals were the Arabs and which is most clearly evidenced by the universal currency of the Byzantine gold *solidus*. Gradually, however, a change came about: the empire lost its maritime character and at last became almost exclusively territorial, as appears in the decline of the imperial navy. At the time of the Arabian conflicts it was the navy that did the best work; at a later period, however, it was counted inferior to the land forces. Similarly there was a transformation in the mental attitude and the occupations of the people. The Greek merchant allowed himself to be crowded out in his own country by his Italian rival. The population even of an island so well adapted for maritime pursuits as Crete seemed, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, veritably afraid of the water. What wrought this change is still an unsolved problem. Here too, possibly, the provincial aristocracy showed its effects, through the extension of its power over the inhabitants of the country districts and its increasing influence on the imperial Government.

The decline of the Byzantine Empire is strikingly exhibited in the depreciation of currency during the reigns of the Comneni. At that period the gold *solidus* lost its high currency value and its commercial pre-eminence. It is noteworthy that at the same time we perceive the beginnings of large finance (*Geldwirtschaft*). For at an earlier period the Byzantine Empire, like the states of Western Europe, appears to have followed the system of barter, or exchange of commodities in kind. Nevertheless, as ground-rents were already paid in money during the Comneni period, some uncertainty remains as to whether the beginnings of finance, and of capital as a distinct power in the civilized world, should be sought in Byzantium or rather in the highly developed fiscal system of the Roman Curia and the mercantile activity of Italian seaports.

It will be seen from all this that the development of the Byzantine Empire was by no means uniform, in point either of time or of place. Why is it then that the word *Byzantine* conveys a definite and self-consistent idea? Was there not something which through all those centuries remained characteristic of Byzantines in contrast with the neighbouring peoples? To this it must be replied that such was certainly the case, and that the difference lay, first of all, in the more advanced civilization of Byzantium. Many small but significant details are recorded —as early as the sixth century Constantinople had a system of street-lighting; sports, equestrian games or polo-playing, and above all races in the circus attained a high national and political importance; Byzantine princesses married to Venetians introduced the use of table forks in the West. More

striking are the facts that as early as the eighth and ninth centuries, the Byzantines, in their wars with the Arabs, used gunpowder—the so-called Greek fire—and that a German emperor like Otto III preferred to be a Roman of Byzantium rather than a German. This Byzantine civilization, it is true, suffered from a serious and incurable disease, a worm gnawing at its core: the utter absence of originality. But here, again, we should beware of unwarranted generalization. A change in this respect is to be noted from age to age; in the first centuries, before the complete severing of the political and ecclesiastical ties uniting them with the Eastern nations, the Greek mind still retained its gift of receptivity, and ancient Greek art traditions, in combination with Persian, Syrian, and other Oriental motives, produced the original plan of the true Byzantine church, a type which left its impression on architecture, sculpture, painting, and the minor arts. And yet, so complete was the isolation of the empire, separated from other nations by the character of its government, the strictness of its court etiquette, the refinement of its material civilization, and, not least, by the peculiar development of the national Church, that a kind of numbness crept over both the language and the intellectual life of the people. The nations of the West were indeed barbarians in comparison with the cultured Byzantines, but the West had something for the lack of which no learning, no technical skill could compensate—the creative force of an imagination in harmony with the laws of nature.

PLAQUE: CHRIST PREACHING TO THE BIRDS AND FISHES

As to the share which Byzantine ecclesiastical development had in this isolation, it must be conceded that the constitution of the Eastern Church was rather imperial than universal. Its administration was seriously influenced by the politics of the empire; the boundaries of the empire bounded the Church's aspirations and activities. In the West, the obliteration of those boundaries by the Germanic peoples and the outburst of vigorous missionary activity on all sides furthered very notably the idea of a universal Church, embracing all nations, and unfettered by political or territorial limits. In the East the development was quite different. Here, indeed, missionary work met with considerable success. From the Syrian and Egyptian Church sprang the Ethiopian, the Indian, the Mesopotamian, and the Armenian Churches. Constantinople sent apostles to the Slavonic and Finnic-Ugrian races. Still, these Oriental Churches show, from the very beginning, a peculiar national structure. Whether this was a legacy from the ancient Eastern religions, or whether it was the reaction against Greek civilization which had been imposed upon the people of the Orient from the time of Alexander the Great, the adoption of Christianity went hand in hand with nationalism. Opposed to this nationalism in many important respects was the Greek imperial Church. Precisely because it was only an imperial Church, it had not yet grasped the concept of a universal Church. As the imperial Church, constituting a department of the state-administration, its opposition to the national Churches among the Oriental peoples was always very emphatic. Thus it is that the dogmatic disputes of these Churches are, above all, expressions of politico-national struggles. In the course of these contests Egypt, and Syria, and finally Armenia also were lost to the Greek Church. The Byzantine imperial Church at last found itself almost exclusively confined to the Greek nation and its subjects. In the end it became, in its own turn, a national Church, and definitively severed all bonds of rite and dogma linking it with the West. The schism between the Eastern and Western Churches thus reveals a fundamental opposition of viewpoints: the mutually antagonistic ideas of the universal Church and of independent national Churches—an antagonism which both caused the schism and constitutes the insurmountable impediment to reunion.

II. DYNASTIC HISTORY.—(1) *Roman Period;* (a) *Dynasties of Theodosius I and Leo I; A. D. 395–518.*



A glance at the above genealogies shows that the law governing the succession in the Roman Empire persisted in the Byzantine. On one hand, a certain law of descent is observed: the fact of belonging to the reigning house, whether by birth or marriage gives a strong claim to the throne. On the other hand, the people is not entirely excluded as a political factor. The popular co-operation in the government was not regulated by set forms. The high civil and military officials took part in the enthronement of a new monarch, often by means of a palace or military revolution. Legally, the people participated in the government only through the Church. From the time of Marcianus, the Byzantine emperors were crowned by the Patriarchs of Constantinople.

Of the emperors of this period, Arcadius (395–408) and Theodosius II (408–50) received the throne by right of inheritance. The old senator Marcianus (450–57) came to the throne through his marriage with the sister of Theodosius II, Pulcheria, who for years previously had been an inmate of a convent. The Thracian Leo I, the Great (457–74), owed his power to Aspar the Alan, *Magister Militum per Orientem*, who, as an Arian, was debarred from the imperial dignity, and who therefore installed the orthodox Leo. Leo, it is true, soon became refractory, and in 471 Aspar was executed by imperial command. On Leo's death the throne was transmitted through his daughter Ariadne, who had been united in marriage to the leader of the Isaurian body-guard, and had a son by him, Leo II. The sudden death of Leo, however, after he had raised his father to the rank of coregent, placed the reins of power in the hands of Zeno (474–91), who was obliged to defend his authority against repeated insurrections. All these movements were instigated by his mother-in-law, Verina, who first proclaimed her brother Basiliscus emperor, and later Leontius, the leader of the Thracian army. Victory, however, rested with Zeno, at whose death Ariadne once more decided the succession by bestowing her hand on Anastasius Silentiarius (491–518), who had risen through the grades of the civil service.

This brief résumé shows the important part played by women in the imperial history of Byzantium. Nor was female influence restricted to the imperial family. The development of Roman law exhibits a growing realization of woman's importance in the family and society. Theodora, whose greatness is not eclipsed by that of her celebrated consort, Justinian, is a typical example of the solicitude of a woman of high station for the interests of the lowliest and the most unworthy of her sisters—from whose ranks perhaps she herself had risen. Byzantine civilization produced a succession of typical women of middle class who are a proof, first, of the high esteem in which women were held in social life and, secondly, of the sacredness of family life, which even now distinguishes the Greek people. To this same tendency is probably to be ascribed the suppression by Anastasius of the bloody exhibitions of the circus called *venationes*. We must not forget, however, that under the successor of Anastasius, Justin, the so-called circus factions kept bears for spectacles in the circus, and the Empress Theodora was the daughter of a bear-baiter. Still the fact remains that cultured circles at that time began to deplore this gruesome amusement, and that the *venationes*, and with them the political significance of the circus, disappeared in the course of Byzantine history.

One may be amazed at the assertion that the Byzantine was humane, and refined in feeling, even to the point of sensitiveness. Too many bloody crimes stain the pages of Byzantine history—not as extraordinary occurrences, but as regularly established institutions. Blinding, mutilation, and death by torture had their place in the Byzantine penal system. In the Middle Ages such horrors were not, it is true, unknown in Western Europe, and yet the fierce crusaders thought the Byzantines exquisitely cruel. In reading the history of this people, one has to accustom oneself to a Janus-like national character—genuine Christian self-sacrifice, unworldliness, and spirituality, side by side with avarice, cunning, and the refinement of cruelty. It is, indeed, easy to detect this idiosyncrasy in both the ancient and the modern Greeks. Greek cruelty, however, may have been aggravated by the circumstances that savage races not only remained as foes on the frontier, but often became incorporated in the body politic, only veiling their barbaric origin under a thin cloak of Hellenism. The whole of Byzantine history is the record of struggles between a civilized state and wild, or half-civilized, neighbouring tribes. Again and again was the Byzantine Empire *de facto* reduced to the limits of the capital city, which Anastasius had transformed into an unrivalled fortress; and often, too, was the victory over its foes gained by troops before whose ferocity its own citizens trembled.

Twice in the period just considered Byzantium was on the point of falling into the hands of the Goths: first, when, under the Emperor Arcadius, shortly after Alaric the Visigoth had pillaged Greece, the German Gainas, being in control of Constantinople, simultaneously stirred up the East Goths and the Gruthungi, who had settled in Phrygia; a second time, when the East Goths, before their withdrawal to Italy, threatened Constantinople. These deliverances may not have been entirely fortunate. There are differences in natural endowments among races; the history of the Goths in Spain, Southern France, and Italy shows that they should not be classed with the savage Huns and Isaurians, and a strong admixture of Germanic blood would perhaps have so benefited the Greek nation as to have averted its moral and political paralysis. But this was not to be expected of the Hunnic and Isaurian races, the latter including, probably, tribes of Kurds in the Taurus ranges in the south-east of Asia Minor. It can only be considered fortunate that success so long crowned the efforts to ward off the Huns, who, from 412 to 451, when their power was broken at Châlons, had been a serious menace to the imperial frontiers. More dangerous still were the Isaurians, inhabitants of imperial territory, and the principal source from which the guards of the capital were recruited. The Emperor Zeno was an Isaurian, as was likewise his adversary, Illus, *Magister Officiorum*, who, in league with Verina, mother of the empress, plotted his downfall; and while these intrigues were in progress the citizens of Constantinople were already taking sides against the Isaurian body-guard, having recourse even to a general massacre to free themselves from their hated oppressors. But it was the Emperor Anastasius who first succeeded in removing these prætorians from the capital, and in subjugating the inhabitants of the Isaurian mountains (493) after a six years' war.

The same period is marked by the beginning of the Slavic and Bulgar migrations. The fact has already been mentioned that these races gradually possessed themselves of the whole Balkan Peninsula, the Slavs meanwhile absorbing the Finnic-Ugrian Bulgars. The admixture of Greek blood, which was denied the Germanic races, was reserved for the Slavs. To how great a degree this mingling of races took place, will never be exactly ascertained. On the other hand, the extent of Slavic influence on the interior developments of the Byzantine Empire, especially on that of the landed interests, is one of the great unsolved questions of Byzantine history.

In all these struggles, the Byzantine polity shows itself the genuine heir of the ancient Roman Empire. The same is true of the contest over the eastern boundary, the centuries of strife with the Persians. In this contest the Byzantine Greeks now found allies. The Persians had never given up their native fire-worship, Mazdeism. Whenever a border nation was converted to Christianity, it joined the Byzantine alliance. The Persians, realizing this, sought to neutralize the Greek influence by favouring the various sects in turn. To this motive is to be attributed the favour they showed to the Nestorians, who at last became the recognized representatives of Christianity in the Persian Empire. To meet this policy of their adversaries, the Greeks for a long time favoured the Syrian Monophysites, bitter enemies of the Nestorians. Upon this motive, the Emperor Zeno closed the Nestorian school at Edessa, in 489, and it was a part of the same policy that induced the successors of Constantine the Great to support the leaders of the Christian clerical party, the Mamikonians, in opposition to the Mazdeistic nobility. Theodosius II resumed this policy after his grandfather, Theodosius the Great, had, by a treaty with Persia (387), sacrificed the greater part of Armenia. Only Karin in the valley of the Western Euphrates, thence forth called Theodosiopolis, then remained a Roman possession. Theodosius II initiated a different policy. He encouraged, as far as lay in his power, the diffusion of Christianity in Armenia, invited Mesrob and Sahak, the founders of Armenian Christian literature into Roman territory, and gave them pecuniary assistance for the prosecution of the work they had undertaken, of translating Holy Scripture into Armenian. Anastasius followed the same shrewd policy. On the one hand, he carried on a relentless war with the Persians (502–06) and, on the other hand, lost no opportunity of encouraging the Monophysite sect which was then predominant in Egypt, Syria, and Armenia. It is true that he met with great difficulties from the irreconcilable factions, as had those of his predecessors who had followed the policy of religious indifference in dealing with the sects. The Eastern Churches in these centuries were torn by theological controversies so fierce as to have been with good reason compared with the sixteenth-century disputes of Western Christendom. All the

MOSAIC ABOVE THE KING'S DOOR IN THE NARTHEX OF SANTA SOPHIA, CONSTANTINOPLE

CHRIST ENTHRONED, VENERATED BY THE EMPEROR (JUSTINIAN)

warring elements of the period—national, local, economic, social, even personal—group themselves around the prevalent theological questions, so that it is practically impossible to say, in any given case, whether the dominant motives of the parties to the quarrel were spiritual or temporal. In all this hurly-burly of beliefs and parties three historical points have to be kept clearly before the mind, in order to understand the further development of the empire: first, the decline of Alexandrian power; secondly, the determination of the mutual relations of Rome and Constantinople; thirdly, the triumph of the civil over the ecclesiastical authority.

Theodosius I was called the Great because he was the first emperor to act against heathenism, and also because he contributed to the victory of the followers of Athanasius over the Arians. This victory redounded to the advantage of the Patriarch of Alexandria. Strange as it seems at the present day, everything pointed to the supremacy of the orthodox Patriarch of Egypt, whose proud title (*Papa et patriarcha Alexandriæ*, etc.) is now the only reminder that its bearer was once in a fair way to become the spiritual rival of Constantinople. Such, however, was the case, and the common object of preventing this formed a bond between Rome and Constantinople. It was some time, it is true, before the two powers recognized this community of interests. St. John Chrysostom, as Patriarch of Constantinople, had already felt the superior power of his Alexandrian colleague. At the Synod of the Oak, held on the Asiatic shore opposite the capital, Chrysostom was deposed—through the collusion of the palace with the intrigues of Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, although the people soon compelled his recall to the patriarchal see, and it was only as the result of fresh complications that he was permanently removed (404). Nestorius, one of his successors, fared even worse. At that time Alexandria was ruled by Cyril, nephew of Theophilus, and the equal of his uncle and predecessor both in intellectual and in political talents. Nestorius had declared himself against the new and, as he asserted, idolatrous, expression "Mother of God" (*Theotokos*), thereby opposing the sentiments and wishes of the humbler people. Cyril determined to use this opportunity to promote the further exaltation of Alexandria at the expense of Constantinople. At the Third Œcumenical Council of Ephesus (431), Cyril received the hearty support of Pope Celestine's representatives. Moreover, the Syrians, who were opponents of Alexandria, did not champion Nestorius energetically. The Patriarch of Constantinople proved the weaker, and ended his life in exile. It now seemed as though Alexandria had gained her object. At the Second Council of Ephesus (the "Robber Council" of 449) Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, had already been hailed by a bishop of Asia Minor as "Œcumenical Archbishop", when the energetic policy of Pope Leo I, the Great, and the death of the Emperor Theodosius II brought about a change in the trend of affairs. Marcian, the new emperor, came to an understanding with Leo; a reconciliation had already been effected with Rome through the drawing up of a confession of faith, which was presented to the Synod of Chalcedon, the so-called Fourth Œcumenical Council (451). Viewed from the standpoint of Old Rome the result was most successful; Dioscorus of Alexandria was deposed and exiled, and the danger of an all-powerful Alexandrian patriarch was averted. The Patriarch of New Rome—Constantinople—could also be satisfied. The solution of the question was less advantageous to the Byzantine Empire. When the Greeks entered into communion with the Western Church, the reaction of the Egyptians, Syrians, and other Oriental peoples was all the more pronounced. "Anti-Chalcedonians" was the term appropriated by everyone in Asia who took sides against the Greek imperial Church, and the outcome of the whole affair demonstrated once more the impossibility of a compromise between the ideal of a universal, and that of a national Church.

The second point, the rivalry between Constantinople and Rome, can be discussed more briefly. Naturally, Rome had the advantage in every respect. But for the division of the empire the whole question would never have arisen. But Theodosius I, as early as the Second Œcumenical Council of Constantinople (381), had the decision made that New Rome should take precedence immediately after old Rome. This was the first expression of the theory that Constantinople should be supreme among the Churches of the East. The first to attempt to translate this thought into action was John Chrysostom. As he undertook the campaign against Alexandria, so he was also able to bring the still independent Church of Asia Minor under the authority of Constantinople. On a missionary journey he made the See of Ephesus, founded by St. John the Apostle, a suffragan of his patriarchate. We can now understand why the war against the Alexandrians was prosecuted with such bitterness. The defeat of Alexandria at the Council of Chalcedon established the supremacy of Constantinople. To be sure, this supremacy was only theoretical, as it is a matter of history that from this time forward the Oriental Churches assumed a hostile attitude towards the Byzantine imperial Church. As for Rome, protests had already been made at Chalcedon against the twenty-first canon of the Eighth General Council, which set forth the spiritual precedence of Constantinople. This protest was maintained until the capture of Constantinople by the crusaders put an end to the pretentions of the Greek Church. Pope Innocent III (1215) confirmed the grant to the Patriarch of Constantinople of the place of honour after Rome.

We now come to the third point: the contest between ecclesiastical and civil authority. In this particular, also, the defeat of Alexandria was signal. Since the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon it had been decided that in the East (it was otherwise in the West) the old Roman custom, by which the emperor had the final decision in ecclesiastical matters, should continue. That was the end of the matter at Byzantium, and we need not be surprised to find that before long dogmatic disputes were decided by arbitrary imperial decrees, that laymen, princes, and men who had held high state offices were promoted to ecclesiastical offices, and that spiritual affairs were treated as a department of the Government. But it must not be supposed that the Byzantine Church was therefore silenced. The popular will found a means of asserting itself most emphatically, concurrently with the official administration of ecclesiastical affairs. The monks in particular showed the greatest fearlessness in opposing their ecclesiastical superiors as well as the civil authority.

(1) (b) *Dynasties of Justinian and Tiberius; 518–610.*



The above table once more contains the names of

two renowned and influential Byzantine empresses. As the world once held its breath at the quarrel between Eudoxia, the wanton wife of the Emperor Arcadius, and the great patriarch, John Chrysostom, and at the rivalry of the sisters-in-law, Pulcheria and Athenais-Eudocia, the latter the daughter of an Athenian philosopher, so Theodora, the dancer of the Byzantine circus, and her niece Sophia succeeded in obtaining extraordinary influence by reason of their genius, wit, and political cleverness. Theodora died of cancer (548), seventeen years before her husband. No serious discord ever marred this singular union, from which, however, there was no issue. The death of this remarkable woman proved an irreparable loss to her consort, who grieved profoundly for her during the remainder of his life. Her niece, Sophia, who approached her in ambition and political cunning, though not in intellect, had a less fortunate ending. Her life was darkened by a bitter disappointment. With the help of Tiberius, commander of the palace guard, a Thracian famed for his personal attractions, she placed on the throne her husband, Justin II (565–78), who suffered from temporary attacks of insanity. Soon Sophia and Tiberius became the real rulers of the empire. In 574 the empress succeeded in inducing her husband to adopt Tiberius as Cæsar and coregent. The death of Justin (578), however, did not bring about the hoped-for consummation of her relations with Tiberius. Tiberius II (578–82) had a wife in his native village, and now for the first time presented her in the capital. After his accession to the throne, he revered the Empress Sophia as a mother, and even when the disappointed woman began to place obstacles in his path, he was forbearing, and treated her with respect while keeping her a prisoner.

The dynasty of Justin originated in Illyria. At the death of the Emperor Anastasius, Justin I (518–27), like his successor Tiberius, commander of the palace guard, by shrewdly availing himself of his opportunities succeeded in seizing the reins of power. Even during the reign of Justin, Justinian, his nephew, and heir-presumptive to the throne, played an important rôle in affairs. He was by nature peculiar and slow. Unlike his uncle, he had received an excellent education. He might justly be called a scholar; at the same time he was a man of boundless activity. As absolute monarch, like Philip II of Spain, he developed an almost incredible capacity for work. He endeavoured to master all the departments of civil life, to gather in his hands all the reins of government. The number of rescripts drawn up by Justinian is enormous. They deal with all subjects, though towards the end by preference with dogmatic questions, as the emperor fancied that he could put an end to religious quarrels by means of bureaucratic regulations. He certainly took his vocation seriously. On sleepless nights he was frequently seen pacing his apartments absorbed in thought. His whole concept of life was serious to the point of being pedantic. We might therefore wonder that such a man should choose as his consort a woman of the demi-monde. No doubt Procopius, "a chamberlain removed from the atmosphere of the court, unheeded and venomous in his sullen old age", is not veracious in all his statements concerning the previous life of Theodora. It is certain, however, that a daughter was born to her before she became acquainted with the crown prince, and it is equally certain that before she married the pedantic monarch, she had led a dissolute life. However she filled her new rôle admirably. Her subsequent conduct was faultless, her influence great, but not obtrusive. Her extravagance and vindictiveness—for she had enemies, among them John the Cappadocian, the great financial minister so indispensable to Justinian—may well have cost the emperor many an uneasy hour, but there was never any lasting breach.

Theodora, after captivating the Crown-Prince Justinian by her genius and witty conversation, proved herself worthy of her position at the critical moment. It was in the year 532, five years after Justinian's accession. Once more the people of Constantinople, through its circus factions, sought to oppose the despotic rule then beginning. It resulted in the frightful uprising which had taken its name from the well-known watchword of the circus parties: *Nika*—"Conquer". In the palace everything was given up for lost, and Belisarius himself, the heroic chief of the mercenaries, advised flight. At this crisis Theodora saved the empire for her husband by her words: "The purple is a good winding-sheet". The Government was firm; the opposing party weakened, the circus factions were shorn of their political influence, and the despotic government of Justinian remained assured for the future.

It is well known what the reign of Justinian (527–65) meant for the external and internal development of the empire. The boundaries of the empire were extended, Africa was reconquered for a century and a half, all Italy for some decades. The Byzantine power was established, for a time, even in some cities of the Spanish coast. Less successful were his Eastern wars. Under Justin and the aged Kavadh, war with Persia had again broken out. On the accession of the great Chosroes I, Nushirvan (531–79), in spite of the peace of 532, which Justinian hoped would secure for him liberty of action in the West, Chosroes allowed him no respite. Syria suffered terribly from pillaging incursions, Lazistan (the ancient Colchis) was taken by the Persians, and a road thereby opened to the Black Sea. Only after the Greeks resumed the war more vigorously (549) did they succeed in recapturing Lazistan, and in 562 peace was concluded.

Nevertheless the Persian War was transmitted as an unwelcome legacy to the successors of Justinian. In 571 strife broke out anew in Christian Armenia, owing to the activity of the Mazdeistic Persians. While the Romans gained many brilliant victories, their opponents also obtained a few important successes. Suddenly affairs took an unexpected turn. Hormizdas, the son and successor of Chosroes I (579–90), lost both life and crown in an uprising. His son, Chosroes II, Parvez (590–628), took refuge with the Romans. Mauritius, who was then emperor (582–602), received the fugitive and by the campaign of 591 re-established him on the throne of his fathers. Thus the relations of the empire with the Persians seemed at last peaceful. Soon, however, Mauritius himself was deposed and murdered on the occasion of a military sedition. The centurion Phocas (602–10) seized the helm of the Byzantine state. Chosroes, ostensibly to avenge his friend, the murdered emperor, forthwith resumed the offensive. The administration of Phocas proved thoroughly inefficient. The empire seemed to swerve out of its old grooves; the energetic action of some patriots, however, under the leadership of nobles high in the Government, and the call of Heraclius, saved the situation, and after a fearful conflict with the powers of the East, lasting over a hundred years, Byzantium rose again to renewed splendour.

It is a noteworthy fact that Lombard and Syrian chroniclers call the Emperor Mauritius the first "Greek" emperor. The transformation of the Roman State, with Latin as the official language, into a Greek State had become manifest. During the reign of Mauritius the rest of Justinian's conquests in Italy and Africa were placed under the civil administration of military governors or exarchs. This is symptomatic. The separation of civil and military power, which had been inaugurated in the happier

and more peaceful days at the end of the third century, had outlived its usefulness. During the period of the Arabian conflicts under the Heraclean dynasty, the old Roman system of combining civil and military power was established in a new form. The commander of a *thema* (regiment) was charged with the supervision of the civil authorities in his military district. The old diocesan and provincial divisions disappeared, and military departments became administrative districts.

It is manifest that Justinian's policy of restoration ended in a miserable failure. The time for a Roman Empire in the old sense of the term, with the old administrative system, was past. It is unfortunate that the rivers of blood which brought destruction upon two Germanic states, the robber Vandals and the noble East Goths, and the enormous financial sacrifice of the eastern half of the empire had no better outcome. If, despite all this, the name of Justinian is inscribed in brilliant letters in the annals of the world's history, it is owing to other achievements: his codification of the laws and his enterprise as a builder. It was the fortune of this emperor to be contemporary with the artistic movement which, rising in Persia, gained the ascendancy in Syria and spread over Asia Minor and thence to Constantinople and the West. It was the merit of Justinian that he furnished the pecuniary means, often enormous, for the realization of these artistic aspirations. His fame will endure so long as Saint Sophia at Constantinople endures, and so long as hundreds of pilgrims annually visit the churches of Ravenna. This is not the place to enumerate the architectural achievements of Justinian, ecclesiastical and secular, bridges, forts, and palaces. Nor shall we dwell upon his measures against the last vestiges of heathenism, or his suppression of the University of Athens (529). On the other hand, there is one phase of his activity as a ruler to which reference must be made here, and which was the necessary counterpart of his policy of conquest in the West and issued in as great a failure. The Emperors Zeno and Anastasius had sought remedies for the difficulties raised by the Council of Chalcedon. It was Zeno who commissioned Acacius, the great Patriarch of Constantinople—the first, perhaps, who took the title of Œcumenical Patriarch—to draft the formula of union known as the "Henoticon" (482). This formula cleverly evaded the Chalcedon decisions, and made it possible for the Monophysites to return to the imperial Church. But the gain on one side proved a loss on the other. Under existing conditions, it did not matter much that Rome protested, and again and again demanded the erasure of the name of Acacius from the diptychs. It was much more important that the capital and Europe, as well as the chief Greek cities, showed hostility to the Henoticon. The Greeks, moreover, were attached to their national Church, and they regarded the decrees of Chalcedon as an expression of their national creed. The Emperor Anastasius was a Monophysite by conviction, and his religious policy irritated the West. At last when he installed in the patriarchal See of Constantinople Timotheus, an uncompromising Monophysite, and at the Synod of Tyre had the decrees of Chalcedon condemned, and the Henoticon solemnly confirmed, a tumult arose at the capital, and later in the Danubian provinces, headed by Vitalian, a Mœsian. Anastasius died (518), and, under Justin I, Vitalian, who had received from Anastasius the appointment as *magister militum per Thraciam*, remained all-powerful. He acted throughout as the enemy of the Monophysites and the champion of Chalcedonian orthodoxy. He urged the union with Rome, which must render the breach with the Eastern Churches final. This union was consummated in 519; the conditions were the removal of the name of Acacius from the diptychs, and the banishment of over fifty bishops of Asia Minor and Syria who were opposed to the Chalcedonian decrees. A year later the government of Justin rid itself of the too powerful Vitalian by having him assassinated. The union with Rome, however, was not disturbed. When, in the year 525, Pope John I appeared in Constantinople on a mission from the Ostrogoth King Theodoric, he celebrated High Mass in Latin and took precedence before the œcumenical patriarch. We know that at the time Justinian was the actual ruler; it may be conjectured what motive inspired him to allow this. His plan for the conquest of the West made it desirable for him to win the papacy over to his side, and consummate the ecclesiastical union with the Latins. These views he held throughout his reign. Theodora, however, thought otherwise. She became the protectress of the Monophysites. Egypt owed to her its years of respite; under her protection Syria ventured to re-establish its Anti-Chalcedonian Church; she encouraged the Monophysite missions in Arabia, Nubia, and Abyssinia. The empress did not even hesitate to receive the heads of the Monophysite opposition party in her palace, and when, in 536, Anthimus, Patriarch of Constantinople, was, at the instance of Pope Agapetus, deposed for his Asiatic propensities, she received the fugitive into the women's apartments, where he was discovered at the death of the empress (548). He had spent twelve years within the walls of the imperial palace under the protection of the Augusta. There are reasons to suspect that Justinian did not altogether disapprove of his consort's policy. It was but a half-way attempt to win over the Monophysites. Could they, indeed, ever be won over?—The spectacle of this emperor wearing out his life in the vain effort to restore the unity of the empire, in faith, law, and custom, is like the development of a tragedy; his endeavours only tended to widen the breach between those nations which most needed each other's support—those of the Balkan Peninsula and of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. With all his dogmatic experiments the emperor did not succeed in reconciling the parties or devising a feasible method of bringing the parts of the empire to co-operate with one another. His successors had no better success. Even the conciliatory measures of John the Faster, Patriarch of the capital (582–95), were of no avail. The conquest of the East by the Arabs, in the seventh century, brought a cessation of this movement towards the differentiation of the East into separate nations—a cessation which, to be sure, involved for most of the Syrian and Egyptian Christians the loss of their faith.

Basket Capital, Church of S. Michele in Affricisco, Ravenna, VI Century

(2) *Founding of the Real Byzantine State; 610–717.*

Eudocia Heraclius Martina

Heraclius Constantinus Heracleonas

Constans II (also called Constantine III)

Constantine IV, Pogonatus

Justinian II, Rhinotmetus

Salvation from the Arab peril came through the energetic dynasty of Heraclius. As appears from the above table, the dynasty flourished for five generations. Three of the rulers were characterized by extraordinary will power and striking intellectual ability: Heraclius (610–41), Constans (642–68), and Constantine, called Pogonatus, or the Bearded (668–85). The year 685 marks the beginning of the dynastic decline. Justinian II (685–95, and 705–11) had inherited the excellent qualities of his ancestors, but grotesquely distorted; he had the instincts of a sultan, with a touch of Cæsarian madness. Whence it came about that in 695 he was deposed. His nose was cut off—whence the name *Rhinotmetus*—and he was banished to Cherson. There he formed an alliance with the Khan of the Khazars, whose son-in-law he became, and fled in a fishing boat over the Black Sea to the mouths of the Danube. The Bulgarians had dwelt in this region since about 679. In 705, aided by an army of Slavs and Bulgarians, Rhinotmetus returned to Constantinople, and the Bulgarian prince received the name of Cæsar as a reward for the help he had rendered. For the next six years the emperor's vengeance was wreaked on all who had been his adversaries. At last, while hastening to Cherson, where Philippicus Bardanes, an Armenian officer, had been proclaimed emperor, Rhinotmetus was slain near Damatrys in Asia Minor.

The first dethronement of Justinian, in 695, had been accomplished by an officer named Leontius, who reigned from then until 698, and it was in this period that the Arabs succeeded in gaining possession of almost all Roman Africa, including Carthage. The Byzantine fleet which had been sent to oppose this invasion revolted, while off the coast of Crete, and raised the admiral, Apsimarus, to the purple under the title of Tiberius III (698–705). The reign of Tiberius was not unsuccessful, but in 705 Justinian returned, and both Tiberius and Leontius (who had meantime been living in a monastery) were beheaded. Philippicus the Armenian, following upon the second reign of Rhinotmetus, favoured the religious principles of his Armenian countrymen, and the people of Byzantium raised to the throne in his stead Anastasius II (713–15), an able civilian official, who restored the orthodox faith. But when he attempted to check the insubordination of the army, which had made three emperors since 695, the troops of the Opsikion *thema* (from the territory of the Troad as far as Nicæa) proclaimed as emperor the unwilling Theodosius (715–17), an obscure official of one of the provinces. At the same time the Caliph Suleiman was equipping a vast armament to ravage the frontier provinces. Thus the empire which the army, under the great military emperors, Heraclius, Constans, and Constantine, had saved from the threatened invasion of the Arabs, seemed fated to be brought to destruction by the selfsame army. But the army was better than the events of the preceding twenty-two years might seem to indicate. Leo and Artavasdus, commanders, respectively, of the two most important *themata*, the Anatolic and the Armenian, combined forces. Theodosius voluntarily abdicated, and again the throne of Constantine was occupied by a great Byzantine ruler, fitted by nature for his position, Leo of Germanicia (now Marash) in Northern Syria.

This brief review of the various rulers suffices to show that the diseased mentality of Justinian II brought to an end the prosperous period of the Heraclean dynasty. The attempt has been made to prove that this prince inherited an unsound mind, and to discover corresponding symptoms of insanity in his ancestors. This much is certain: that a strength of will carried at times to the point of foolhardiness and incorrigible obstinacy and a propensity to the despotic exercise of power distinguish the whole dynasty. Even Heraclius, by a personal inclination to which he clung in defiance of reason and against the remonstrances of his well-wishers, placed the peace of the State and the perpetuation of his dynasty in serious peril. This was his passion for his niece Martina, whom he married after the death of his first wife in

JUSTINIAN II AND HIS WIFE SOPHIA, COPPER COIN STRUCK AT CONSTANTINOPLE (4TH YEAR OF HIS REIGN)

defiance of all the warnings of the great Patriarch Sergius. Martina is the only woman of any political importance during these warlike times. Her character was distinguished by a consuming ambition, and her influence may have increased when, after the loss of Syria to the Arabs, Heraclius, becoming afflicted with an internal disease, fell into a state of lethargy. On the death of her husband (641) she sought to obtain the supreme power for her own son Heracleonas, to the prejudice of her step-son Constantine. The army recognized both princes as sovereign, a state of things which contained the germ of further complications. Fortunately Constantine, who had long been ailing, died a few weeks after his father, and the army, ignoring Martina and Heracleonas, placed Constans, the son of Constantine, on the throne. Thus it was that the almost uninterrupted succession of the three emperors, Heraclius, Constans, and Constantine IV, Pogonatus came about.

As has been repeatedly observed, the activity of these rulers was concentrated on the Herculean task of defending the empire against the foreign foes that were bearing down on it from all sides. Fortunately, the Avars, who from the time of Justinian had been bought off with an annual tribute, but who as lately as 623 and 626 had besieged Constantinople, were gradually hemmed in by the onrushing Slavs and Bulgarians upon the Hungarian lowlands, and thereby removed from immediate contact with the Byzantine Empire. All the more persistent, however, were the attacks of the Slavic races. During the time of Heraclius the Croats and Serbs established themselves in their present homes. The Roman cities of Dalmatia had difficulty in defending themselves. Presently the Slavs took to the sea, and by 623 they had pushed their way as far as Crete. Still their visits were only occasional; they made no permanent settlements on the islands, and on the mainland the larger cities escaped subjection to Slavic influence. Thessalonica was attacked again and again, most seriously in 675, but was saved each time by the heroism of her citizens. The Slavs, fortunately, were still split into different tribes, so that they could be held in check by timely expeditions, such as that which Constans had made near Thessalonica. It was otherwise with the Bulgarians. In 635 Heraclius concluded an alliance with their prince, Kuvrat, so as to use them in opposing the Avars and Slavs. However, there soon arose in the territory between the Danube and the Balkan Peninsula, under the leadership of the Bulgarians, a state composed of Slavonic and Finnic-Ugrian elements. Their organization differed widely from that of the Serbs and Croats, who were held together by no political bond. In 679 the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus suffered a serious defeat at the hands of the Bulgarians; by

695 things had come to such a pass that Justinian II reconquered Constantinople through Bulgarian assistance. In later centuries the Bulgarian State became Byzantium's most dangerous European foe.

But at this period its most formidable enemies were its neighbours, the Persians. It will be recalled how Anastasius and Justinian I had fought with this nation, and how, in the peace of 562, Lazistan at least had been held as a guarantee of Byzantine supremacy over the trade routes to Central Asia. The twenty years' war (571–91) brought many vicissitudes. At last the Emperor Mauritius obtained possession of Dara and Martyropolis, in Syria, as well as the greater part of Armenia. Nisibis, however, remained Persian. So far, an important advantage had been gained for Byzantium. But the assassination of Mauritius effected a marked change. Chosroes II, Parvez, commenced war against the usurper Phocas, which he continued against his successor, Heraclius. In 606 Dara fell, and in 608 the Persians appeared for the first time before Chalcedon. In 611 they captured Antioch and the eastern part of Asia Minor, in 613 Damascus, and in 614 Jerusalem. The True Cross fell into their hands and was carried off to Persia. In 615 a Persian army stood before Chalcedon for the second time. In 619 they conquered Ancyra, in Asia Minor, and even Egypt. Heraclius saved himself splendidly from this terrible situation. In three daring campaigns (622–28) he freed Armenia from her oppressors. By the peace of 628 Armenia and Syria were recovered. On 14 September, 629, the True Cross, restored by the Persians, was again set up in Jerusalem, and in 629 Egypt likewise was wrested from the Persians. Then came the fearful reverses consequent on the Arab rising; in 635 Damascus fell; in 637 Jerusalem was surrendered by the Patriarch Sophronius, after a siege of two years. At first (634) Heraclius himself came to Antioch to organize the campaign; then followed the lethargy due to his sickness, and he supinely allowed the Arabs to advance. At his death (641) Egypt was virtually lost; on 29 September, 643, Amru entered Alexandria; in 647 the province of Africa, and in 697 its capital, Carthage, fell into the hands of the Arabs. Meanwhile the Arabs had built a navy, and soon the war raged on all sides. They had taken Cyprus in 648; in 655 they first thought of attacking Constantinople. Fortunately their fleet was vanquished off the Lycian coast. Later they established themselves in Cyzicus, and from 673 to 677 menaced the capital. At the same time they conquered Armenia (654) and ravaged Asia Minor. In 668 they pushed on to Chalcedon. During all these losses, the Greeks could show only one step gained—or rather one successful attempt to safeguard their power. Many Christian families emigrated from Asia Minor and Syria to Sicily, Lower Italy, and Rome, thus strengthening the Byzantine power in the West, and the Emperor Constans could use Sicily as a base for the reconquest of Africa (662). He is thought to have intended making Rome once more the capital of the empire. In 668, however, he was murdered in Syracuse, during a military uprising, and with him these vast plans came to an end. His son, Constantine IV, was very young at the time of his accession; still he was not only able to assert his authority in the face of an unruly army, but soon, like his father and great-grandfather, proved himself a brave warrior, and displayed consummate generalship against the Arabs, the Slavs, and the Bulgarians.

The splendid prowess of Byzantium is still brilliantly apparent, in spite of these losses. This was due, in the first place, to its excellent military equipment. The period of the Arab peril, a peril which at a later date in the West, during the time of Charles Martel, saw the introduction of cavalry wearing defensive armour in place of the Roman and Germanic infantry, marked a like innovation in the East, at an earlier period. The Byzantine cuirassiers, or cataphracti, probably originated at this time. Moreover, the State was now thoroughly organized on military lines. The system of *themata*, after the model of the exarchate of Ravenna and Africa, found acceptance in Asia Minor, and gradually spread through the whole empire. The *thema* of the Cibyrrhæots, in southern Asia Minor, belonged to the districts which during the Roman Republic had produced the most notorious pirates. In the Saracen wars the fleet played a very important part; the Byzantine victory, therefore, showed that the Byzantine fleet was not only equal to that of the Arabs in point of men and solidity of construction, but had an important technical advantage. During the great leaguer of Constantinople, from April to September, 673, Callinicus, a Syrian, is said to have taught the Greeks the use of gunpowder, or "Greek fire".

It remains to discuss the ecclesiastical disputes of the seventh century. At first everything seemed to point towards a compromise. The Persian invasions, which had swept over the Christian peoples of the Orient since 606, probably strengthened a feeling of kinship among Christian nations. Even during his Armenian campaign, Heraclius began to prepare the way for the union with the Oriental Churches. He was supported in his efforts by Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Pope Honorius I. As a basis of dogmatic unity, Heraclius proclaimed as a formula of faith the "union of the two Natures of the God-Man through the Divine-human energy". Everything seemed propitious, the only opponent of the movement being Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was afterwards forced to surrender the city to the Arabs. His antagonism lent the opposition movement stability and permanence. Heraclius, in his effort to conciliate the Monophysites, in his "Ecthesis" of 638 emphasized still more emphatically the union of the two natures by one will (Monothelitism). Immediately the West —and particularly Africa, the scene of St. Maximus's labours—set up the standard of opposition. It was of no avail that Emperor Constans II in his "Typus" (648) forbade all contention over the number of wills and energies, and that he caused Pope Martin I, as well as St. Maximus, to be apprehended and banished to Cherson. The West was temporarily defeated, though destined finally to conquer. After Syria, Egypt, and Africa had been lost to the Arabs, there was no further object in trying to establish Monothelitism. At the Sixth Œcumenical Council (680–81) orthodoxy was re-established by the Emperor Constantine IV. That this move was in harmony with the desire of the Greek people, was evident during the reign of Philippicus, the Armenian. His attempt to restore Monothelitism in the Rome of the East resulted in his dethronement. Once more the Greeks had cut themselves loose from the Armenians; whether to the advantage of the empire is a question which receives various answers.

(3) *Iconoclasm; 717–867.*





During this period two dynasties occupied the throne, each lasting for several generations. Both were of Eastern origin, the one from Northern Syria, the other from Phrygia. Leo V (813–20) also was of Oriental extraction. On the other hand, Nicephorus I (802–11) and his son-in-law Michael I, Rhangabe (811–13), were Greeks. In other words, the government of the empire became orientalized. This racial antagonism must be borne in mind in order to grasp the bitterness of the religious contentions of the period. The same period shows a second dynastic anomaly: for the first and last time there is an empress on the throne not as regent, but with the full title *Basileus*. This is Irene, perhaps the most disagreeable character of all the great Byzantine women. Like Athenais, she was an Athenian, but in the charm of the Muses she was totally lacking. Two passions possessed her soul: ambition and religious fanaticism; but her piety was of a strange kind. She persisted in her devotion to her party with the unswerving conviction that her opinion was right, and she did not hesitate to commit the most atrocious crimes of which a woman could be guilty in order to ruin her son morally and physically. Not without reason has Irene been compared to Catherine de' Medici. On the death of her husband, Leo IV (775–80), in her desire for power she strove to keep her son as a minor as long as possible, and finally to set him aside altogether. Of her own authority she cancelled the betrothal of Constantine VI (780–97) to Rotrud, the daughter of Charlemagne, and forced him to marry Maria, an Armenian, a woman wholly distasteful to him. When the seventeen-year-old emperor showed a disposition to escape her power, she had him scourged with rods. She finally lent her sanction to his marriage with a woman of the court, Theodota, a union regarded by the Church as bigamous. In this way she thought to make his accession to power impossible. The worst, however, was still to come; Irene took advantage of an uprising to rid herself of her son permanently. Constantine VI, blinded at the command of his mother, ended his life in an obscure apartment of the imperial palace, where Theodota bore him a son. His mother now ruled alone (797–802) until the elevation of the grand treasurer, Nicephorus, put an end to her power, and she spent her remaining years on the island of Lesbos in sickness and poverty.

Irene is honoured as a saint in the Greek Church, because at the Seventh General Synod of Nicæa (787), she obtained important concessions in the matter of the veneration of images. Though the adoration of images, as well as other abusive practices of veneration, which had already been condemned as idolatrous, were again wholly forbidden, prostrate veneration, incense, and candles were permitted. Theodora achieved a similar prominence. After the fall of Irene, the Iconoclasts again gained the upper hand, and the brief reign of Michael I, who supplanted his brother-in-law Stauracius (811), was powerless to change this. The Emperor Theophilus (829–42) in the vigour of his religious persecution approached the energetic Constantine V (741–75), known to the opposite party, and later to historians, by the insulting epithet of Copronymus. When Theodora became regent, through the early death of her husband, she introduced milder measures. A compromise was effected between the parties. At the synod of 843 permission was given for the veneration of images, and at the same time the anathema was removed from the name of the Emperor Theophilus. In order to remove it, Theodora, it is said, was guilty of a pious fraud and the false declaration that the emperor, before his death, had been converted to the veneration of images. Of more importance, however, is the fact that the members of the ecclesiastical party, by removing the anathema against the emperor, yielded to state authority, and while victorious in the dogmatic controversy acknowledged that they were vanquished in the ecclesiastico-political.

The questions of this time seem to have concerned matters of far-reaching importance, problems which, despite their strange dress, appear fundamentally quite modern and familiar. The dogmatical side of these contests was not connected with the old controversy about the two natures of Christ, but with the heretical views of different Oriental sects, influenced by Judaism and Mohammedanism. The eastern frontier of the empire in Asia Minor was the home of these multifarious sects, which guaranteed the separate existence of the tribes which belonged to them and regarded themselves as the "faithful" in opposition to the state Church. Leo III, the Syrian (717–41), who saved Byzantium from the Arabian peril, repulsed the last serious attack of the Arabs on the capital (September, 717, to August, 718), by his reforms made the empire superior to its foes, and brought the views of these sectaries into the policy of the Byzantine empire. In the celebrated edict of 726 he condemned the veneration of images, a decree which he considered part of his reforming activity. Probably he hoped by this means to bring the people of the empire closer to Islam, to lessen the differences between the two religions. This may be regarded as another attempt to orientalize the empire, such as the dynasty of Heraclius and others before had previously made. The Greek nation answered by promptly repudiating the attempt, all the more emphatically because here again dogmatic and national antagonisms were connected with the struggle between Church and State.

It is unjust to attribute unworthy motives to the party who called themselves image-worshippers and rallied around such men as Plato, abbot of the monastery of Saccudion, and his nephew Theodore, afterwards Abbot of Studium. The fact is that the whole movement was based on a deeply religious spirit which led to detachment from the world and indeed to complete insensibility towards all earthly ties, even the most legitimate. The ideal of these men is not the Christian ideal of to-day; their rigorous stand might not always meet with our approval. But it was a party that exerted a powerful influence on the people, which could only be intensified by persecution. In this movement it seems possible to discern the forerunner of the great reform movement of the West during the tenth and eleventh centuries, a movement which tended to intensify religious life and which stood for the liberation of the Church from the control of the State.

The Iconoclasts, on the other hand, represented a principle which we know to have been forced into the Greek-Byzantine world as something foreign. It encountered sentiments and views, however, with which it could combine. In spite of the Christianization of Byzantium, there remained there a residue of ancient pagan Roman ideas. The Byzantines of this school often appear so modern to us precisely because they were permeated with rationalistic, anti-ecclesiastical sentiments. Such men were found most frequently among the cultured classes, the high dignitaries of Church and State. This is why Iconoclasm, which was sympathetic to this rationalistic tendency, could develop into a general movement, and why it reminds us in so many ways of the rationalistic movement of the eighteenth century; it also

explains why the Iconoclastic emperors always found supporters in the higher ranks of the clergy. Thus it was that Leo III conducted his attack against the protesting popes through the Patriarch Anastasius. When Pope Gregory II refused to recognize the edict of 726, the emperor withdrew from his jurisdiction Sicily, Lower Italy, and Illyria, and placed them under the Patriarch of Constantinople. Constantine Copronymus had similar support. Upheld by prelates in favour of a national Church, he once more, through the council of 754, prohibited the veneration of images. We know of the numerous martyrdoms caused by the execution of the decree, and how the Empress Irene, herself a friend of the "image-worshippers", finally yielded. There soon followed the reaction of the Iconoclasts under Leo V, the Armenian, and the Phrygian dynasty, and at last the legal restoration of image-worship by Theodora. We have already seen that this victory of the orthodox party, viewed from an ecclesiastico-political standpoint, was not complete. The reason of this partial defeat lay not in the existence of a party among the higher clergy favouring a national Church, but in the fact that the orthodox party gradually lost their hold on the people. We know how the antagonism of the Greeks to the Latins had gradually grown more intense. It was regarded as unpatriotic when Theodore of Studium and his friends so openly declared for Rome. The strength of this National-Church movement came into most perfect evidence with the advent of the great Photius. His rise and the fall of the Patriarch Ignatius were connected with a shabby court intrigue, the Patriarch Ignatius having ventured to oppose the all-powerful Bardas during the reign of Michael III (842–67). At first the proceedings of Photius differed in no respect from those of a common office-seeker. But by opposing the claims of Old Rome to Bulgarian obedience he suddenly gained immense popularity, and thus paved the way for the ultimate separation of the Greek and Latin Churches.

It was Boris (852–88), the Bulgarian Tsar, who stirred up the entire question. With the help of St. Clement, a disciple of Methodius, the Apostle of the Slavs, he had introduced Christianity among his people; on the occasion of his own baptism, the Emperor Michael III was sponsor. Soon afterwards Boris tried to withdraw from the influence of East Rome, and enter into closer relations with Old Rome. At the same time the Holy See renewed its claims to the Illyrian obedience. Photius's answer was the ἐγκύκλιος ἐπιστολή (circular letter) of 867, by which he sought to establish the separation from Old Rome both in ritual and in dogma. In spite of the many vacillations of Byzantine politics between the partisans of Ignatius and those of Photius during the next decades, this was the first decisive step towards the schism of 1054.

During this whole period the Bulgarians had given great trouble to the Byzantine Empire. The Emperor Nicephorus I fell in battle against them, and his successors warded them off only with the greatest difficulty. Equally violent were the wars against the Saracens and the Slavs. There was no second investment of the capital by the Syrian Arabs, it is true, though on the other hand, in 860, the city was hard pressed by the Varangian Ros, but all the more danger was to be apprehended from the Arabs who had been expelled from Spain and had settled in Egypt in 815. In 826 they conquered Crete, and about the same time the Arabs of Northern Africa began to settle in Sicily, a migratory movement which finally resulted in the complete loss of the island to the Byzantines. As once they had come from Syria and Asia Minor, so now many Greek families migrated to Lower Italy and the Peloponnesus. The Christianization and hellenization of the Slavs was now begun, and soon produced rich fruits. It is difficult, as we have already said, to determine how great an admixture of Slavic blood flows in the veins of the Greeks of to-day; on the other hand, it is certain that the Slavs have left many traces of their laws and customs. The agrarian law, dating, possibly, from the time of the Emperor Leo III, shows the strength of the Slavic influence on the development of the Byzantine agrarian system.

Group of Warriors, from MS., IX Century

It remains to touch on the relations between the Byzantine Empire and the West during this period. In the West, the Frankish nation had gradually taken the lead of all other Germanic peoples. As we know, the relations of Byzantium with these nations were always somewhat unstable. One thing only had remained unchanged: the Byzantine rulers, as legitimate successors of the Roman emperors, had always maintained their claim to sovereignty over the Germanic peoples. For the most part this had been unconditionally admitted, as is evident from the coinage. At the time of the Empress Irene, however, a great change set in. The restoration of the Roman Empire of the West by Charlemagne (800) was the signal for a complete break with all previous traditions. The West stood now on the same footing as the East. As we know, this important step had been taken in full accord with the papacy. Historically, it is thus a part of the controversies which began with the withdrawal of Illyrian obedience, and culminated in the ἐγκύκλιος ἐπιστολή of Photius. The idea of a national imperial Church seemed to prevail in both East and West; to be sure this was only seemingly so, for the popes did not give up their universal supremacy, but soon began again to utilize politically their advantageous location midway between East and West.

(4) *Period of Political Balance; 867–1057.*



The period of the highest development of Byzantine power was not dynastically the most fortunate.

Seldom has there been such an accumulation of moral filth as in the family of Basil the Macedonian (867–86). The founder of the house, a handsome hostler of Armenian extraction, from the vicinity of Adrianople, attracted the notice of a high official by his powerful build and his athletic strength and later gained the favour of the dissolute emperor Michael III, the last of the Phrygian emperors. Basil was also a favourite with women. His relations with the elderly Danielis of Patras, whom he had met whilst in the retinue of his master, were most scandalous. The gifts of this extremely wealthy woman laid the foundations of Basil's fortune. The depth of his baseness, however, is best seen in his marriage to the emperor's mistress, Eudocia Ingerina. Michael III stipulated that Eudocia should remain his mistress, so that it is impossible to say who was the father of Leo VI, the Wise (886–912). His physical frailty and taste for learned pursuits—during his reign the

Basil I, Copper Coin

Code of the Basilica was prepared in sixty books—as also the mutual aversion between Basil and Leo are no evidence for the paternity of the Macedonian. If this view be correct, Basil's line was soon extinct, as his real son, Alexander, reigned only one year (912–13). Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus (913–59), the long wished-for heir, by the fourth marriage of Leo the Wise, inherited the learned tastes of his father, but was not completely deficient in energy. It is true he left the government at first to his father-in-law, Romanus I, Lacapenus (919–44), and later to his wife Helena; still, when Romanus had become too overbearing, Constantine VII showed himself possessed of enough initiative to enlist the aid of Stephen and Constantine, sons of Romanus, in overthrowing the power of their father, and, later, to set aside his brothers-in-law (945). In Romanus II (959–63) the dissolute nature of his great-grandfather Michael III reappeared. His reign, fortunately, lasted only a few years, and then Theophano, his widow, the daughter of an innkeeper, took into her hands the reins of government, for her minor sons. Circumstances compelled her marriage with Nicephorus II, Phocas (963–69), an old and fanatically religious warrior. He is the first of that series of great military leaders who occupied the Byzantine throne, and who soon raised the empire to undreamed-of heights of power. As in the dynasty of Heraclius, three of these reigned in succession: Nicephorus II, John Zimisces, and Basil II. John I, Zimisces (969–76), was the nephew of Nicephorus, but very unlike him. The younger man was as joyous and life-loving in disposition as the older was grim and unlovable. Theophano, therefore, did not hesitate to introduce into the palace the murderer of her morose husband. But like Sophia, niece of the great Theodora, she saw her hopes dashed to the ground. The new emperor confined her in a convent and, to legitimize his power, married Theodora, sister of Basil and Constantine, the two young emperors. Like his uncle, John Zimisces was only coregent, but he showed great force in his administration of affairs. At his death the elder of the young emperors was competent to take charge of the State. Luckily, Basil II (976–1025) proved as capable a military leader as his two predecessors. It was under his brother, Constantine VIII (1026–28), that the reaction set in. In opposition to the great imperial generals who had brought the empire to an unhoped-for pinnacle of power, a civilian party had grown up which had for its aim the curtailment of military power. This party was successful during the reigns of Constantine and his successors. Constantine VIII left two daughters, Zoe and Theodora. Zoe (1028–50) was forty-eight years of age at the death of her father, but even after that married three times, and by her amours and her jealousy brought many trials upon her younger sister. Zoe's three husbands, Romanus III, Argyrus (1028–34), Michael IV (1034–41), and Constantine IX, Monomachus (1042–54), all came from the higher bureaucratic circles. Thus the civil party had gained its end. This explains why neither Zoe nor the nephew of her second husband, whom she had adopted, and who proved so ungrateful, Michael V (1041–42—termed the Caulker because his father was a naval engineer) could uphold the glory attained by the State during the times of the great military emperors. Even generals as great as Georgius Maniaces and Harold Hardrada—the latter, chief of the North-German (Varangian) bodyguard which was coming more and more into prominence—were powerless to stem the tide of the decline. The general discontent was most manifest when Theodora, on the death of her sister and her last surviving brother-in-law, assumed the reins of power, and not unsuccessfully (1054–56). On her death-bed she transferred the purple to the aged senator Michael VI, Stratioticus (1056–57. This was the signal for the military power to protest. The holders of great landed estates in Asia Minor gave the power instead to one of their own faction. Isaac I, Comnenus, inaugurates a new era.

During the period of its greatest power, i. e. under the military emperors, the Byzantine State was able to expand equally in all directions. It had its share of reverses, it is true. The most important was the final loss of Sicily to the Saracens; in 878 Syracuse fell, and in 902 Tauromenium (Taormina), the last Byzantine stronghold on the island, was taken by the Arabs. Two years later Thessalonica was subjected to an appalling pillage. As compensation for the loss of Sicily, however, the Byzantines had Lower Italy, where, since the conquest of Bari (875), the Lombard *thema* had been established. This led to the renewal of relations with the Western powers, especially with the recently founded Saxon line. The Byzantines were still able to hold their own with these, as formerly with the Carlovingians. Conspicuous was the success of the campaigns against the Arabs in the East: the fall of the Caliphate of Bagdad rendered it possible to push forward the frontier towards Syria; Melitene (928), Nisibis (942–43), Tarsus and Cyprus (965), and Antioch (968–69) were captured in turn. About the same time (961) Crete was wrested back from the Arabs. These were the battlefields on which the great generals of the empire, chiefly Armenian, Paphlagonian, and Cappadocian by race, won distinction. Under Romanus I it was the great Armenian Kurkuas, and later the Cappadocian Nicephorus Phocas who achieved these victories. Nicephorus, as husband of Theophano, ascended the throne, and as emperor he achieved his victorious campaign against the Arabs. His assassination brought to the throne his nephew John Zimisces, an Armenian, and fortunately a warrior as great as his uncle.

John made preparations for the subjugation of the Bulgarians. It will be recalled how Tsar Boris introduced Christianity into Bulgaria and, even at that period, thought, by ingratiating himself with Rome, to escape from Byzantine influence. Tsar Symeon (893–927) devised another way of attaining independence. He raised his archbishop to the rank

of patriarch, thereby proclaiming the ecclesiastical autonomy of Bulgaria. His ultimate aim became evident when he assumed the title of Tsar of the Bulgarians and Autocrat of the Romans. This dream, however, was not to be realized. Though Symeon had extended the boundaries of his dominions as far as the Adriatic Sea, though he held Adrianople for a time, and in 917 inflicted a crushing defeat on the Greeks, still, under his successor Peter (927–69), Macedonia and Illyria shook off the Bulgarian yoke and established a West Bulgarian State under the usurper Shishman and his successors. Even under these trying circumstances the policy of Byzantium was skilful: it recognized the Bulgarian patriarchate—thus widening the breach with Rome—but on the other hand lost no time in inciting the neighbouring peoples, the Magyars, Petchenegs, Cumani, and Croatians, against the Bulgarians. The Russians, also, who in 941 threatened Constantinople for the second and last time, were stirred up against the Bulgarians. But soon it was recognized that the devil had been expelled with the help of Beelzebub. The grand Duke Svjatoslav of Kiev settled south of the Danube, and in 969 seized the old Bulgarian capital of Preslav for his residence. The Emperor John Zimisces now interfered. In 971 he captured Preslav and Silistria, but did not re-establish the Bulgarian State. Tsar Boris II was taken to Constantinople and received as compensation the title of *Magister;* the Bulgarian patriarchate was suppressed. There now remained only the West Bulgarian State under Shishman.

Basil II in Armour, from MS. Psalter, End of X Century

The work begun by John Zimisces was completed by Basil II, "Slayer of Bulgarians". In three great campaigns the Bulgarians were subjugated with monstrous cruelty. The work, however, was accomplished. When, in 1014, the emperor celebrated his victory with imposing ceremonies in the church of Panagia at Athens (the old Parthenon), the Greek Empire stood on a height it was never again to reach. Basil II was succeeded by his brother Constantine VIII, who never distinguished himself, and by the daughters of the latter, Zoe and Theodora. The government passed from the hands of the military party into those of high civilian officials, and soon defeat followed on defeat. Under heroes like Georgius Maniaces, and Harold Hardrada, it is true, headway was made against the most various foes. But after 1021 Armenia, which had reached a high state of prosperity under the rule of the Bagratides, and had been annexed to Byzantine territory by Basil II and Constantine IX, gradually passed under the sway of the Seljuk Turks, and after 1041 Lower Italy was conquered by the Normans. This is the first appearance of the two foes who were slowly but surely to bring about the destruction of the empire, and the worst feature of their case was that the Greeks themselves prepared the way for their future destroyers. As formerly Blessed Theodora and her successors had persecuted the heterodox Paulicians, who were the brave protectors of the frontier of Asia Minor, and whom John Zimisces later established near Philippopolis, so now the Greek clergy were treating the Bulgarians and Armenians most harshly. The Western Church also at times wounded national feelings and sometimes provoked the hostility of individual nations by financial exactions. It would be difficult, however, to point out in the history of Rome such complete disregard of the obligations of the universal Church as was shown by the Patriarchs of Constantinople. It is not a matter for surprise, then, that the oppressed nations became more and more alienated from Byzantium and finally welcomed hostile invasions as a sort of relief, though of course ultimately they found out their error. This turned out to be the case not only in Bulgaria, but also in North Syria, Armenia, and the eastern part of Asia Minor which contained a large Armenian population.

There was another circumstance that caused the Seljuk Turks to appear as liberators. In the course of the preceding centuries, a body of provincial nobility had been in process of formation in all parts of the empire. In Asia Minor—for conditions were not the same in all parts of the empire—this nobility acquired its predominance from its large landed possessions. And this, indeed, is reason for believing that no monetary system of economics existed in the older Byzantine Empire, and that the power of capitalism did not originate on its soil. Rich families invested their wealth in landed possessions, and the poorer population had to make way for them. This decline of the peasantry was a grave menace to the empire, the military strength of which declined with the decline of popular independence. Moreover, this monopolization of the land tended to undermine a military institution—that of feudal tenures. It is not known when this institution originated; possibly it was an inheritance from the Roman Empire, developed afresh, during the struggles with the Arabs, in the form of cavalry fiefs on the frontiers of Asia Minor and Syria, and as naval fiefs in the Cibyrrhæot *thema*. But in any case, the danger to this institution was recognized at court, and attempts were made to meet it. Romanus I, Lacapenus, descended from an Armenian family of archons, seems to have been the first to devise legislation against the further extension of the landed interests. Other measures date from Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus, Romanus II, and Nicephorus II, Phocas. Nicephorus II, also, was descended from a Cappadocian family of great landed proprietors, but this did not prevent him from vigorously continuing the policy of Romanus I. His stern piety—for the old warrior, after the death of his wife and his only son always wore a hair shirt, never ate meat, and slept on the bare floor—did not prevent his opposing the further extension of ecclesiastical property. For ecclesiastical, particularly monastic, holdings had gradually begun to absorb the estates of smaller land-holders. These measures against the Church were one of the causes

of the fall of old Nicephorus and of the elevation of light-hearted young John Zimisces to the throne. Still, even under John Zimisces and Basil II, the struggle of the great landed interests continued. It was only the reaction after the death of Basil that gave the aristocratic party the final victory. It gained strength under the regime of the civilian emperors. Ultimately this party was strong enough to decide the succession to the imperial crown.

(*5*) *Period of Centrifugal tendencies; 1057–1203.*



The powerful body of landed proprietors were of advantage to the empire in one particular. Since the decline of the old military organization they upheld the military prestige of the empire. This was all the more significant because, unfortunately, since the revival of learning an antagonism had arisen between the civil officials, who had studied in the schools of the rhetoricians, and the officers of the imperial army. We have already noted that during the last years of the so-called Macedonian dynasty, under the empresses Zoe and Theodora, the influence of the civil-service party was all-powerful. For that very reason a council of the landed proprietors of Asia Minor raised Isaac Comnenus (1057–59), much against his will, to the throne. Isaac regarded the crown as a burden. Weary of strife with the senatorial aristocracy, he soon gave up the sceptre and retired to the monastery of Studium. He considered himself defeated and accordingly designated as his successor not his capable brother John, and his sons, but an official high in the civil service, Constantine X, Ducas (1059–67), a man who during Isaac's brief reign had greatly assisted the emperor, who was wholly unversed in affairs of administration. This meant a fresh victory for the civil bureaucracy, who signalized their accession to power by setting aside army interests, and even the most pressing requirements for the defence of the empire. This naturally led to a severe retribution, and as a consequence popular sympathy reverted to the military party. At the death of Constantine, the widowed Empress Eudocia took a step decisive for the fate of the empire by recognizing the need and choosing as her husband Romanus IV, Diogenes (1067–71), an able officer and one of the heroic figures of Byzantine history. Romanus was pursued by misfortune, and after four years the government again fell into the hands of the civil party. Michael VII, Parapinaces (1071–78), the pupil of Psellus, was raised to the throne. Soon the crisis became so serious that another military emperor was placed on the throne, Nicephorus III, Botaniates (1078–81). The old man, however, was unable to bring order out of the universal chaos. The Comneni were recalled. Alexius I, Comnenus (1081–1118), who had been excluded from the succession by his uncle, took the reins of government and founded the last of the great dynasties, which was to give the empire three more brilliant rulers, Alexius I, John II, and Manuel I.

The splendour of the Comneni was the splendour of the setting sun. It was a period of restoration. Men hoped again to raise literature to the standard of the classic authors and to revive the ancient language, and thus they hoped to restore the glory of the Roman Empire. Only too often it was merely a jugglery

Coin of Alexius I

with high sounding words. Never were the titles of state officials more imposing than during the period of the Comenni; and never, on the other hand, was the empire in a more precarious position, despite all its outward splendour. The old Byzantine army was demoralized; foreign mercenaries had replaced the native troops. Saddest of all was the decay of the fleet. Things had come to such a pass that no shame was felt at being dependent on the allied Italian seaports. Still, not a little was achieved. Clever diplomacy replaced actual power, and succeeded in preserving for some time the semblance of Byzantine supremacy. Moreover, the Greeks seem to have learned the art of husbanding their resources better than they had, and this was due largely to the co-operation of the Western nations. We know for a certainty that during the time of the Comneni ground-rents were levied in coin. This income was increased by the heavy receipts from custom duties. In a word, the economic administration of both public and private business was admirable during this period. It was most unfortunate that this splendour should be darkened by the deep shadows of official corruption, the depreciation of currency, and a total disregard of the Byzantine national, or rather civic, conscience.

Abroad, the Byzantine State was menaced, as of old, on three sides: on the East by the Seljuk Turks, who had supplanted the Arabs; on the West by the Normans, who had succeeded the Arabs in that quarter; on the North by the Slavs, Bulgarians, and Finnic-Ugrian peoples (Magyars, Petchenegs, and Cumani). All three perils were bravely met, though at the cost of heavy losses. In 1064 the Seljuk Turk Alp-Arslan destroyed Ani, the centre of Armenian civilization, whereupon many Armenians emigrated to Little Armenia in the Cilician Taurus. In 1071 the brave Romanus IV was made a prisoner by the Seljuks near Mantzikert. Having been released by the chivalrous Alp-Arslan, he was put to death in the most barbarous manner in his own country, during the frightful revolution which placed Michael VII on the throne. In the same year (1071) Bari was lost to the Normans, and in 1085 Antioch was captured by the Turks. This period also marked the beginning of the Norman raids on the Balkan Peninsula. Between 1081 and 1085 Albania and Thessaly were threatened by Robert Guiscard and his son Bohemund, who were twice defeated in naval encounters by the Byzantines in league with the Venetians. On land, however, they proved their superiority in several places, until the death of the elder Guiscard put an end to their projects and gave the Byzantine State half-a-century of peace in that direction. After that period, however, the raids were renewed. In 1147 Thebes and Corinth were taken by King Roger, on which occasion many silk-weavers were deported to

Sicily. In 1185, at the command of King William II of Sicily, Thessalonica was reduced to ashes. To the north, the outlook was no brighter. The Byzantine State was successful, it is true, in keeping the Serbs in nominal subjection, and in entering into diplomatic and family relations with the royal family of Hungary, but the Bulgarians finally broke loose from Byzantine control. In 1186 they established their new kingdom at Tirnovo, with an autocephalous archbishopric. Soon after this they began once more to push farther to the west and thus laid the foundation of their present ethnographic homes in Thrace and Macedonia.

These heavy reverses, however, were counterbalanced by successes; at the same time it was of great moment that this period marked the beginning of that great movement of the West towards the East, the Crusades. The Byzantine Empire derived great advantage from this, and in some respects fully realized the fact. Even the First Crusade brought about two important results: the victory of the crusaders at Dorylæum (1097) brought the western part of Asia Minor directly under Byzantine control, and Antioch indirectly, through the oath of fealty exacted of Bohemund (1108); the Second Crusade, during which the Emperor Manuel allied himself with the Emperor Conrad III (1149), neutralized the power of the Italian Normans. Manuel now conceived far-reaching plans. He avenged King Roger's incursion into central Greece (1147) by the recapture of Corfu (1149) and the occupation of Ancona (1151), in this way becoming a factor in Italo-German complications. He actually dreamed, as Justinian and Constans II had, of re-establishing the Roman Empire of the West. These ambitious demands found no favour with the popes, with whom, since the quarrel about the Norman possessions in South Italy, under the Patriarch Michael Cerularius (1054), a final rupture had taken place. Thus the undertaking resulted in failure. Great offence had been given to the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, which became manifest when he allied himself with the Seljuk Turks and the Sultan of Egypt.

Byzantium also reaped great advantage from the establishment of the principalities of the crusaders in Syria. The invasion of the East by the crusaders also brought new dangers, which grew constantly more menacing. Even before this the constant and manifold intercourse between the empire and the Italian maritime states, as well as the settlement of the Amalfians, Pisans, Genoese, and Venetians in Byzantine cities, had involved many inconveniences. It is true that the victory over the Normans in the campaign of 1081–85 was gained with the aid of the Venetians, but by 1126 war was in progress with Venice. The commercial republics of Italy grew constantly more arrogant, demanding trading privileges as payment for aid rendered by them, and retaliating for any slights by hostile invasions. It was only the rivalries of the Italian cities that enabled the Byzantines to maintain their supremacy in their own country. As a matter of fact, the Italians had long regarded the empire merely as their prey, and so it was inevitable that the hatred of the Greek nation should be slowly gathering strength. Even the spirit of the administration had long since become Western—the Emperor Manuel lived like a Western knight and twice married European princesses—when it became evident that the pent-up hatred must soon break forth. The crisis came after the death of Manuel, during the regency of his second wife, Maria of Antioch, and with frightful results. At the head of the movement was a man wholly devoid of principle, but of great personal charm and magnetism. This was Andronicus the Liberator (1183–85), at that time about sixty-seven years of age. The movement began (1182) with the appalling slaughter of the Latins; Andronicus was placed on the throne (1183), and in 1184 the young Emperor Alexius was assassinated. The Latins, however, took a terrible vengeance. In 1185 Dyrrachium and soon afterwards Thessalonica were captured amid frightful cruelties. These disasters reacted on the capital. The Byzantines were no longer able to uphold their independence, and a counter-revolution was inaugurated. The aged Andronicus was beheaded, and the first of the Angeli, Isaac II (1185–95, and again 1203–04), ascended the throne. We know how the difficulties between Isaac and his elder brother Alexius III (1195–1203) resulted in an appeal by the dethroned emperor to his brother-in-law, Philip of Swabia, and how, owing to various circumstances, the Fourth Crusade was turned against Constantinople. The Fourth Crusade ended this period of Byzantine history; the empire was in ruins, out of which, however, deft hands contrived to build up a new Byzantine State, and a feeble reproduction of the former magnificence.

(6) *The Decline; 1203–1453.*



The fact that there had been no regular order of succession made the Byzantine throne the focus of numerous dissensions. It is undeniable, however, that this often redounded to the advantage of the State, inasmuch as military and palace revolutions frequently brought the most capable men to the head of affairs at a decisive moment. The sentiment in favour of dynastic succession, however, had been gaining ground under the so-called Macedonian dynasty. The views of Constantine Porphyrogenitus furnish clear evidence of this; a proof even stronger is the touching devotion exhibited by the people towards Zoe and Theodora, the last representatives of that dynasty. Still the last period of Byzantine history thrice witnessed the accession of men outside the regular line of succession. John III, Vatatzes (1222–54), set aside his brother-in-law, Constantine, thus becoming the immediate successor of Theodore Lascaris. A military revolution placed Michael VIII, Palæologus (1259–82), at the head of the State, in place of the child John IV, Lascaris (1258–59). John VI, Cantacuzene (1341–55), contrived to obtain possession of the sovereign power under similar circumstances. It may be said of John Vatatzes and Michael Palæologus that events alone justified the interruption of the order of succession. But the elevation of John Cantacuzene must be counted, like

the family dissensions of the Palæologi, as among the most unfortunate occurrences of the empire. It is a sorry spectacle to see Andronicus II (1282–1328) dethroned by his grandson Andronicus III (1328–41) and immured in a monastery, and John V (1341–76 and 1379–91) superseded first by Cantacuzene, then by his own son Andronicus IV (1376–79), and finally by his grandson John VII (1390). It is true that the neighbouring states, the Turkish Empire in particular, were rent with similar dissensions. The house of the Palæologi, moreover, produced some capable rulers, such as Michael VIII, Manuel II (1391–1425), Constantine XI (1448–53). Still, the contests for the throne, at a period when the imperial glory was manifestly on the wane, could not but be ruinous to the best interests of the empire, and contribute mightily to its dissolution.

At first it seemed as though such capable rulers as Theodore I, Lascaris (1204–22), John III, Vatatzes (1222–54), and Theodore II, Lascaris (1254–58), must bring back prosperous times to the empire. It was no small achievement, to be sure, that the Greeks were able not only to make a brave stand against the Franks, but to expel them again from Constantinople, a task which was all the more difficult because at that time the Greek nation had undergone a dismemberment from which it never recovered. The Empire of Trebizond, under the Comneni, survived the fall of the capital on the Bosphorus (1453) for some years. The task of reabsorbing into the body of the empire the state, or rather the states, of the Angeli in Thessalonica, Thessaly, and Epirus was accomplished slowly and with difficulty. It was impossible to drive the Franks from Byzantine soil. Split up into various minor principalities after the fall of Thessalonica (1222) and Constantinople (1261), they settled in the central part of Greece and in the Peloponnesus, in Crete, Eubœa, Rhodes, and the smaller islands. Moreover, during the course of the fourteenth century, the Serbs rose to unexpected heights of power. During the reigns of Stephen Urosh II, Milutin (1281–1320), and Stephen Dushan (1321–55), it seemed as though the Serbs were about to realize the old dream of the Bulgars, of a Byzantine Empire under Slavonian rule. This dream, however, was shattered by the Turkish victory on the Field of Blackbirds (1389). It was not easy for the Greeks to maintain themselves against so many enemies for two and a half centuries, and it often appeared as though the end had come. The Frankish Emperor of Constantinople, Henry (1206–16), had come very near to destroying Greek independence, and would probably have succeeded had he not been snatched away by an early death. A second crisis came during the minority of the Latin Emperor Baldwin II (1228–61), when the Frankish princes were considering the appointment of the Bulgarian Tsar John II, Asên, as guardian of the young emperor, and regent of the empire. The plan failed of execution only because of the stubborn opposition of the Latin clergy, and the final choice fell on the old King of Jerusalem, John of Brienne (1229–37). Thus the danger was temporarily averted, and the Emperor John Vatatzes was wise enough to gain the favour of the Bulgarian powers by prudent deference to their wishes, as, for instance, by recognizing the Archbishop of Tirnovo as autocephalous patriarch.

The Latin Empire became dangerous for the third and last time when the Franks began, in the year 1236, to renew their heroic attempts to regain their conquests. John Vatatzes, however, succeeded in parrying the blow by forming an alliance with the Emperor Frederick II, whose daughter Anne he espoused. Even after the fall of the capital (1261), the fugitive Frankish emperor became a source of danger, inasmuch as he ceded to the Angevins his right as Lord Paramount of Achaia. As early as the year 1259 there had been serious complications with the principality of Achaia. At that time Michael VIII, by the conquest of Pelagonia had succeeded in withstanding a coalition formed by William of Villehardouin, Prince of Achaia, Michael II, Despot of Epirus, and Manfred of Sicily. When Charles of Anjou replaced Manfred the situation became more serious. In 1267 Charles captured Corfu, and in 1272 Dyrrachium; soon afterwards he received at Foggia John IV, Lascaris, who had been overthrown and blinded by Michael VIII, Palæologus. In this crisis Palæologus knew of no other resource than to call upon the pope for assistance. At the Council of Lyons, his representative, Georgius Acropolites, accepted the confession of faith containing the "Filioque", and recognized the primacy of the pope, thus securing the political support of the papacy against Anjou. Only the Sicilian Vespers gave him permanent immunity from danger from this source (1282). After this the Byzantine Empire was no longer menaced directly by the Norman peril which had reappeared in the Angevins. The Byzantines were gradually entering into a new relationship with the West. They assumed the rôle of coreligionists seeking protection. But of course the reunion of the churches was a condition of this aid, which, as at an earlier period, was vehemently opposed by the people. The national party had already taken a vigorous stand against the negotiations of the Council of Lyons, which had found an excellent advocate in the patriarch, John Beccus. This opposition was made manifest whenever there was any question of union with Rome from political motives, and it explains the attitude of the different factions in the last religious controversy of importance that convulsed the Byzantine world: the Hesychast movement. This movement had its inception at Athos, and involved a form of Christian mysticism which reminds us strongly of certain Oriental prototypes. By motionless meditation, the eyes fixed firmly on the navel (whence their name, *Omphalopsychites*), the devotees pretended to attain to a contemplation of the Divinity, and thereby absolute quietude of soul (*hesychia*, whence *Hesychasts*). The key to this movement is found in the needs of the time, and it was not confined to the Greek world. Many Eastern princes of this period assumed the "angel's garb", and sought peace behind monastery walls. The sect, however, did not fail to encounter opposition. In the ensuing controversy, Barlaam, a monk of Calabria, constituted himself in a special manner the adversary of Hesychasm. It is significant that Barlaam's coming from Southern Italy, which was in union with Rome, and his having been under the influence of the Scholasticism of the West did not commend him to the good graces of the people, but rather contributed to the victory of his adversaries.

Thus the great mass of the people remained as before, thoroughly averse to all attempts to bring about the union. The Byzantine rulers, however, in their dire need, were obliged as a last resource to clutch at this hope of salvation, and accordingly had to face the deepest humiliations. When the unfortunate Emperor John V, after hastening to the papal court at Avignon to obtain assistance for Constantinople, was on his homeward journey, he was detained at Venice by creditors who had furnished the money for the journey. His son, Andronicus IV, who acted as regent at Constantinople, refused to advance the requisite amount. At last the younger son, Manuel II, then regent of Thessalonica, collected sufficient money to redeem his father (1370). Considering the wretched state of Byzantine affairs and the unfriendly spirit of the people, it was certainly generous that the West twice sent a considerable body of reinforcements to the Byzantines. Both expeditions, unfortunately, proved unsuccessful. In

1396 the Western Christians were defeated near Nicopolis by the Sultan Bayazid, and it was only the vigorous action of Maréchal Boucicaut, who had been sent by the French, that saved Constantinople from conquest by the Turks. The final catastrophe was temporarily averted by an almost fortuitous event, the victory of Timur-Leng over the Turks near Angora (1402). This storm quickly passed over; but soon Constantinople was again on the verge of capture (1422). The Emperor John VIII (1423–48) once more attempted to effect a union. At Florence (1439) it was consummated, so far, at least, as the Florentine formula of union later served as a basis for the union with the Orthodox Ruthenians, Rumanians, and others.

Close upon the union followed another attempt to succour Constantinople. After some preliminary victories, however, defeat ensued near Varna, 1444. The quarrels of various pretenders to the throne and the lack of unity among those in power within the city precipitated the final catastrophe. On 29 May, 1453, the Turks captured Constantinople, and seven years later (1460) the last remnant of the empire, the principalities on the Peloponnesus. Constantine XI, the last emperor, by his heroic death shed lustre on the last hours of the empire. Even the Western Christian may reflect with sadness on the downfall of this Christian empire, once so mighty. He will also trust in the ultimate victory of the Cross over the Crescent. But where is the strong hand capable of bringing so many nations and religions into ecclesiastical and political unity, which is the first requisite for cultural and industrial prosperity?

BURY, *Appendixes to Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (London, 1896–1900); KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Litteratur* (Munich, 1897); GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* (Leipzig, 1898); HIRSCH, *Byzantinische Studien* (Leipzig, 1876); POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi* (Berlin, 1895–97); MARC, *Plan eines Corpus der griechischen Urkunden* (Munich, 1903); FINLAY, ed. TOZER, *A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the Present Time* (Oxford, 1877); OMAN, *The Byzantine Empire* (London, 1892); LE BEAU, ed. SAINT-MARTIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1824–36); HOPF, *Gesch. Griechenlands vom Beginn des Mittelalters bis auf unsere Zeit* in ERSCH AND GRUBER, *Encyclopädie* (Leipzig, 1867–68), Sec. I, Vols. LXXXV, LXXXVI; HERTZBERG, *Gesch. Griechenlands seit dem Absterben des antiken Lebens bis zur Gegenwart* (Gotha, 1876–78); IDEM, *Gesch. der Byzantiner und des osmanischen Reiches bis gegen Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1883); PAPARREGOPOULOS, Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἔθνους (Athens, 1887–88); LAMPROS, Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλλάδος (Athens, 1888—); GELZER, *Abriss der byzantinischen Kaisergesch.* in KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 911–1067; VON SCALA, *Byzanz* in HELMOLT, *Weltgesch.* (Leipzig, 1904), V; ROTH, *Gesch. des byzantinischen Reiches* in *Sammlung Göschen* (Leipzig, 1904); TORGA, *The Byzantine Empire* in *The Temple Cyclopædic Primers* (London, 1907); HESSELING, *Essai sur la civilisation byzantine* (Paris, 1907); HIRSCH, *Byzantinisches Reich* in *Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Berlin, 1878—); *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (Leipzig, 1892—); *Vizantijskij Vremennik* (St. Petersburg, 1894—); LAMPROS ed., Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων (Athens, 1904—).

ERNST GERLAND.

Byzantine Literature.—To grasp correctly the essential characteristics of Byzantine literature, it is necessary first to analyze the elements of civilization that find expression in it, and the sources whence they spring. If Byzantine literature is the expression of the intellectual life of the Greek race of the Eastern Roman Empire during the Christian Middle Ages, it is evident that there is question here of an organism not simple but multiform; a combination of Greek and Christian civilization on the common foundation of the Roman political system, set in the intellectual and ethnographic atmosphere of the Near East. In Byzantine literature, therefore, four different cultural elements are to be reckoned with: the Greek, the Christian, the Roman, and the Oriental. Their reciprocal relations may be indicated by three intersecting circles all enclosed within a fourth and larger circle representing the Orient. Thus in each of the three smaller circles we shall have to determine the influence of the Orient.

The oldest of these three civilizations is the Greek. Its centre, however, is not Athens but Alexandria; the circle accordingly represents not the Attic but the Hellenistic civilization. Alexandria itself, however, in the history of civilization, is not a unit, but rather a double quantity; it is the centre at once of Atticizing scholarship and of Græco-Judaic racial life. It looks towards Athens as well as towards Jerusalem. Herein lies the germ of the intellectual dualism which thoroughly permeates the Byzantine and partly also the modern Greek civilization, the dualism between the culture of scholars and that of the people. Even the literature of the Hellenistic age suffers from this dualism; we distinguish in it two tendencies, one rationalistic and scholarly, the other romantic and popular. The former originated in the schools of the Alexandrian sophists and culminated in the rhetorical romance, its chief representatives being Lucian, Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus, and Longus, the latter had its root in the idyllic tendency of Theocritus, and culminated in the idyllic novel of Callimachus, Musæus, Quintus of Smyrna, and others. Both tendencies persisted in Byzantium, but the first, as the one officially recognized, retained predominance and was not driven from the field until the fall of the empire. The first tendency, strong as it was, received additional support from the reactionary linguistic movement known as Atticism. Represented at its height by rhetoricians like Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and grammarians like Herodian and Phrynicus at Alexandria, this tendency prevailed from the second century B. C. onward, and with the force of an ecclesiastical dogma controlled all subsequent Greek culture, so that the living form of the Greek language, even then being transformed into modern Greek, was quite obscured and only occasionally found expression, chiefly in private documents, though also in popular literature.

While Alexandria, as an important central and conservative factor, was thus influential in confining, and, during the Byzantine period, directing, the literary and linguistic life of the later Greek world, a second conservative factor is found in the influence of the Roman culture-circle on the political and judicial life of the Eastern Empire. Alexandria, the centre of intellectual refinement, is balanced by Rome, the centre of government. It is as a Roman Empire that the Byzantine State enters into history; its citizens are known as Romans (Ῥωμαῖοι), its capital city as New Rome. Its laws were Roman; so were its government, its army, and its official class, and at first also its language and its private and public life. In short, the whole organization of the State was that of the Roman imperial period, with its hierarchy and bureaucracy entire and destined yet to play an important part. To these two ancient forces, Hellenistic intellectual culture and Roman governmental organization, are now to be added as important expressions of the new environment, the emotional life of Christianity and the world of Oriental imagination, the last enveloping all the other three.

It was in Alexandria also that Græco-Oriental Christianity had its birth. There the Septuagint translation had been made; it was there that that fusion of Greek philosophy and Jewish religion took place which found in Philo its most important representative; there flourished the mystic speculative neo-Platonism associated with the names of Plotinus and Porphyry. At Alexandria the great Greek ecclesiastical writers pursued their studies with pagan rhetoricians and philosophers; in fact several of them were born here, e. g. Origen, Athanasius, and his opponent Arius, also Cyril and Synesius. Not indeed in the city of Alexandria, but yet upon Egyp-

tian soil, grew up that ascetic concept of life which attained such great importance as Byzantine monasticism. After Alexandria, Syria was important as a home of Christianity, its centre being Antioch, where a school of Christian commentators flourished under St. John Chrysostom, and where later arose the Christian universal chronicles. In Syria, also, we find the germs of Greek ecclesiastical poetry, while from neighbouring Palestine came St. John of Damascus, the last of the Greek Fathers.

It is evident that Greek Christianity had of necessity a pronounced Oriental character; Egypt and Syria are the real birthplaces of the Græco-Oriental church, and indeed of Græco-Oriental (i. e. Byzantine) civilization in general. Egypt and Syria, with Asia Minor, became for the autochthonous Greek civilization a sort of America, where hundreds of flourishing cities sprang into existence, and where energies confined or crippled in the impoverished home-land found an unlimited opportunity to display themselves; not only did these cities surpass in material wealth the mother-country, but soon also cultivated the highest goods of the intellect (Krumbacher). Under such circumstances it is not strange that about nine-tenths of all the Byzantine authors of the first eight centuries were natives of Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and Asia Minor.

After this brief characterization of the various elements of Byzantine civilization, it is to be inquired in what relation they stood to each other, how they mingled, and what was the product of their combination. It is extremely instructive to notice how the two fundamental elements of Byzantinism, the Roman and the Hellenistic, are connected, both with each other and with the culture of the East—what each one gains and what it loses, and what influence it has upon the other. The Roman supremacy in governmental life did not disappear in Byzantium. It was even amplified, through the union of Roman Cæsarism with Oriental despotism. Moreover, the subjection of the Church to the power of the State led to that governmental ecclesiasticism always irreconcilably opposed to the Roman Church, which had triumphed over the secular power. On the other hand, the intellectual superiority of the Greek element was shown by its victory over the Latin tongue as the official language of the Government. Its last Latin monument is the "Novellæ" of Justinian. As early as the seventh century the Greek language made great progress, and by the eleventh the supremacy of Greek was secure, although it was never able to absorb the numerous other languages of the empire. Moreover, while the Greek world might artificially preserve the classic form of its ancient literature, the same cannot be said of the poetical feeling and the imagination. It was precisely in æsthetic culture that the Byzantine Greek broke completely with the ancient traditions; in literature and in the plastic arts the spirit of the Orient was everywhere victorious. On the one hand, some ancient literary types, e. g., lyric verse and the drama, became quite extinct, while only in the minor departments of literature was any great degree of skill attained; on the other hand, the ancient sense of proportion, the feeling for beauty, and the creative power in poetry were wholly lost, and were replaced by a delight in the grotesque and the disproportioned on the one hand, and in ornamental trifles on the other. This injury, affecting literature and its free development, was a result of social conditions which contrast markedly with those of ancient Athens and ancient Rome, while they fit in perfectly with the masterful ways of the Orient. There is no trace of a body of free and educated citizens, which is also in keeping with the Roman policy of close centralization, and the consequently slight development of municipal life. Constantinople was *the* city, and no rivals were permitted. Literature was, therefore, wholly a concern of the high official and priestly classes; it was aristocratic or theological, not representative of the interests of the citizens. Thus classical standards could be imitated because only the upper classes concerned themselves with literature. For the same reason it lacked genuine spontaneity, having no roots in the life of the people. The Church alone—and here we come to its influence on Byzantine civilization—for some time infused fresh life into literature. But even this life was an Oriental growth, for Greek hymnology is of Syrian origin. In Byzantium therefore, ecclesiastical and Oriental influences coincide. The Oriental influence is especially apparent in Byzantine plastic art. Here the ancient sources of inspiration are even more completely obscured than in the domain of literature, and we notice the same principles: complete absence of feeling for architectonic proportion of members, transference of the artistic centre of gravity to the interior, i. e. to the wall-surfaces, and there the replacing of form by colour, of the plastic effect by the picturesque; not, however, by broadly drawn fresco treatment, but by the more artisanlike work in mosaic, with its predominance of ornamental motives. Wall-decoration and minor ornament are thus combined in a fashion analogous to the Byzantine treatment of annalistic and epigrammatic poetry. And while Byzantine art, like its poetry, goes back to the Alexandrian, yet it is greatly altered and modified by influences from Syria, Persia, and Asia Minor, so that it approaches the Oriental.

The next point to be discussed is the influence of the Orient upon Church and State. Here we must distinguish between direct and indirect forces. Chief among the former is the office of Emperor. In so far as the emperor unites in himself both secular and spiritual power, there falls upon him a glamour of Oriental theocracy; his person is regarded as sacred; he is a representative of God, indeed the very image of God, and all must prostrate themselves before him; everything that serves for his use is sacred, even the red ink with which he underlines his signature. The Oriental character of the Byzantine Church appears in its tenacious dogmatic spirit, the establishment of Christian doctrines by councils, the asceticism which affected monastic life so far as to hinder the formation of regular orders with community life, and also the mad fanaticism against the Roman West and the Church, which in the eleventh century finally led to an open breach. The Oriental character of Church and State is still more pronounced considered in its effect upon civic life. The lack of a vigorous citizen-body, owing to the lack of large cities, has already been mentioned. The landed nobility, officials, and priests controlled political, social, and religious life. Hence the aristocratic, exclusive, and non-popular character of the language and literature, and the one-sided development of both, down to the twelfth century. The Church, too, kept in subjection by the State, though failing to ennoble the inner religious life of the citizens, sought all the more zealously to fashion their external life upon an ecclesiastical model. The church edifice even served as a model for secular building; every house had its altar, and the family life followed ecclesiastical forms. On the other hand, we do not find the rich and fruitful interaction between spiritual and secular affairs that we do in western countries. The religious devotion to Mary gave rise to no chivalric devotion to woman, and from the oratories there came no religious drama. Theological and dogmatic interests outweighed the religious and ethical; the individualistic sentiment was stronger than the social. Such, approximately, was the result of the mingling of the diverse elements in the body of Byzantine culture.

What then were the cultural effects emanating from this complex organism?

The most momentous effect of the establishment of the Eastern Roman Empire on European civilization was the division of the latter into two parts: one Romance and Germanic, the other Greek and Slavic. Ethnographically, linguistically, ecclesiastically, and historically, both cultures are sharply distinct from each other, as is evident from a comparison of alphabets and calendars. The former division is the more progressive; the latter is the more conservative, and very slow to adapt itself to the West. Byzantium exerted a decided and effective influence only in the eastern half of the empire. Russia, the Balkan countries, and Turkey are the modern offshoots of Byzantine civilization; the first two particularly in ecclesiastical, political, and cultural respects (through the translation and adaptation of sacred, historical, and popular literature); the third in respect to civil government.

For the European West the Byzantine Empire and its culture are significant in a twofold way. Indirectly, this Empire affected the West in forming a strong bulwark against the frequent advances of the Asiatic races and protecting Europe for centuries from the burdens of war. Byzantium was also the storehouse of the greatest literature of the ancients, the Greek. During the Middle Ages, until the capture of Constantinople, the West was acquainted only with Roman literature. Greek antiquity was first unlocked for it by the treasures which fugitive Greek humanists carried to Italy. Byzantine culture had a direct influence especially upon Southern and Central Europe, that is to say on Italy, in church music and church poetry, though this was only in the very early period (until the seventh century); it had a permanent and wider influence in ecclesiastical architecture, through the development of the so-called Romanesque style (in the tenth and eleventh centuries), the Oriental and Byzantine origin of which has been more clearly recognized of late. This influence was transmitted through the Frankish and Salic emperors, primarily Charlemagne, whose relations with Byzantium are well known. Probably it was also in this way that Byzantine titles and ceremonial were introduced into Central Europe, and that Central and Eastern European official life assumed its hierarchical and bureaucratical character. Finally, though not very numerous, the effects of Byzantine culture upon the countries of the Near East, especially upon the Armenians, the Persians, and the Arabs, must not be underestimated. Even if Byzantium received from these nations more than it imparted, still the Byzantines gave a strong intellectual impulse to the Orient, particularly by enriching its scholarly literature, though even in this they served chiefly as intermediaries.

In the following account Byzantine literature is classified in five groups. The first three include representatives of those kinds of literature which continued the ancient traditions: historians (including also the chroniclers), encyclopedists, and essayists, and writers of secular poetry. The remaining two groups include the new literary species, ecclesiastical and theological literature, and popular poetry.

I. Historians and Annalists.—The two groups of secular prose literature show clearly the dual character of Byzantine intellectual life in its social, religious, and linguistic aspects. From this point of view historical and annalistic literature supplement each other; the former is aristocratic, the latter is of the people, both in origin and aim; the former is secular, the latter ecclesiastical and monastic; the former is classical, the latter popular. The works of the historians belong to scholarly literature, those of the annalists (or chroniclers) to the literature of the people. The former are carefully elaborated, the latter give only raw material; the former confine themselves to the description of the present and the most recent past, and thus have rather the character of contemporary records; the latter cover the whole history of the world as known to the Middle Ages. The former are therefore the more valuable for political history; the latter for the history of civilization. The following detailed account will bring to light still further differences.

A. *Historians.*—Classical literary tradition set the standard for Byzantine historians in their grasp of the aims of history, the manner of handling their subjects, and in style of composition. Their works are thoroughly concrete and objective in character, without passion, and even without enthusiasm. Ardent patriotism and personal convictions are rarely evident. They are diplomatic historians, expert in the use of historical sources and in the polished tact called for by their social position; they are not closet-scholars, ignorant of the world, but men who stood out in public life: jurists like Procopius, Agathias, Evagrius, Michael Attaliates; statesmen like Joannes Cinnamus, Nicetas Acominatus, Georgius Pachymeres, Laonicus Chalcondyles; generals and diplomats like Nicephorus Bryennius, Georgius Acropolites, Georgius Phrantzes; and even crowned heads, like Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Anna Comnena, John VI Cantacuzene, and others. The Byzantine historians thus represent not only the social but also the intellectual flower of their time, resembling in this their Greek predecessors, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Polybius, who became their guides and models. In some cases a Byzantine chooses one or another classic writer to imitate in method and style. The majority, however, took as models several authors, a custom which gave rise to a peculiar mosaic style, quite characteristic of the Byzantines. This was not always due to mere caprice, but often resulted from a real community of feeling, effectually preventing, however, any development of an individual style. For the continuity of historical style it would surely have been desirable for an historian of such great influence on posterity as Procopius to have chosen as his model Polybius rather than Thucydides. That such was not the case, however, is not the fault of the Byzantines but of the "Atticists", who had checked the natural course of the development. Nevertheless, within the limits of this development, it is certainly no accident that military characters like Nicephorus Bryennius (eleventh and twelfth centuries) and Joannes Cinnamus (twelfth century) emulated Xenophon in the precision of their diction, and that a philosophic character like Nicephorus Gregoras (thirteenth century) took Plato as his model. On the other hand, it is doubtless due to chance that writers trained in theology like Leo Diaconus and Georgius Pachymeres chose to ornament their pages with Homeric turns. On the whole it is in the later historians that the dualism of Byzantine civilization—ecclesiastico-political matter in classical form—becomes most apparent.

Although the Byzantine historians are thus for the most part dependent on foreign models, and while, to outward appearances, they form a continuous series in which each begins where his predecessor stopped, yet they do not blend into a uniform whole, distinguishable only under the light cast on them from classic literature. There are, on the contrary, clearly marked groups within which individual personalities stand out with distinctness. Most of the historians come in either the period embracing the sixth and seventh centuries, or that extending from the eleventh to the fifteenth century, i. e. either during the reigns of the East-Roman emperors or those of the Comneni and the Palæologi. At the time of its zenith under the Macedonian emperors (the ninth and tenth centuries) the Byzantine world produced

great heroes, but no great historians, if we except the solitary, and therefore more conspicuous, figure of the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus.

The first period is dominated by Procopius, not so much because of his personal character, as on account of his share in historical events of universal interest, and his literary importance. As a man he was typically Byzantine, as is evident from a comparison of two of his works, in one of which his depreciation of the Emperor Justinian is as emphatic as his unqualified apotheosis of him in the other. In literature, and as a historian, however, he still has one foot on the soil of antiquity, as is evident in the precision and lucidity of his narrative acquired from Thucydides, and in the reliability of his information, qualities of special merit in the historian. Significantly enough, Procopius and to a great degree his continuator, Agathias, remain the models of descriptive style, even as late as the eleventh century. Procopius is the first representative of the over-laden, over-ornamented Byzantine style in literature, and in this is surpassed only by Theophylaktos Simokattes in the seventh century, while others continued to imitate the historian of the Gothic War. In spite of their unclassical form, however, they approach the ancients in their freedom from ecclesiastical and dogmatic tendencies.

Between the historical writings of the first period, in form and content half antique, and those of the second, characterized by reverence for an artificial classicism, there is an isolated series of works which in matter and form offer a strong contrast to both the aforesaid groups. These are the works current under the name of the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (tenth century), dealing respectively with the administration of the empire, its political division, and the ceremonial of the Byzantine Court. They treat of the internal conditions of the empire, and the first and third are distinguished by their use of a popular tongue. Their content also is of great value; the first is an important source of information for the ethnological conditions of the empire, while the last is an interesting contribution to the history of civilization in the Byzantine Orient.

The second group of historians present very different characteristics. In their works a classical eclecticism veils theological fanaticism quite foreign to the classic spirit and an arrogant chauvinism. Revelling in classical forms the historians of the period of the Comneni and Palæologi were absolutely devoid of the classical spirit; there are among them, however—and this goes far to palliate their faults—much stronger and more sympathetic personalities than in the first period. It seems as if, amid all the weakening of civil and imperial power, a few great individual personalities stood out, all the more striking because of the general decay. Indeed, the individuality of each is so vigorous that it impairs the objectivity of his work. This is particularly true of those historians who belonged to an imperial family or were closely related to one. Most of these writers produced partisan works. Such are the "Alexiad", the pedantic work of the Princess Anna Comnena (a glorification of her father Alexius, and of the reorganization of the empire set afoot by him), the historical work of her husband, Nicephorus Bryennius (eleventh and twelfth centuries; a description of the internal conflicts that accompanied the rise of the Comneni, done in the form of a family chronicle), and lastly the self-complacent narrative of his own achievements by one of the Palæologi, John VI Cantacuzene (fourteenth century). The historical writers of this period exhibit also very striking antitheses, both personal and objective. Beside Cinnamus, who honestly hated everything Western, stand the broad-minded Nicetas Acominatus (twelfth century) and the conciliatory but dignified Georgius Acropolites (thirteenth century); beside the theological polemist, Pachymeres (thirteenth century), stands the man of the world, Nicephorus Gregoras (fourteenth century), well versed in philosophy and the classics. While these and other similar writers are less objective than is desirable in their presentation of internal Byzantine history, they are all the more trustworthy in their accounts of external events, being especially important sources for the first appearance of the Slavs and Turks on the borders of the Empire.

B. *Chroniclers.*—Unlike the historical works, Byzantine chronicles were intended for the general public; hence the difference in their origin, development, and diffusion, as well as in their character, the method in which materials are handled, and their style of composition. The beginnings of the Byzantine chronicle have not yet been satisfactorily traced. That they are not very remote seems certain from their comparatively late appearance, as compared with historical literature (sixth century), and from their total lack of contact with hellenistic (pagan) tradition. In point of locality, also, the chronicle literature is originally foreign to Greek civilization, its first important product having been composed in Syria, by an uneducated Syrian. Its presumable prototype, moreover, the "Chronography" of Sextus Julius Africanus, points to an Oriental Christian source. Accordingly, the origins and development of the chronicle literature are confined to a much narrower circle; it has no connexion with persons of distinction and is not in touch with the great world; its models are bound almost exclusively within its own narrow sphere. The high-water mark of the Byzantine chronicle was reached in the ninth century, precisely at a time when there is a gap in historical literature. Afterwards it falls off rather abruptly; the lesser chroniclers, met with as late as the twelfth century, draw partly from contemporary and partly, though at rare intervals, from the earlier historians. In the Palæologi period there are, significantly enough, no chroniclers of any note.

The importance of Byzantine chronicles lies not in their historical and literary value, but in their relation to civilization. They are not only an important source for the history of Byzantine civilization, but themselves contributed to the spread of that civilization. The most important chronicles, through numerous redactions and translations, passed over to Slavic and Oriental peoples and in this way became one of their earliest sources of civilization. Their influence was chiefly due to their popular tone and bias. They depict only what lies within the popular world of consciousness, events wonderful and dreadful painted in glaring colours, and interpreted in a Christian sense. The method of handling materials is extremely primitive. Beneath each section of a chronicle lies some older source usually but slightly modified, so that the whole story resembles a crude collection of material, rather than ingenious mosaic like the narratives of the historians. The diction corresponds with the low level of education in both author and reader, and is naturally that of the popular tongue in its original purity, therefore these chronicles are a rich treasure-house for the comparative study of languages.

Representative Byzantine chronicles, typical also of the different stages in the development of the chronicle, are the three of Joannes Malalas, Theophanes Confessor, and Joannes Zonaras respectively. The first is the earliest Christian Byzantine monastic chronicle, and was composed at Antioch in the sixth century by a hellenized Syrian (consequently Monophysite) theologian. Originally a chronicle of the city, it was later expanded into a world-chronicle. It is a popular historical work, full of the gravest historical and chronological errors, and the first

monument of a purely popular hellenistic civilization. It is the chief source for most of the later chroniclers, as well as for a few church historians; it is also the earliest popular history, which was translated into Old-Bulgarian, about the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century. Superior in substance and form, and more properly historical, is the Chronicle of Theophanes, a monk of Asia Minor, written in the ninth century, and in its turn a model for later chronicles. It contains much valuable information from lost sources, and its importance for the Western world is due to the fact that by the end of the ninth century it had been translated into Latin. A third guide-post in the history of Byzantine chronicles is the twelfth-century Universal Chronicle of Zonaras. There is already apparent in it something of the atmosphere of the renaissance that occurred under the Comneni; not only is the narrative better than that of Theophanes, but in it many passages from ancient writers are worked into the text. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that this chronicle was translated not only into Slavic and Latin, but also, in the sixteenth century, into Italian and French.

II. Encyclopedists and Essayists.—The spirit of antiquarian scholarship awoke in Byzantium earlier than in the West, though it proved less productive. It is extremely significant, however, that the study of antiquity at Byzantium was begun not by laymen, but by theologians. For this reason it always had a certain scholastic flavour; the Byzantine humanistic spirit savoured alike of antiquity and the Middle Ages; neither ever really gained the upper hand. A pronounced interest in the literature of Greek antiquity was first manifested at Constantinople in the second half of the ninth century. It was primarily directed to the systematic collection and sifting of manuscripts. With the twelfth century begins the period of original productions in imitation of antique models, a revival of the Alexandrian essay and rhetorical literature, a number of writers showing vigorous originality. Quite isolated between the two periods stands Michael Psellus, a universal genius of the eleventh century who bridges over the periods. While the humanism of the ninth and tenth centuries retained throughout a strong theological colouring and maintained a hostile attitude towards the West, that of the twelfth to the fourteenth century developed several writers who consciously or unconsciously sought to break away from orthodox classicism, and to attain a true humanism, and so became the earliest forerunners of the Italian Renaissance. The new spirit first found expression in an academy founded for classical studies at Constantinople in 863. About the same time the broadly trained and energetic Photius, patriarch of the city and the greatest statesman of the Greek Church (820–897), exhibited much enthusiasm in the collection of manuscripts and an intuitive genius for the revival of forgotten works of antiquity and the discovery of works hitherto unknown, in which his attention, however, was chiefly directed to the prose writers, a fact indicative of his sound practical sense. Photius made selections or excerpts from all the works he discovered, and these were the beginning of his celebrated "Bibliotheca" (Library), which, despite its dry and schematic character, is the most valuable literary compendium of the Middle Ages, containing, as it does, trustworthy summaries of many ancient works that have since been lost, together with which many good characterizations and analyses are given, e. g. those of Lucian and Heliodorus. Strangely enough, the same Photius, who thus laid a foundation for the renewed study of antiquity, also prepared the way for the Greek Schism, that momentous break of the Greek world from the West and its civilization. Even within his own Church, however, he appears greater as an ecclesiastical statesman than as a theologian.

The encyclopedic activity in Byzantium which had been begun by Photius was more assiduously pursued in the tenth century, particularly in the systematic collecting of materials, which is usually associated with the name of the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913–959). Scholars did not confine themselves solely to collecting materials, but formed great compilations, arranged according to subjects, on the basis of older sources. Among them was an encyclopedia of political science which contained extracts from the classical, Alexandrian, and Roman-Byzantine periods; it is preserved, however, only in a few fragments. If we take account also of the fact that in the same century originated the collection of ancient epigrams known as the "Anthologia Palatina", as well as the scientific dictionary which goes under the name of Suidas, we may rightly designate the tenth century as that of the encyclopedias.

A typical representative of the period appears in the following century in the person of the greatest encyclopedist of Byzantine literature, Michael Psellus. Like Bacon, he stands between the Middle Ages and modern times. He is not, like Photius, a theologian, but a jurist and a man of the world; his mind is not only receptive but productive; he not only does not undervalue the old philosophers, as does Photius, who was more concerned with points of philosophy and grammar, but is himself of a philosophic temperament. He was the first of his intellectual circle to raise the philosophy of Plato above that of Aristotle and to teach philosophy as a professor. Though surpassing Photius in intellect and wit, he lacks that scholar's dignity and solidity of character. A certain restless brilliancy characterized the course of his life, as well as his literary activity. At first a lawyer, he then became a professor of philosophy, was for a time a monk, then a court official, and ended his career as prime minister. He was equally adroit and many-sided in his literary work, in this respect resembling Leibniz. In harmony with the polished, pliant nature of the courtier is his elegant Platonic style, as it is exhibited most distinctly in his letters and speeches. His extensive correspondence furnishes endless material for an understanding of his personal and literary character. In his speeches, especially in his funeral orations, we recognize clearly the ennobling influence of his Attic models; that delivered on the death of his mother shows deep sensibility. Compared with Photius, Psellus had something of a poetic temperament, as several of his poems show, though indeed they owe their origin more to satirical fancy or to external occasions than to deep poetic feeling. Though Psellus exhibits more formal skill than original, creative talent, his endowments proved most valuable for his time, which was particularly backward in the direction of æsthetic culture. The intellectual freedom of the great scholars (*polyhistores*), ecclesiastical and secular, of the twelfth to the fourteenth century would be inconceivable without the activity of Psellus, the first great victor over Byzantine scholasticism, who cleared the way for his successors.

In one point indeed, and that important in passing any judgment on him, Psellus was surpassed by most of his intellectual posterity, i. e. in character. It is true there are also among his successors many morally corrupt and hollow natures, like Nicephorus Blemmydes, and Hyrtakenos; the majority, however, are admirable for their rectitude of intention and sincerity of feeling, and their beneficently broad culture. Among these great intellects and strong characters of the twelfth century several theologians are especially conspicuous, e. g. Eustathius of Thessalonica, Michael Italicus, and Michael Acominatus; in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries several secular scholars, like Maximus Planudes, Theodorus Metochites, and, above all, Nicephorus Gregoras.

The three theologians first named are best judged by their letters and minor occasional writings. Eustathius seems to be the most important among them, not only because of his learned commentary on Homer and Pindar, but particularly because of his own original writings. Therein he reveals a candid character, courageously holding up every evil to the light and intent upon its correction, not shrinking from sharp controversy. In one of his works he attacks the corruption of the monastic life of that day and its intellectual stagnation; in another, one of the best of the Byzantine polemical writings, he assails the hypocrisy and sham holiness of his time; in a third he denounces the conceit and arrogance of the Byzantine priests, who were ashamed of their popular designation, "pope". For a rhetorician like Michael Italicus, later a bishop, it is extremely significant that he should attack the chief weakness of Byzantine literature, external imitation; this he did on receiving a work by a patriarch, which was simply a disorderly collection of fragments from other writers, so poorly put together that the sources were immediately recognizable.

Noteworthy also is the noble figure of the pupil and friend of Eustathius, Michael Acominatus (twelfth and thirteenth centuries) Archbishop of Athens and brother of the historian Nicetas Acominatus. His inaugural address, delivered on the Acropolis, compared by Gregorovius with Gregory the Great's sermon to the Romans in St. Peter's, exhibits both profound classical scholarship and high enthusiasm; the latter, however, is somewhat out of place in view of the material and spiritual wretchedness of his times. These pitiful conditions moved him to compose an elegy, famous because unique, on the decay of Athens, a sort of poetical and antiquarian apostrophe to fallen greatness. Gregorovius compares this also with a Latin counterpart, the lament of Bishop Hildebert of Tours on the demolition of Rome by the Normans (1106). More wordy and rhetorical are the funeral orations over his teacher, Eustathius (1195), and over his brother Nicetas, both of them, nevertheless, fine evidences of a noble disposition and deep feeling. In spite of his humanism, Michael, like his brother, remained a fanatical opponent of the Latins, whom he called "barbarians". They had driven him into exile at Ceos, whence he addressed many letters to his friends, which are of great value for the understanding of his character. In his style he is strongly influenced by Eustathius; hence the ecclesiastical note in his otherwise classical diction.

With Theodorus Metochites and Maximus Planudes we come to the universal scholars (*polyhistores*) of the time of the Palæologi. The former gives evidence of his humanistic zeal in his frequent use of the hexameter, the latter in his knowledge of the Latin, both being otherwise unknown in Byzantium, and acquaintance with them foreboding a new and broader grasp of antiquity. Both men show an unusually fine grasp of poetry, especially of the poetry of nature. Metochites composed meditations on the beauty of the sea; Planudes was the author of a long poetic idyll, a kind of literature otherwise little cultivated by Byzantine scholars. On the whole, Metochites was a thinker and poet, Planudes chiefly an imitator and compiler. Metochites was of the more speculative disposition, as his collection of philosophical and historical miscellanies show. Planudes was more precise, as his preference for mathematics proves. It is worth noting, as an evidence of contemporary progress in philosophy, that Metochites openly attacks Aristotle. He also deals more frankly with political questions, as is shown, for instance, in his comparison of democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy. In spite of this breadth of interest his culture rests wholly on a Greek basis, while Planudes, by his translations from the Latin (Cato, Ovid, Cicero, Cæsar, and Boethius), vastly enlarged the Eastern intellectual horizon.

This inclination toward the West is most noticeable in Nicephorus Gregoras, the great pupil of Metochites. His project for a reform of the calendar alone suffices to rank him among the modern and superior intellects of his time, as he will surely be admitted to have been if ever his numerous and varied works in every domain of Byzantine intellectual activity are brought to light. His letters, especially, promise a rich harvest. His method of exposition is based on that of Plato, whom he also imitated in his ecclesiastico-political discussions, e. g. in his dialogue "Florentius, or Concerning Wisdom". These disputations with his opponent, Barlaam, dealt with the question of church union, in which Gregoras stood on the side of the Unionists. This attitude, which places him outside the sphere of strictly Byzantine culture, brought upon him bitter hostility and the loss of the privilege of teaching; he had been occupied chiefly with the exact sciences, whereby he had already earned the hatred of orthodox Byzantines.

While, therefore, the Byzantine essayists and encyclopedists stood, externally, wholly under the influence of ancient rhetoric and its rules, and while they did not, like Bacon, create an entirely new form of the essay, yet they embodied in the traditional form their own characteristic knowledge, and thereby lent it a new charm.

III. Secular Poetry.—As the prose literature, both historical and philosophical, followed one or more ancient models—the former Thucydides in particular, the latter Plato—so poetry likewise had its prototypes; each of its principal classes had, so to speak, an ancient progenitor to whom it traced back its origins. Unlike the prose literature, however, these new kinds of poetical Byzantine literature and their models are not to be traced back to the classical Attic period. The Byzantines write neither lyrics nor dramas and imitate neither Pindar nor Sophocles. They imitate the literature of the post-classic or Alexandrian period, and write romances, panegyrics epigrams, satires, and didactic and hortatory poetry. The chief Alexandrian representatives of these species of literature are the models for the Byzantines, in particular Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius, Asclepiades and Posidippus, Lucian and Longus. For didactic poetry it is necessary to go back to an earlier prototype, a work ascribed to Isocrates, by whom, however, it was not actually written. The poetic temperament of the Byzantines is thus akin to that of the Alexandrian, not of the Attic, writers. This statement is of great importance for the understanding of the poetry of Byzantium. Only one new poetic type was evolved independently by the Byzantines—the begging-poem. The five ancient types and the new one just mentioned are not contemporaneous in the Byzantine period; the epigram and the panegyric developed first (in the sixth and seventh centuries), and then only, at long intervals, the others, i. e. satire, didactic and begging poetry, finally the romance. All of these appear side by side only after the twelfth century, that is to say in the period of decay, they themselves marking a decadence in literature.

The epigram was the artistic form of later antiquity which best suited the Byzantine taste for the ornamental and for intellectual ingenuity. It corresponded exactly to the concept of the minor arts, which in the Byzantine period attained such high development. It made no lofty demands on the imagination of the author; the chief difficulty lay rather in the technique and the attainment of the utmost possible pregnancy of phrase. Two groups may be distinguished among the Byzantine epigrammatists:

one pagan and humanistic in tendency, the other Christian. The former is represented chiefly by Agathias (sixth century) and Christophorus of Mitylene (eleventh century); the latter by the ecclesiastics, Georgius Pisides (seventh century) and Theodorus Studites (ninth century). Between the two groups, in point of time as well as in character, stands Joannes Geometres (tenth century). The chief phases in the development of the Byzantine epigram are most evident in the works of these three. Agathias, who has already been mentioned among the historians, as an epigrammatist, has the peculiarities of the school of the semi-Byzantine Egyptian Nonnus (about A. D. 400). He wrote in an affected and turgid style, in the classical form of the hexameter; he abounds, however, in brilliant ideas, and in his skilful imitation of the ancients, particularly in his erotic pieces, he surpasses most of the epigrammatists of the imperial period. Agathias also prepared a collection of epigrams, partly his own and partly by other writers, some of which afterwards passed into the "Anthologia Palatina" and have thus been preserved. The abbot Theodorus Studites is in every respect the opposite of Agathias; a man of deep earnestness and simple piety, with a fine power of observation in nature and life, full of sentiment and warmth and simplicity of expression, his writings are free from servile imitation of the ancients, though he occasionally betrays the influence of Nonnus. Of his epigrams, which touch on the most varied things and situations, those treating of the life and personnel of his monastery offer especial interest for the history of civilization. Joannes Geometres is in a way a combination of the two preceding writers. During the course of his life he filled both secular and ecclesiastical offices; his poetry also was of a universal character; of a deeply religious temper, he was still fully appreciative of the greatness of the ancient Greeks. Alongside of epigrams on ancient poets, philosophers, rhetoricians, and historians, are others on famous Church Fathers, poets, and saints. In point of poetic treatment, the epigrams on contemporary and secular topics are superior to those on religious and classic subjects. He is at his best when depicting historical events and situations that have come within his own experience, and reflect his own spiritual moods (Krumbacher).

Less agreeable than the epigrams are the official panegyrics on emperors and their achievements, which unfortunately even the best writers often could not escape composing. Typical of this kind of literature are the commemorative poem of Paulus Silentiarius on the dedication of the church of St. Sophia, and that of Georgius Pisides on the victory of Heraclius over the Persians; each comprises over a thousand verses and celebrates not the importance of these great events, but the glory of the prince. Unfavourable conclusions must not be drawn, however, as to the character of these poets, when it is borne in mind that such eulogies were composed not only by courtiers like Psellus and Manuel Holobolos (thirteenth century), but also by dignified and independent characters like Eustathius and Michael Acominatus. In fact this species of literature had become traditional, and had been handed down from imperial Rome to Byzantium as a part of ancient rhetoric with all the extravagance of a thoroughly decadent literature (F. Gregorovius). It was a sort of necessary concession to despotism; popular taste was not in general offended by it.

As previously stated, the chief kinds of poetry during the period of the decline (eleventh to thirteenth century) were satire and parody, didactic and hortatory poetry, the begging-poem, and the erotic romance. In form this literature is characterized by its extensive use of the popular forms of speech and verse, the latter being the "political" verse, a trochaic verse of fifteen syllables, still the standard verse of modern Greek popular poetry. In content, however, all this literature continues to bear the imprint of Byzantine erudition. The father of Byzantine satire is Lucian. His celebrated "Dialogues of the Dead" furnished the model for two works, one of which, the "Timarion" (twelfth century), is marked by more rude humour, the other, "Mazaris" (fifteenth century), by keen satire. Each describes a journey to the underworld and conversations with dead contemporaries; in the former their defects are lashed with good-natured raillery; in the latter, however, under the masks of dead men, living persons and contemporary conditions, especially at the Byzantine Court, are sharply stigmatized; thus the former is more of a literary satire, the latter a political pamphlet, with keen personal thrusts and without literary value, but with all the greater interest for the history of civilization; the former is in a genuinely popular tone, the latter is vulgar and crude. [Cf. Tozer in "The Journal of Hellenic Studies" (1881), II, 233–270; Krumbacher, op. cit., 198–211.] Two popular offshoots of the "Timarion", the "Apokopos" and the "Piccatoros" will be discussed later. Another group of satires takes the form of dialogues between animals, manifestly a development from the Christian popular book known as the "Physiologus". Such satires describe assemblages of quadrupeds, birds, and fishes, and recite their lampooning remarks upon the clergy, the bureaucracy, the foreign nations in the Byzantine Empire, etc. (Krumbacher, 385–390). Here belong also the parodies in the form of church poems which are mentioned below, and in which the clergy themselves took part, e. g. Bishop Nicetas of Serræ (eleventh century). One of the worst examples of this sacrilegious literature, which is not yet, however, fully understood, is the "Mockery of a Beardless Man" in the liturgical form of Mass-Chants. This is one of the most obscene products of Byzantine literature (fourteenth century). (Krumbacher, 337.)

As the Byzantine satire had its prototype in Lucian, the didactic poetry found its model in the dialogue, "To Demonikos", erroneously ascribed to Isocrates. The greatest example of this type of literature in Byzantium is the "Spaneas" (twelfth century), a hortatory poem addressed by an emperor to his nephew, a sort of "Mirror for Princes". Some few offshoots from this are found in the popular literature of Crete in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, handed down under the names of Sachlikis and Depharanas. Here also belong the ranting theological exhortations resembling those of the Capuchin in Schiller's "Wallenstein". Such, for instance, are that of Georgillas after the great plague of Rhodes (1498) and the oracular prophecies on the end of the Byzantine empire current under the name of Emperor Leo (886–911). (Krumbacher, 332, 336, 343, 352, 366.)

A late Byzantine variety of the laudatory poem is the begging-poem, the poetical lament of hungry authors and the parasites of the court. Its chief representatives are Theodorus Prodromus and the still more contemptible Manuel Philes, the former of whom lived under the Comneni (twelfth century), the latter under the Palæologi (thirteenth century). For the history of civilization such poetical wails of distress as Prodromus addressed to the emperor are of value because they give interesting pictures of street and business life in the capital. (Cf. Krumbacher, 324, 333.)

The Alexandrian erotic romance was imitated by three late writers of the twelfth century: Eustathius Makrembolites, Theodorus Prodromus, and Nicetas Eugenianus. E. Rohde's criticism of the last is true of all three: "Nothing original is found anywhere; on the contrary, Nicetas unhesitatingly steals his flowers of speech and gallant turns from everywhere, from

the Anacreontics, from the bucolic poets, from Musæus, from the epigrammatists of the Anthology, even from Heliodorus and Longus, and especially from Achilles Tatius". The tone of these romances is characterized by a combination of sickening affectation of style and a crude coarseness of material. (Cf. Krumbacher, 313, 318, 319; Rohde, Der griechische Roman, Leipzig, 1876, 522 sqq.)

The epigram was thus the only form of secular poetry which had an independent revival in Byzantine literature, and this at the very time when ecclesiastical poetry also reached its highest perfection, in the sixth and seventh centuries. This age is therefore the most flourishing period of Byzantine scholarly poetry; its decline in the twelfth century is contemporary with the rise of popular poetry.

IV. Ecclesiastical and Theological Literature.—While the most flourishing period of the secular literature of Byzantium runs from the ninth to the twelfth century, as already seen in the account of its three principal groups, its religious literature developed much earlier. Christianity entered the world as a new force, with all the vigour of youth, between antiquity and the Byzantine Middle Ages; indeed, it first gave to those Middle Ages their distinctive characteristic, that theological element which permeates all Byzantine culture. From the Eastern provinces, Asia Minor and Palestine, came the first great ecclesiastical writers of the fourth century: Athanasius from Alexandria, Eusebius from Palestine, Cyril from Jerusalem, Synesius from Cyrene, and above all, the three great Fathers from Cappadocia, Basil and the two Gregories (of Nyssa and of Nazianzus). The contribution of these districts to Eastern Christianity was twofold: the rhetorical and speculative spirit of Hellenistic thought as it had developed in Alexandria and in Asia Minor, the old home of Greek culture; and the ascetic and dogmatic spirit peculiar to the Orient. The two blended in Byzantine Christianity into a new and peculiar unity which, however, was from the beginning strangely opposed to the Christian ideal of the Western world, and which finally separated from the latter. Because of the excessive emphasis it laid on asceticism the Eastern Church lost moral influence on practical life, and through its preference for the pagan ideal of ornate discourse, traditional indeed, but in forms no longer generally understood, that church estranged itself from the great masses of the people. "No Greek Father of the Church", says Krumbacher, "rose to the level of the golden sentence of Augustine: 'Let the grammarians find fault with us, if only the people understand us' ". Thus even the ecclesiastical literature of Byzantium, precisely at the period of its first florescence, is Hellenistic in form and Oriental in spirit. This period falls in the fourth century and is closely associated with the names of the ecclesiastical writers already mentioned. Their works, which cover the whole field of ecclesiastical prose literature, dogma, exegesis, and homiletics, became typical, even canonical, for the whole Byzantine period, which can therefore show no independent work in this field; on the contrary, scientific theology fell into decay as early as the sixth century; the last important work is the ecclesiastical history of Evagrius. Everything later consists, if we except the controversial writings against sectaries and the Iconoclasts, of mechanical compilations and commentaries, in the form of the so-called *Catenæ;* even the "Fountain of Knowledge" of John of Damascus (eighth century), the fundamental manual of Greek theology, though systematically worked out by a learned and keen intellect, is merely a gigantic collection of materials. Even the homily clings to a pseudo-classical, rhetorical foundation, and tends more and more to mere external breadth, not to inwardness and depth.

Only three kinds of ecclesiastical literature, which were as yet undeveloped in the fourth century, exhibit later an independent growth. These were the ecclesiastical poetry of the sixth century, popular lives of the saints of the seventh, and the mystic writings of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The history of Greek ecclesiastical poetry proves irrefutably how completely ancient poetry had exhausted itself in content and form, and how insufficient were its forms to express new and living thoughts. In ecclesiastical prose literature it was still possible to attempt to preserve ancient forms artificially, but even here we sometimes meet with foreign principles of literary art, which presuppose a new sense of poetry. It has been noticed that in several collections of early Christian correspondence it is not the rhythmic laws of Greek rhetorical style which govern the composition, but those of Semitic (Syriac) prose. This fact would be in perfect harmony with the other relations existing between late-Greek and Semitic culture, and the hypothesis of Cardinal Pitra, that the rhythmical poetry of the Byzantines has its origin in the Jewish Psalms of the Septuagint, receives therefrom a new support. As this rhythmic principle accords with the linguistic character of the later Greek, which had no musical, but only a stress, accent, and as it had already been developed in Syriac poetry, we need not wonder that Romanos, the first great ecclesiastical poet of the Greeks to adopt this principle, was a Syrian Jew, who had become a Christian at an early age.

About his life as little is known as about that of his contemporary and fellow-countryman, the chronicler Malalas, who also made a vigorous attempt to reform the language. What Malalas is to prose, Romanos is to the Christian poetry of the Greek Middle Ages. If he did not go so far as Malalas, yet he strongly modified the language of poetry and released it from the fetters of the ancient metric laws; he brought it into harmony with the latest idea of poetical form prevailing in his native country as well as with the character of the Greek language. Romanos, in fact, did not remain in Syria, but soon went to Constantinople, where he became a deacon of the church of St. Sophia, and where he is said to have first developed his gift for hymn-writing.

Romanos borrowed not only the form of his poems, but also their material and many of their themes, partly from the Old and New Testaments, partly from the (metrical) homilies of the Syrian Father, Ephrem (fourth century). He wrote hymns on the Passion of the Lord, on the betrayal by Judas, Peter's denial, Mary before the Cross, the Ascension, the Ten Virgins, the Last Judgment, whilst among his Old Testament themes mention may be made of the history of Joseph and that of the three young men in the fiery furnace. In giving poetical form to this matter he is said to have composed about a thousand hymns, of which, however, only eighty have come down to us, evidently because in the ninth century the hymns of Romanos were crowded out of the Greek Liturgy by the so-called *canones*, linguistically and metrically more artistic in form. Thenceforth his hymns held their own in only a few of the remoter monasteries. Characteristic of the technical treatment of his material by Romanos is the great length of his hymns, which are regularly composed of from twenty to thirty stanzas of from twelve to twenty-one verses each, very finely wrought and varied in metrical structure, and in construction transparent and terse. To appreciate rightly the great length of the hymns we must compare them, not with the more concise Latin hymns, but with the modern oratorios. This resemblance is emphasized by their antiphonal rendering by alternate choirs. This also explains the dramatic character of many hymns, with their inserted dialogues and choric songs, as in "Peter's Denial", a little drama of human boastfulness and weakness,

MAPS SHOWING THE DECLINE OF THE BYZANTINE EMPIRE
FROM THE TIME OF JUSTINIAN TO ITS FALL IN 1452

and the last part of the "History of Joseph", the "Psalm on the Apostles", and the "Birth of Jesus". Other pieces, like the hymn on the Last Judgment, are purely descriptive in character, though even in them the rhetorical and dogmatic elements seriously impair the artistic effect.

With regard to an æsthetic judgment of Romanos, it does not seem that the last word has been said. Some, like Bouvy and Krumbacher, place him among the greatest hymn-writers of all times; others, like Cardinal Pitra, are more conservative. For a final judgment a complete edition of the hymns is needed. Even now, however, it is certain that Romanos is not to be placed on the same level with the great Latin church poets like Ambrose and Prudentius. Two faults are especially obvious: his abundant use of rhetorical devices and his fondness for digressions into dogmatic theology. In both respects he is essentially Byzantine. He is fond of symbolic pictures and figures of speech, antitheses, assonances, especially witty *jeux d'esprit*, which are in strange contrast with his characteristic simplicity of diction and construction, and by their graceless embellishments destroy the smooth flow of his lines. Not only the form but also the sequence of thought in his hymns is often beclouded by the dragging in of dogmatic questions, e. g. in the celebrated Christmas hymn the question of the miraculous birth of Jesus is discussed no less than four times, and that too with a comfortable amplitude which betrays the theologian and for the time thrusts the poet completely aside. The theologian is also too evident in his allusions to the Old Testament when dealing with New Testament incidents; Mary at the birth of Jesus compares her destiny to that of Sarah, the Magi liken the star which guided them to the pillar of fire which went before the Israelites in the wilderness, and so on. The frequent citation of passages from the prophets also greatly weakens the poetic impression as well as the effect of the religious fervour of the poet, many passages seeming more like unimpassioned paraphrases than like inspired poetry. In fact Romanos does not control the abundant and highly-coloured imagery of the earliest Greek church poets, nor their fine grasp of nature. The reader also gathers the impression that the height of the poet's imagination is not in proportion with the depth of his piety; on the contrary, there often appears in him something naïve, almost homely, as when Mary expresses her pleasure in the gifts of the Magi and calls attention to their utility for the impending Flight into Egypt. There are passages, however, in which devout fervour carries the imagination along with it and elevates the poetical tone, as in the jubilant invitation to the dance (in the Easter-song), in which thoughts of spring and of the Resurrection are harmoniously blended:

Why thus faint-hearted?
Why veil ye your faces?
Lift up your hearts!
Christ is arisen!
Join in the dances,
And with us proclaim it:
The Lord is ascended,
Gleaming and glorified,
He who was born
Of the giver of light.
Cease then your mourning,
Rejoice in blessedness:
Springtime has come,
So bloom now, ye lilies,
Bloom and be fruitful!
Naught bringeth destruction.
Clap we our hands
And shout: Risen is He
Who helpeth the fallen ones
To rise again.

Ecclesiastical poetry, like ecclesiastico-historical literature, did not long remain on the high level to which Romanos had raised it. The "Hymnus Acathistus" (of unknown authorship) of the seventh century, a sort of Te Deum in praise of the Mother of God, is the last great monument of Greek church poetry, comparable to the hymns of Romanos, which it has even outlived in fame. It has had numerous imitators and as late as the seventeenth century was translated into Latin.

As early as the seventh century, the period of Andrew of Crete, begins the rapid decline of Greek hymnology. The delicate flower of religious sentiment was overgrown and choked by a classical formalism which stifled all vitality, as had happened in the case of contemporary secular poetry. The overvaluation of technique in details destroyed the sense of proportion in the whole. This seems to be the only explanation for the monstrosities called *canones* first found in the collection of Andrew of Crete. A *canon* is a combination of a number of hymns or chants (generally nine) of three or four strophes each. The "Great Canon" of Andrew actually numbers 250 strophes. Such length could only result in poverty of thought, as a "single idea is spun out into serpentine arabesques".

Pseudo-classical artificiality found an even more advanced representative in John of Damascus, in the opinion of the Byzantines the foremost writer of *canones*, who took as a model Gregory of Nazianzus, even reintroducing the principle of quantity into ecclesiastical poetry. If it be true that the sublimity of religious poetry is in this way reduced to mere trifling, this is, strictly speaking, the case here. For in the eleventh century, which witnessed the decline of Greek hymnology and the revival of pagan humanism, are found for the first time the parodies of church hymns, afterwards so popular. Their author was none other than Michael Psellus. Didactic poems took this form without being regarded as blasphemous. Another evidence of the few religious needs of the Byzantines is the absence of any religious drama such as developed among the people of the West during the Middle Ages. The only example, the "Suffering of Christ" (Christus Patiens), written in the eleventh or twelfth century, and even now frequently valued too highly in theological circles, can hardly be called a religious drama; it is the offspring of a pagan, rather than a Christian, spirit; of its 2,640 verses, about one-third are borrowed from ancient dramas, chiefly from those of Euripides, and Mary, the chief character, sometimes recites verses from the "Medea" of Euripides, again from the "Electra" of Sophocles, or the "Prometheus" of Æschylus. In her action, also, Mary impresses the reader as but feebly Christian. The composition is evidently a poor production of a theologian trained in the classics, but without the slightest idea of dramatic art. It is made up chiefly of lamentations and reports of messengers. Even the most effective scenes, those which precede the Crucifixion, are described by messengers; almost two-thirds of the text are given to the descent from the Cross, the lament of Mary, and the apparition of Christ. (Cf. Van Cleef, "The Pseudo-Gregorian Drama Χριστὸς πάσχων in its relation to the text of Euripides" in "Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences", VIII, 363–378; Krumbacher, 312.)

Between ecclesiastical poetry and ecclesiastical prose stands the theologico-didactic poem, a favourite species of ancient Christian literature. One of its best examples is the "Hexaemeron" of Georgius Pisides, a spirited hymn on the universe and its marvels, i. e. all living creatures. Taken as a whole, it is somewhat conventional; only in the description of the minor forms of life, especially of the animals, are

revealed the skill of the epigrammatist and the nature-lover's gift of affectionate observation.

Besides sacred poetry, hagiography flourished from the sixth to the eleventh century. This species of literature developed from the old martyrologies, and became the favourite form of popular literature. The most flourishing period extended from the eighth to the eleventh century, and was concerned principally with monastic life. Unfortunately, the rhetorical language was in violent contrast with the simple nature of the contents, so that the chief value of this literature is historical.

More popular in style are the biographers of saints of the sixth and seventh centuries. The oldest and most important of them is Cyril of Scythopolis (in Palestine), whose biographies of saints and monks are distinguished for the reliability of their facts and dates. Of great interest also for their contributions to the history of culture and of ethics, and for their genuinely popular language, are the writings of Leontius, Archbishop of Cyprus (seventh century), especially his life of the Patriarch John (surnamed The Merciful), *Eleemosynarius* of Alexandria. (Cf. Gelzer, Kleine Schriften, Leipsig, 1907.) This life describes for us a man who in spite of his peculiarities honestly tried "to realize a pure Biblical Christianity of self-sacrificing love", and whose life brings before us in a fascinating way the customs and ideas of the lower classes of the people of Alexandria. Still another popular work of Byzantine origin ranks among those that have won for themselves a place in universal literature; it is the romance of Barlaam and Jonsaph (q. v.), the "Song of Songs" of Christian asceticism, illustrated by the experience of the Indian prince Jonsaph, who is led by the hermit Barlaam to abandon the joys of life, and as a true Christian to renounce the world. The material of the story is originally Indian, indeed Buddhistic, for the original of Jonsaph was Buddha. The Greek version originated in the Sabbas monastery in Palestine about the middle of the seventh century. It did not circulate widely until the eleventh century, when it became known to all Western Europe through the medium of a Latin translation. [Cf. Conybeare, The Barlaam and Josaphat Legend, in Folk-lore (1896), VII, 101 sqq.]

The ascetic conception of life was deeply imbedded in the Byzantine character, and was strengthened by the high development of monastic institutions. The latter in turn brought forth an abundant ascetic literature, though it shows little if any advance on the asceticism of the Fathers of the Church, especially that of its great exponent, St. Basil. Less extensively cultivated, but excelling in quality, are Byzantine mystical writings. The true founder of Byzantine mysticism was Maximus Confessor (seventh century), who first stripped it of its neo-Platonic character and harmonized it with orthodox doctrine. Later and more important representatives were Symeon and Nicetas Stethatos in the eleventh, and Nikolaus Kavasilas in the fourteenth century. The Byzantine mystical writers differ from those of Western Europe chiefly in their attitude to ecclesiastical ceremonial, to which they adhered implicitly, seeing in it not a tendency to replace the spiritual life of the church by external pomp, but rather a profound symbol of this life. Accordingly Symeon strictly observed the ceremonial rules of the church, regarding them, however, only as a means to the attainment of ethical perfection. His principal work (published only in Latin) is a collection of prose pieces and hymns on communion with God. He is akin to the chief German mystics in his tendency towards pantheism. Of Symeon's equally distinguished pupil, Nicetas Stethatos, we need only say that he cast off his teacher's pantheistic tendencies. The last great mystic, Kavasilas, Archbishop of Saloniki, revived the teachings of Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite, but in the plan of his principal work, "Life in Christ", exhibits a complete independence of all other works and is without a parallel in Byzantine asceticism.

V. Popular Poetry.—The capture of Constantinople by the Latins in the year 1204 released popular literature from the aristocratic fetters of official Byzantium. The emotional and imaginative life long latent, awoke again in the Byzantine world; in response to new influences from the Roman West, the withered roots of popular literature showed signs of new life. They needed only assiduous care to put forth fresh shoots, being as deeply imbedded in popular consciousness as those of literary poetry. As the latter springs from the rationalistico-classical atmosphere of the Hellenistic period, even so the popular poetry, or folk-song, is an outgrowth of the idyllic or romantic literature of the same period. The artificial literature had its prototypes in Lucian, Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius, and Nonnus; on the other hand, the popular literature of mediæval Byzantium imitated Apollonius of Rhodes, Callimachus, Theocritus, and Musæus. The chief characteristic of folk-song throughout the Greek Middle Ages is its lyric note, which constantly finds expression in emotional turns. In Byzantine literature, on the other hand, the refinement of erotic poetry was due to the influence of the love-poetry of chivalry introduced by Frankish knights in the thirteenth century and later. These Westerners also brought with them in abundance romantic and legendary materials that the Byzantines soon imitated and adapted. Lastly, Italian influences led to a revival of the drama. The celebration of the achievements of Greek heroes in popular literature was the result of the conflicts which the Greeks sustained during the Middle Ages with the border nations to the east of the empire. There were, in addition, popular books relating the deeds of ancient heroes, which had long been current, and were widespread through the East; these revived heroic poetry, to which a deep romantic tinge was imparted. The result was a complete upheaval of popular ideals and a broadening of the popular horizon, both to the East and West; the oppressive power of ancient standards was gradually replaced by the beneficial influence of modern ideals.

There was, consequently, a complete reconstruction of the literary types of Byzantium. Of all the varieties of artistic poetry there survived only the romance, though this became more serious in its aims, and its province expanded. Of metrical forms there remained only the political (fifteen-syllable) verse. From these simple materials there sprang forth an abundance of new poetic types. Alongside of the narrative romance of heroism and love there sprang up popular love lyrics, and even the beginnings of the modern drama.

The only genuine heroic epic of the Byzantines is the "Digenis Akritas", a popular poetic crystallization of the conflicts between the Byzantine wardens of the marches (*duces*) and the Saracens, in Eastern Asia Minor, during the tenth and eleventh centuries. The nucleus of this epic goes back to the twelfth or thirteenth century, its final literary form to the fifteenth. The original poems have suffered much in the final redaction from the mutilations of the schoolmen. An approximate idea of the original poem may be gathered from the numerous echoes of it extant in popular poetry. The existing versions exhibit a blending of several cycles, quite after the manner of the Homeric poems. Its principal subjects are love, adventures, battles, and a patriarchal, idyllic enjoyment of life; it is a mixture of the Iliad and the Odyssey, the majority of the material being drawn from the latter, while the atmosphere is Christian. With an intimate sympathy with Nature are com-

bined genuine piety and a strong family feeling. In an artistic sense the work can certainly not be compared with either the Greek or the Germanic epics. It lacks their dramatic quality and the variety of their characters. It must be compared with the Slavic and Oriental heroic songs, among which it properly belongs.

The love-romance of the Greek Middle Ages is the result of the fusion of the sophistical Alexandro-Byzantine romance and the medieval French popular romance, on the basis of an Hellenistic view of life and nature. This is proved by its three chief creations, composed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: "Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe", "Belthandros and Chrysantza", "Lybistros and Rhodamne". While the first and the last of these are yet markedly under the influence of the Byzantine romance, both in thought and in manner of treatment, the second begins to show the æsthetic and ethical influence of the Old-French romance; indeed, its story often recalls the Tristan legend. The style is clearer and more transparent, the action more dramatic, than in the extant versions of the Digenis legend. The ethical idea is the romantic idea of knighthood—the winning of the loved one by valour and daring, not by blind chance as in the Byzantine literary romances. Along with these independent adaptations of French material, are direct translations from "Flore et Blanchefleur", "Pierre et Maguelonne", and others, which have passed into the domain of universal literature.



Dedicatory Design in a Book of Selections from St. Chrysostom Compiled for the Emperor Nicephorus Botaniates

To the period of Frankish conquest belongs also the metrical Chronicle of Morea (fourteenth century). It was composed by a Frank brought up in Greece, though a foe of the Greeks, and its literary value is but slight, though its value for the history of civilization is all the greater. Its object was, amid the constantly progressing hellenization of the Western conquerors, to remind them of the spirit of their ancestors. It is Greek, therefore, only in language; in literary form and spirit it is wholly Frankish. The author "describes minutely the feudal customs which had been transplanted to the soil of Greece, and this perhaps is his chief merit; the deliberations of the High Court are given with the greatest accuracy, and he is quite familiar with the practice of feudal law" (J. Schmitt). As early as the fourteenth century the Chronicle was translated into Spanish and in the fifteenth into French and Italian.

About the same time and in the same locality, in the small islands off the coast of Asia Minor, appeared the earliest collection of neo-Greek love songs, known as the "Rhodian Love-Songs". Besides songs of various sorts and origins, they contain a complete romance, told in the form of a play on numbers, a youth being obliged to compose in honour of the maiden whom he worships a hundred verses, corresponding to the numbers one to one hundred, before she returns his love.

Between the days of the French influence in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and those of Italian in the sixteenth and seventeenth, there was a short romantic and popular revival of the ancient legendary material. It is true that for this revival there was neither much need nor much appreciation, and as a consequence but few of the ancient heroes and their heroic deeds are adequately treated. The best of these works is a romance based on the story of Alexander the Great, a revised version of the Pseudo-Callisthenes of the Ptolemaic period, which is also the source of the western versions of the Alexander romance. The "Achilleis", on the other hand, though written in the popular verse and not without taste, is wholly devoid of antique local colour, and is rather a romance of French chivalry than a history of Achilles. Lastly, of two compositions on the Trojan War, one is wholly crude and barbarous, the other, though better, is a literal translation of the old French poem of Benoît de Ste.-More.

To these products of the fourteenth century may be added two of the sixteenth, both describing a descent into the lower world, evidently popular offshoots of the Timarion and Mazaris already mentioned. To the former corresponds the "Apokopos", a satire of the dead on the living; to the latter, the "Piccatores", a metrical piece decidedly lengthy but rather unpoetic, while the former has many poetical passages (e. g. the procession of the dead) and betrays the influence of Italian literature. In fact Italian literature impressed its popular character on the Greek popular poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, as French literature had done in the thirteenth and fourteenth. As a rich popular poetry sprang up during the last-mentioned period on the islands off the coast of Asia Minor, so now a similar literature developed on the Island of Crete. Its most important creations are the romantic epic "Erotokritos" and the dramas "Erophile" and "The Sacrifice of Abraham", with a few minor pictures of customs and manners. These works fall chronologically outside the limits of Byzantine

literature; nevertheless, as a necessary complement and continuation of the preceding period, they should be discussed here. The "Erotokritos" is a long romantic poem of chivalry, lyric in character, and didactic in purpose, the work of Cornaro, a hellenized Venetian of the sixteenth century. It abounds in themes and ideas drawn from the folk-poetry of the time. In the story of Erotokritos and Arethusa the poet glorifies love and friendship, chivalric courage, constancy, and self-sacrifice. Although foreign influences do not obtrude themselves, and the poem, as a whole, has a national Greek flavour, it reveals the various cultural elements, Byzantine, Romance, and Oriental, without giving, however, the character of a composite. The lyrical love tragedy "Erophile" is more of a mosaic, being a combination of two Italian tragedies, with the addition of lyrical intermezzos from Tasso's "Jerusalem Delivered", and choral songs from his "Aminta". Nevertheless, the materials are handled with independence, and more harmoniously arranged than in the original; the father who has killed his daughter's lover is slain not by his daughter's hand, but by the ladies of his palace, thus giving a less offensive impression. Owing to the lyric undertone of the work, some parts of it have survived in popular tradition until the present time. The mystery-play of "The Sacrifice of Abraham" is a little psychological masterpiece, apparently an independent work. The familiar and trite Biblical incidents are reset in the patriarchal environment of Greek family life. The poet emphasizes the mental struggles of Sarah, the resignation of Abraham to the Divine will, the anxious forebodings of Isaac, and the affectionate sympathy of the servants, in other words, a psychological analysis of the characters. The mainspring of the action is Sarah's fore-knowledge of what is to happen, evidently the invention of the poet to display the power of maternal love. The diction is distinguished by high poetic beauty and by a thorough mastery of versification. Other products of Cretan literature are a few adaptations of Italian pastorals, a few erotic and idyllic poems, like the so-called "Seduction Tale" (an echo of the Rhodian Love-Songs), and the lovely, but ultra-sentimental, pastoral idyll of the "Beautiful Shepherdess".

GENERAL: A central medium for the investigation of all branches of Byzantine culture is *Die byzantinische Zeitschrift*, ed. KRUMBACHER (Leipzig, 1892 ——); it is especially rich in bibliography; DIEHL, *Études byzantines* (Paris, 1900); SYMONDS, *Studies of the Greek Poets* (3d ed., London, 1902), II, c. xxii sqq.; ROHDE, *Der griechische Roman* (3d ed., Leipzig, 1900); WENDLAND, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum* (Tübingen, 1907); THUMB, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (Strasburg, 1901); STRZYGOWSKI, *Orient oder Rom* (Leipzig, 1900); LETHABY, *Medieval Art from 312 to 1350* (London, 1906).

I. A. HISTORIANS.—KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzant. Litteratur* (2nd ed., Munich, 1896), 219–319: DAHN, *Prokopius von Cäsarea* (Berlin, 1865); SEGER, *Nikephoros Bryennios* (Munich, 1888); GIBBON, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. BURY (London, 1898), V–VI; NEUMANN, *Griechische Geschichtsschreiber und Geschichtsquellen im 12 Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1888); BURY, *Roman Emperors from Basil II to Isaac Komnenos* in *The Eng. Histor. Rev.* (1889), IV, 41–64, 251–285; IDEM, *The Treatise De Admin. Imperio* in *Byzant. Zeitschrift*, XV, 517 sqq.; SAINTE-BEUVE, *Causeries du lundi* (*Nicetas Acominatus*) (Paris, 1854), IX, 305–340; PARISOT, *Cantacuzène, homme d'état et historien* (Paris, 1845).

I. B. CHRONICLERS.—KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzant. Lit.* (2nd ed.), 319–408; HIRSCH, *Byzantinische Studien* (Leipzig, 1878); GIBBON, op. cit., V.

II. ENCYCLOPEDISTS AND ESSAYISTS.—HERGENRÖTHER, *Photios, Patriarch von Konstantinopel, sein Leben, seine Schriften, und das griechische Schisma* (3 vols., Ratisbon, 1867–69); RAMBAUD, *L'empire grec au dixième siècle* (*Constantin VII*), 137–164; GREGOROVIUS, *Gesch. der Stadt Athen im M. A.* (Stuttgart, 1889), I, 176 sqq. and C; NEUMANN, *Die Weltstellung des byzant. Reiches vor der Kreuzzügen* (Leipzig, 1894), 81–93 (*M. Psellos*); ELLISSEN, *Michael Akominatos* (Göttingen, 1846); GREGOROVIUS, op. cit., I, 204–349; FABRICIUS, *Bibl. gr.*, ed. HARL., II, 682 sqq. (*Maximus Planudes*); SATHAS, Μεσαιωνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη (1872), I, προλ., 119–135 (*Theodorus Metochites*); PARISOT, op. cit. (*Nicephorus Gregoras*); KRUMBACHER, op. cit., 216 (*Photius*), 108 (*Constantine VII, Porphyrog.*), 184 (*Psellus*), 221 (*Eustathius*), 197 (*Michael Italicus*), 199 (*Michael Acominatus*), 223 (*Maximus Planudes*), 226 (*Theodorus Metochites*), 128 (*Nicephorus Gregoras*).

III. SECULAR POETRY, *The Epigram:* PAULY, *Realenzyklopädie* (new ed., 1894), I, 2380–91; KRUMBACHER, op. cit., 100, 292, 293, 295, 304, 306–308.

IV. ECCLESIASTICAL AND THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.—On homiletics cf. EHRHARD in KRUMBACHER, op. cit., 160–176. On the influence of syriac literature on old Christian literature: WEHOFER, *Untersuchungen zur altchristlichen Epistolographie*, in *Wiener Sitzungsber., phil.-hist. Cl.*, CXLIII (1901). For ecclesiastical poetry, cf. STEVENSON, *L'hymnographie de l'église grecque* in *Revue des questions histor.* (1876), II, 482–543; MEYER, *Anfang und Ursprung der lateinischen und griechischen rythmischen Dichtung* in *Abhandl. bayr. Akad.* (1885), XVII, ii, 270–450; BOUVY, *Etude sur les origines du rythme tonique dans l'hymnographie de l'église grecque* (Nimes, 1886); KRUMBACHER, op. cit., 653–705.

On Romanos, cf. BOUVY, op. cit., 367–375; KRUMBACHER, 272; IDEM, *Studien zu Romanos* in *Sitzungsber. bayr. Akad., phil. hist. Cl.* (1898), II, No. 1. On hagiography cf. EHRHARD in KRUMBACHER, op. cit., 176–205. On ascetic and mystical writings, cf. EHRHARD, *ibid.*, 139–160.

V. POPULAR POETRY.—KRUMBACHER, 328–384; DIETERICH, *Gesch. der byzantin. und neugriech. Litt.* (Leipzig, 1902); SCHMITT, ed. BURY, *The Chronicle of Morea, ed. in two parallel texts . . . with introduction, critical notes, and indices*, in *Byzantine Texts* (London, 1904).

KARL DIETERICH.

Byzantine Rite. See CONSTANTINOPLE, LITURGY OF.

Byzantium. See CONSTANTINOPLE.

Bzovius, ABRAHAM. See BARONIUS.

C

Caballero, FERNÁN (*nom de plume* of CECILIA BÖHL VON FABER), a noted Spanish novelist, b. at Morges, a small town in Switzerland, 25 December, 1796; d. at Seville, 7 April, 1877. Her father was Nicolas Böhl von Faber, a German who had settled in Spain and enjoyed some reputation there as an author, and her mother was a native of Spain. She spent her early years in Germany and Italy, and came to Spain with her parents in 1813, settling at Cadiz. She was three times married and widowed, her first husband being Captain Planelles, whom she married when she was barely seventeen. Having lost her husband shortly after her marriage, she became in 1822 the wife of the Marqués de Arco Hermoso, who died in 1835. Two years later she married Antonio Arrón de Ayala, a lawyer, and for a time Spanish Consul in Australia. After the death of her third husband, in 1863, she retired to the royal palace at Seville, where she was enabled to reside through the friendship and influence of her neighbour, the Duc de Montpensier. Fernán Caballero, who was much better known by her pseudonym than by her own name, was also a journalist, and at one time was a contributor to "La Ilustración Española y Americana". But it was as a novelist that she made her reputation, her descriptive powers, in particular, being compared to those of Scott and Cooper. In 1849 she published her first novel, "La Gaviota", which appeared originally in serial form in a newspaper. This work has been translated into several languages, the English version appearing in 1868 under the title of "The Sea Gull", and it has probably been more widely read by foreigners than any Spanish book of the century. Following "La Gaviota" there appeared from her pen many novels and short stories in which she describes, with much charm, grace, and exactness, the types and customs of the different classes of Spanish society, especially in Andalusia. Under the general title "Cuadros Sociales" were published, with others, "La Gaviota", "Clemencia", "La Familia de Albareda", and "Elía". Her complete works were published at Madrid (1860–61) in thirteen volumes.

FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *History of Spanish Literature* (London, 1907); *Obras Completas de Fernán Caballero* (1860).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Caballero, RAIMUNDO DIOSDADO, miscellaneous writer, chiefly ecclesiastical, b. at Palma, in the island of Majorca, 19 June, 1740; d. at Rome, either 16 Jan., 1830, or 28 April, 1829. He entered the Society of Jesus 15 November, 1752, held the chair of literature in the Jesuit College at Madrid for several years, and was deported with the other Jesuits to Italy when the Society was suppressed in the Spanish dominions. In his new home Father Caballero developed a varied literary activity. The following are the most important of his works: (1) "De primâ typographiæ hispanicæ ætate specimen" (Rome, 1793); (2) "Commentariola critica, primum de disciplinâ arcani, secundum de linguâ evangelicâ" (Rome, 1798).—The author corrects in this work what he considers to be the mistakes of Schelstrate and Hardouin, and proves that the native tongue of Christ and the Apostles was Syriac, not Greek, as Dominicus Diodati (d. 1801) had maintained in his "De Christo loquente exercitatio" (Naples, 1767).—(3) "Bibliothecæ Scriptorum Societatis Jesu supplementa. Supplementum primum" (Rome, 1814), "Supplementum alterum" (Rome, 1816); (4) Father Caballero shows his Scriptural knowledge in his "Tetraglotton D. Marci Evangelium, et Marcologia critica"; "El Evangelio de S. Marcos escrito en latín, griego y hebreo, con los tres alfabetos". (5) Not to mention several historical works, we may add here his writings on American subjects: "Observaciones americanas, y suplemento crítico á la historia de México"; "Medios para estrechar más la union entre españoles americanos y europeos"; "Consideraciones americanas".

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II, 481 sqq. (Brussels, 1891); HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1895), III, 874.

A. J. MAAS.

Caballero y Ocio, JUAN, b. at Querétaro, Mexico, 4 May, 1644; d. there 11 April, 1707. A priest remarkable for lavish gifts to the Church and for charity. While still a layman he was mayor of his native city. After taking Holy orders he held several high offices. He gave large sums of money to several churches, and founded and endowed in his native city the church and college of the Jesuits, enlarged the Franciscan church, built the Dominican church and convent, constructed the Chapel of Our Lady of Loretto, to which he gave all his family jewels, founded the convent of Capuchin nuns, and built a hospital or infirmary in St. Francis' convent. He gave dowries to more than two hundred girls, and left large sums of money for daily charities. In the city of Mexico he rebuilt the church of Santa Clara and contributed generously to the construction of the churches of Sts. Philip Neri and Belen. In Guadalajara he finished the church of St. Dominic, and for the missions of the newly discovered California he gave $150,000. Some years before his death he bequeathed his property for charitable purposes. He was remarkable for his humility and piety. He refused two bishoprics which were offered to him at different times, and the title of *Adelantado* (governor) of California, which the King of Spain sent him, after his generous donation to those missions. Every year he used to make a spiritual retreat, drawing at the same time his last will, and becoming the executor of his pious bequests until he renewed them the following year. Almighty God seemed to bless his charity, and the sums he left for charitable purposes were wonderfully preserved and increased for a century and a half, until the general spoliation of the Church in Mexico.

SIGUENZA Y GONGORA, *Glorias de Querétaro* (Mexico, 1690); OROZCO Y BERRA, *Apéndice al Diccionario Universal* (Mexico, 1856).

MONTES DE OCA Y OBREGÓN.

Cabasa, a titular see of Egypt. About seven and one-half miles north of Sais (ruins at Ssa el-Haggar) stands a little village called Shabas-Sounkour, or Shabas as-Shoada. It has been rightly identified with the see that figures in a Coptic-Arabian episcopal list of the seventh century under the names Shabas-Sanhoul and Gabaseos-tivari-Khevasen. Ptolemy (IV, v, 48) calls it Kabasa, and says it is the capital of the fifth *nomos* (Kabasites). The city is also known by its coins. It is mentioned by Pliny (V, ix, 9), Georgius Cyprius (ed. Gelzer, 730), and Hierocles (724, 5). Parthey (ed.), "Notitia Prima", about 840, gives it as the metropolis of Ægyptus Secunda. Two of its bishops are known: Theopemptus, present at Ephesus in 431 and 449, and Macarius, an opponent of Dioscorus at Chalcedon in 451.

DE ROUGÉ, *Géographie ancienne de la Basse-Egypte* (Paris, 1891), 24, 152; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878), I, 462.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cabassut (CABASSUTIUS), JEAN, French theologian and priest of the Oratory, b. at Aix in 1604, d. there, 1685. He excelled equally in learning and holiness of life. He entered the Oratory at the age of twenty-one and though devoted to his labour he was always ready to interrupt even his most favourite study to assist the needy. He had taught canon law at Avignon for some time, when Cardinal Grimaldi, Archbishop of Aix, took him as companion to Rome, where Father Cabassut remained about eighteen months. Returning to Aix, he became a distinguished writer on questions of ecclesiastical history, canon law, and moral theology. St. Alphonsus considers him classical. He was a probabilliorist in his moral solutions. The following of his works are worthy of note: "Notitia Conciliorum" (Lyons, 1668). Cardinal Grimaldi induced the writer to enlarge this work and publish it under the title, "Notitia ecclesiastica historiarum, conciliorum et canonum invicem collatorum", etc. (Lyons, 1680, and other dates; Munich, 1758; Tournai, 1851, 3 vols.). Often modified and enlarged, it was once, under the title "Cabassutius", an authority for the history of councils. A compendium of the "Notitia" appeared at Louvain, 1776. "Theoria et Praxis Juris Canonici" etc. (Lyons, 1660, and other dates; Rouen, 1703; Venice, 1757).

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II, 501; PUNGES in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1641; BATTERSBY, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. de l'Orat.* (Paris, 1903), III, 396-412.

A. J. MAAS.

Cabello de Balboa, MIGUEL, a secular priest, b. at Archidona in Spain; dates of birth and death unknown. In 1566 he emigrated to Peru in South America; from here he went to Quito, Ecuador, where he began to write the "Miscelánea Antártica", finishing it at Lima in 1586. Nothing else is known of him except that, in the years 1602-1603, he wrote a letter giving valuable details concerning the regions of Pelechuco and Apolobamba in eastern Bolivia, between the Andes and the Beni River. In this letter he does not explicitly state that he visited those districts, but the information imparted is such as to imply this. The letter is taken from a book written by Father Cabello of which nothing else is known.

The "Miscelánea Antártica", however, is an important source. Unfortunately, most of it remains in manuscript. Only the third part has been published in French by Ternaux Compans. The original was (1853) in possession of the celebrated historiographer Don Joaquín García Icazbalceta at Mexico. A complete copy also exists at the Lenox Branch of the New York Public Library. It contains Indian traditional records of the coming to South America of white men who are said to have preached the Gospel to the aborigines; also a theory that the Indians of Patagonia and Chile are the descendants of pirates of Macassar. The legendary history of the Inca tribe is expounded at length, and the origin of the Inca given in a manner somewhat at variance with the accounts of other Spanish authors.

TERNAUX COMPANS, *Histoire du Pérou* (tr. of part of CABELLO'S book) furnishes a few biographical data. More is told in the *Diccionario universal de Historia* (Mexico, 1853); LEÓN Y PINELO, *Epitome* (1737-1738), has a short notice of the work. On the missions to the Bolivian Andes and Apolobamba, see the letter by CABELLO in *Relaciones geográficas de Indias* (Madrid, 1885), II; MENDIBURÚ, *Diccionario etc.* (Lima, 1876), II, gives only meagre information.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Cabeza de Vaca, ALVAR NUÑEZ, b. at Jerez de la Frontera in Andalusia, Spain; dates of birth and death uncertain. The family were originally peasants and called themselves Alhaja until after the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa (11 July, 1212), when they were ennobled for service that contributed to the important victory which the kings of Castile, Aragon, and Navarre achieved over the Moors. One of the Alhajas informed the Christians of a mountain pass by which the position of the Arabs could be turned, and indicated the entrance by placing the skull of a cow near it. Hence the change of name and the coat of arms. Alvar Nuñez joined the expedition of Pámfilo de Narvaez to Florida in 1526 as treasurer. With two other Spaniards and an Arab Moor, he was the only survivor who remained on the mainland. For eight years they roamed along the coasts of Louisiana and Texas under the greatest hardships, their position among the Indians being wellnigh intolerable. In utter despair, Cabeza de Vaca at last tried his scanty knowledge of medicine, and, his cures proving successful, he became a renowned medicine man among the natives, his companions following the example. The treatment to which they resorted partook of the nature of a faith-cure. He declares the sign of the cross to have been a seldom-failing remedy. The belief of the outcasts in miracles was sincere, while acknowledging that they also employed indigenous Indian remedies with simple Christian religious ceremonials. After nine years they reached the Pacific coast in Sonora, Mexico, thus being the first Europeans to travel across the North American continent. Cabeza de Vaca arrived at the city of Mexico in 1536. He was also the first European who saw and described the American bison or buffalo. But the wanderers did not, as has been supposed, see the New Mexican pueblos. They only heard of them. Returning to Spain in 1537, he obtained the post of Governor of the La Plata regions (Argentina), whither he went in 1541.

Cabeza de Vaca was a trustworthy subaltern, but not fit for independent command. His men rebelled against him in 1543, took him prisoner, and sent him to Spain, where for eight years he was kept in a mild captivity. The date of his death is not known, but it is stated that he ended his days at Seville, where he occupied an honourable and modestly lucrative position in connection with the American trade. He wrote two works. One is the story of his first trials in America as a member of the expedition of Narvaez, which was published at Zamora in 1542, and is known under the title of "Naufragios" (reprinted 1555 and several times translated into English); the other is on his career in South America (published 1555) and called "Comentarios". Both are valuable for the history of Spanish colonization, the former also for the customs and manners of North American Indians. There is hardly a work on the history of North America extant that does not allude, more or less correctly, to Cabeza de Vaca, and the same may be stated in regard to histories of Argentina and Paraguay. The earliest publications are of course those written by himself, his "La Relacion que dio Aluar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca de lo acaescido en las Indias en la armada donde yua por gouernador Pamphilo de Narbaez" etc. (Zamora, 1542), only two copies of which are known to exist, and "La Relacion y comentarios del gouernador Aluar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca" (Valladolid, 1555).

OVIEDO, *Hist. general y natural* (Madrid, 1850), gives the text of the above with some modifications, adding a communication written while on the way to Europe. In *Documentos inéditos de Indias*, there are a few more documents; RAMUSIO, *Delle Navigazioni e Viaggi* (Venice, 1550), an Italian version. There is a French translation by TERNAUX COMPANS, both of the *Naufrages* and the *Commentaires*. English translations: PURCHAS, *His Pilgrimage* (London, 1625 26, title, *Relation of the Fleet in India, whereof Pamphilus Narvaez was Governor*); SMITH, tr. (Washington, 1851); reprinted by John Gilmary Shea (New York, 1871). A paraphrase of the work has been given by KINGSLEY, *Tales of Old Travels* (London, 1869). FANNY BANDELIER has published *The Journey of Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca* (New York, 1905), a translation of the 1542 edition of the *Naufragios*.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Cabot, JOHN (GIOVANNI CABOTA or GABOTA), a celebrated navigator and the discoverer of the American mainland, b. in the first half of the fifteenth cen-

tury at Genoa; date of death unknown. In 1461 he went to Venice and, after living there fifteen years, the prescribed residence for obtaining citizenship, was naturalized, 28 March, 1476. For this reason he is generally called a Venetian. On his commercial journeys, which took him to the shores of Arabia, he heard of the countries rich in spices which lay to the far East. This may have led him to conceive the plan of a great voyage of discovery. About 1490 he went to England with his three sons, Ludovico, Sebastiano, and Sancto, and settled there as an experienced seaman. He may have inspired the expedition that sailed from Bristol in 1491 to find the fabulous Isles of the West. When the success of Christopher Columbus became known, Cabot acquainted himself most carefully with the theories and opinions of his countryman, and finally offered to do for England what Columbus had done for Spain. By letters patent of 5 March, 1496, King Henry VII granted Cabot and his three sons the right to seek islands and countries of the heathen towards the west, east, and north, with five ships under the English flag. Cabot began his preparations for the voyage at once and sailed from Bristol early in May, 1497, on the ship Matthew, with eighteen men, among whom may have been his son Sebastian. After sailing for fifty days, mainly in a westerly direction, they reached the American mainland, 24 June, 1497, that is, before Columbus. According to the chart of Sebastian Cabot (1544), the land was in the vicinity of Cape Breton Island. Some investigators, however, assert that this entry of the younger Cabot is a falsification to support the English claim to possession, and they place the spot where the landing was made in Labrador. On 26 June Cabot began his return voyage; towards the end of July or the first week of August he reached England, where he received a warm welcome. Letters patent of 3 February, 1498, empowered him to undertake a second expedition. This was made up of five ships and three hundred men, and set sail some time before 25 July, 1498. They first went north, apparently as far as 67° N. lat.; drifting ice forced them to turn, and they sailed along the east coast of America past Newfoundland, which Cabot named Bacallaos, as far as the latitude of Cape Hatteras, as is learned from the chart of Juan de la Cosa (1500). No further information has been preserved of Cabot, even as to his return from this expedition. Nevertheless, existing data, although scanty, suffice to assure John Cabot a place among the greatest discoverers.

SEBASTIAN, son of John Cabot, b. probably in Venice c. 1474; d. 1557, or soon after. As already stated, he may have taken part in the first expedition of his father. In 1512 he was in the employ of Henry VIII of England as cartographer; in the same year he accompanied Willoughby to Spain, where he received the rank of Captain from King Ferdinand V. After Ferdinand's death he returned to England, where, in 1517, he tried in vain to win the favour of Vice-Admiral Perte for a new expedition. In 1522, although once more in the employ of Spain and holding the rank of pilot-major, he secretly offered his services to Venice, undertaking to find the north-west passage to China. Finally he received the rank of captain general from Spain, and was entrusted, 4 March, 1525, with the command of a fleet which was to find Tarshish, Ophir, and the far eastern country of Cathay, and also to discover the way to the Moluccas. The expedition consisted of three ships with 150 men, and set sail from Cadiz, 5 April, 1526, but only went as far as the mouth of the Rio de la Plata. Cabot here went ashore and left behind his companions, Francisco de Rojas, Martín Mendez, and Miguel de Rodas, with whom he had quarrelled; he explored the Paraná River as far as its junction with the Paraguay, and built two forts. In August, 1530, he returned to Spain, where he was at once indicted for his conduct towards his fellow-commanders and his lack of success, and was condemned, 1 February, 1532, to a banishment of two years to Oran in Africa. After a year he was pardoned and went to Seville; he remained pilot-major of Spain until 1547, when, without losing either the title or the pension, he left Spain and returned to England, where he received a salary with the title of great pilot. In the year 1553 Charles V made unsuccessful attempts to win him back. In the meantime Cabot had reopened negotiations with Venice, but he reached no agreement with that city. After this he aided both with information and advice the expedition of Willoughby and Chancellor, was made life-governor of the "Company of Merchant Adventurers", and equipped (1557) the expedition of Borough. After this, nothing more is heard of him; he probably died soon afterwards.

SEBASTIAN CABOT

The account of his journeys written by himself has been lost. All that remains of his personal work is a map of the world drawn in 1544; one copy of this was found in Bavaria, and is still preserved in the National Library at Paris. This map is especially important for the light it throws on the first journey of his father. The character of Sebastian Cabot does not leave a favourable impression; restless and unscrupulous, he busied himself with the most varied projects, and was ready to enter into relations with any country from which he might hope to gain the realization of his schemes. The country most indebted to him is England, where he roused enthusiasm for great undertakings; with his father he laid the foundation of the English supremacy at sea.

The accounts of the journeys of John and Sebastian Cabot were collected by Richard Hakluyt in his work "The Principal Navigations, Voyages" etc., and have been recently published in an extra series of the Hakluyt Society (Glasgow, 1904), VII, 141–158. In the same series appears "Ordinances, Instructions, and Advertisements of and for the Direction of the intended Voyage for Cathay, compiled, made and delivered by.....Sebastian Cabota" (Glasgow, 1903), II, 195–205. Cabot's picture, apparently by Holbein, appears on page 240 of this latter volume.

WINSHIP, *Cabot Bibliography* (London, 1900), gives a list of the extensive bibliography on the subject in 579 titles; BIDDLE, *Memoir of Sebastian Cabot* (London, 1831); D'AVEZAC, *Les navigateurs terre-neuviens Jean et Sébastien Cabot* (Paris, 1869); NICHOLLS, *Life, Adventures, and Discoveries of Sebastian Cabot* (London, 1869); HARRISSE, *Jean et Sébastien Cabot* (Paris, 1882); IDEM, *The Discovery of North America* (Paris, 1892); MARKHAM, ed. and tr., *The Journal of Christopher Columbus and Documents Relating to the Voyages of John Cabot and Gaspar Corte Real* (London, 1893), No. 86 of the publications of the Hakluyt Society; BEAZLEY, *John and Sebastian Cabot* (London, 1898); *The Voyages of Columbus and of J. Cabot*, ed. BOURNE (New York, 1906).

OTTO HARTIG.

Cabral, FRANCISCO, Portuguese missionary in Japan, b. in the castle of Govillou, Diocese of Guarda, Portugal, 1529; d. at Goa, 1609. In 1554 he entered the Society of Jesus, and after his studies went to Japan, where he laboured strenuously to propagate the Christian religion. There he enjoyed the friend-

ship of princes and kings, many of whom, together with their subjects, were won over to the Faith by his zealous labours. He filled very important places in the government of his order, being superior of Japan for twelve years, master of novices, and rector of the College of San Pablo of Goa, and of the colleges of Cochin, Bazain, and Macao, superior of the professed house of Goa, and finally visitor to India. He died at the age of eighty-one with a great repute for prudence and holiness.

Varones Ilustres de la Compañía de Jesús (2nd ed., Bilbao, 1887), I, 655–63.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Cabral, PEDRALVAREZ (PEDRO ALVAREZ), a celebrated Portuguese navigator, generally called the discoverer of Brazil, b. probably about 1460; date of death uncertain. Very little is known concerning the life of Cabral. He was the third son of Fernão Cabral, Governor of Beira and Belmonte, and Isabel de Gouvea, and married Isabel de Castro, the daughter of the distinguished Fernando de Noronha. He must have had an excellent training in navigation and large experience as a seaman, for King Emmanuel of Portugal considered him competent to continue the work of Vasco da Gama, and in the year 1500 placed him in command of a fleet which was to set sail for India. His commission was to establish permanent commercial relations and to introduce Christianity wherever he went, using force of arms when necessary to gain his point. The nature of the undertaking led rich Florentine merchants to contribute to the equipment of the ships, and priests to join the expedition. Among the captains of the fleet, which consisted of thirteen ships with 1,200 men, were Bartolomeu Diaz, Pero Vaz de Caminha, and Nicolao Coelho, the latter the companion of da Gama. Da Gama himself gave the directions necessary for the course of the voyage.

The fleet left Lisbon, 9 March, 1500, and following the course laid down, sought to avoid the calms of the coast of Guinea. On leaving the Cape Verde Islands, where Luis Pirez was forced by a storm to return to Lisbon, they sailed in a decidedly south-westerly direction. On 22 April a mountain was visible, to which the name of "Monte Paschoal" was given; on the 23d Coelho landed on the coast of Brazil, and on the 25th the entire fleet sailed into the harbour called "Porto Seguro". Cabral perceived that the new country lay east of the line of demarcation made by Alexander VI, and at once sent Andreas Gonçalvez (according to other authorities, Gaspar de Lemos) to Portugal with the important tidings. Believing the land to be an island he gave it the name of "Island of Vera Cruz" and took possession of it by erecting a cross and holding a religious service. The service was celebrated by the Franciscan, Father Henrique, afterwards Bishop of Ceuta, on the island called Coroa Vermelha in the bay of Cabralia. Cabral resumed his voyage 3 May; by the end of the month the fleet approached the Cape of Good Hope, where it was struck by a storm in which four vessels, including that of Bartolomeu Diaz, were lost. With the ships now reduced to one-half of the original number, Cabral reached Sofala, 16 July, and Mozambique, 20 July; in the latter place he received a cordial greeting. On 26 July he came to Kilwa where he was unable to make an agreement with the ruler; on 2 August he reached Melinde; here he had a friendly welcome and obtained a pilot to take him to India. At Calicut, where he arrived 13 September, he met with many obstacles, so that he was obliged to bombard the town for two days; in Cochin and Kananur, however, he succeeded in making advantageous treaties. Cabral started on the return voyage, 16 January, 1501, and arrived at Lisbon, 31 July, or, as is sometimes given, 23 June. On the way home he met Pero Diaz whom he had dispatched, during his voyage, to Magadoxo, and in September the last of his ships, in command of Sancho de Toar whom he had sent to Sofala, returned to Lisbon. Of his later life nothing is known.

The authorities for the voyage of discovery of Cabral are contained in the reports of eyewitnesses, especially in the letter of VAZ DE CAMINHA to King Emmanuel, of which the original was discovered in 1790. This letter was first published by CAZAL in his *Corografia brazilica* (1817), I, 12–34; the best edition is in the *Revista do Instituto Historico Geographico do Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro, 1877), XL, Pt. II, 12–37. Another narrative is that of a pilot, published by RAMUSIO in his *Delle Navig. e Viaggi* (Venice, 1563), I, 121–127. There is also a description of the voyage in BARROS, *Asia* (Lisbon, 1552), Dec. I, lib. V, i-x; in FARIA Y SOUSA, *Asia Port.*, I, 1, v, 45–49, and in the writings of other historians. VARNHAGEN, *Historia geral do Brazil* (Rio de Janeiro, 1854), I; Materials for a Biography in *Revista do Instituto Histor. Geog. do Brasil* (1843), V, 496–98; BALDAQUE DA SILVA, *O Descobrimento do Brazil por Pedro Alvarez Cabral* (Lisbon, 1892).

OTTO HARTIG.

Cabrillo, ESTÉVAN (also called JUAN), a Portuguese in the naval service of Spain, date and place of birth unknown; d. on the island of San Bernardo, 3 Jan., 1543. In 1541 Pedro de Alvarado gathered a fleet of twelve vessels on the coast of Western Mexico (Navidad) for an expedition to the Moluccas. Alvarado was soon after killed in the assault on the rock of Nochiztlan (Jalisco), defended by hostile Indians. The Viceroy Mendoza then sent most of the squadron under the command of Villalobos to the Moluccas, and two of the largest vessels to the north along the coast, appointing Cabrillo as commander. The latter sailed from Navidad in 1542, coasting slowly upwards owing to contrary winds. In the course of his voyage he discovered Santa Catalina, the Santa Barbara channel, Monterey, Cape Mendocino, and the Oregon coast as far as latitude 43°, thus being the discoverer of Oregon and of the entire California coast. Scurvy having broken out among the crew to a violent degree, Cabrillo could make but a short stay on the shores of Oregon and Northern California, and had to turn back. His character was distinguished by many honourable features, and his treatment of the aborigines on the voyage was particularly kind and generous. Nothing else is known of him, except that he was brought up a Catholic and remained in the Faith to the time of his death. The report of Cabrillo has been printed in the "Colección de documentos para la historia de España". To that collection and to the "Colección de documentos de Indias" (both printed at Madrid, and very voluminous) the reader must be referred for collateral information. The map of Cabrillo was published by Archbishop Lorenzana (1770). His voyage is mentioned more or less extensively in every work of importance on the early history of North America.

H. H. BANCROFT, *History of the Pacific States;* CLINCH, *California and Its Missions* (San Francisco, 1904); BERISTAIN DE SOUZA, *Biblioteca hispano-americana septentrional* (Amecameca, 1883).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Cáceres. See NUEVA CÁCERES.

Cadalous, Bishop of Parma and antipope, b. in the territory of Verona of noble parentage; d. at Parma, 1072. After the death of Nicholas II, 1061, the cardinals, under the direction of Hildebrand, met in legal form and without any reference to the German Court, elected (30 Sept.) Alexander II, who as Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, had been one of the leaders of the reform party. Twenty-eight days after Alexander's election an assembly of bishops and notables (enemies of reform), convoked at Basle by the Empress Agnes as regent for her son Henry IV, and presided over by the Imperial Chancellor Wibert, chose as antipope the ambitious prelate of Parma, Cadalous, who assumed the name of Honorius II (Oct. 28). In the spring of 1062 Cadalous with his troops marched towards Rome, whither the imperial agent, Benzo, Bishop of Alba, a clever but unscrupulous

man, had been sent in advance to prepare the way. On 14 April a brief but sanguinary conflict took place, in which the forces of Alexander were worsted and Cadalous got possession of the precincts of St. Peter's. The arrival, however, of Godfrey, Duke of Tuscany, in May, forced the antipope to withdraw to Parma, Alexander II at the same time engaging to return to his see in Lucca, there to await the result of Godfrey's mediation with the German Court.

In Germany, meanwhile, a revolution had taken place. Anno, the powerful Archbishop of Cologne, had seized the regency, and the Empress Agnes retired to the convent at Fructuaria in Piedmont. Having declared himself against Cadalous, the new regent at the Council of Augsburg, Oct., 1062, secured the appointment of an envoy to be sent to Rome for the purpose of investigating Alexander's election. The envoy, Burchard, Bishop of Halberstadt (Anno's nephew), having pronounced favourably upon the election, Alexander II was recognized as the lawful pontiff, and his rival, Cadalous, excommunicated (1063). The antipope did not, however, abandon his claims. At a counter-synod held at Parma he hurled back the bann and having gathered about him an armed force, once more proceeded to Rome, where he established himself in the Castle of Sant' Angelo and for more than a year defied the power of Alexander at the Lateran. His cause at length becoming hopeless he fled to his Bishopric of Parma. The Council of Mantua, Pentecost, 1064, practically ended the schism by anathematizing Cadalous and formally declaring Alexander II to be the legitimate successor of St. Peter. Cadalous, however, maintained his pretensions to the day of his death.

JAFFÉ, *Regesta PP. Rom.* (2nd ed.), I, 593 sq.; WILL, *Benzos Panegyrikus auf Heinrich IV* (Marburg, 1856); HEFELE, *Conciliengesch.* (2d ed.), IV, 850–882; FETZER, *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Gesch. des Pontifikats Alexanders II* (Strasburg, 1887); MUNERATI, *Sulle origini dell' antipapa Cadalo (Honorius II) vescovo di Parma* in *Rivista delle scienze storiche* (Pavia, 1906).

THOMAS OESTREICH.

Caddo Indians, an important group of closely cognate and usually allied tribes formerly holding a considerable territory in Western Louisiana and Eastern Texas, centring upon the Red, Sabine, and Neches Rivers. In the earlier period they were commonly known to the Spaniards as Tejas, whence the name of the State, and to the French as Cenis or Assinais. Of some twenty small tribes, the principal were the Nashitosh (Natchitoches), Yatasi, and Adai (Adayes), in Louisiana, and the Kadohadacho (Caddodaquio or Caddo proper), Hainai or Hasinai (Assinai), Nakohodotsi (Nacogdoches), Nadako (Anadarko), and Haiish (Alliche), in Texas. The Caddo were a semi-sedentary and agricultural people, living in large, conical, communal, grass-thatched houses, and cultivating abundant crops of corn, beans, and pumpkins. Their men were brave, but not aggressive, while their women were expert potters and mat weavers. In general culture they were on a plane with the Choctaw, Creeks, and other tribes of the Gulf States, and far superior to the moving tribes of the Plains, or the fish-eaters of the Texas Coast. They had a fully developed clan system with ten clans, in which descent followed the female line. All but one of these (The Sun) were named from animals, and no Caddo would dare to kill the animal from which his clan derived its name. The eagle also was held sacred and might be killed, for its feathers, only by the regularly appointed priest and after certain propitiatory ceremonies. Their religion savoured of the bloody rites of the Natchez and Aztecs, including cannibalism.

The French officer, La Harpe, describes one of these savage ceremonies which he witnessed while sojourning in their villages in 1712. A large war-party had arrived from an expedition against a western tribe, bringing with them two prisoners, all that remained of six unfortunates, the others having been eaten on the way. The prisoners were closely guarded in the open air, as, according to tribal custom, a captive who had once entered a Caddo house was thenceforth free and safe from harm. Two frames were quickly prepared by planting two pairs of stout uprights in the earth about four feet apart, with cross-pieces about one foot and nine feet from the ground. To these frames the doomed men were then fastened, with their outstretched arms bound to the cross-pieces above their heads, and with their whole weight hanging upon the cords. After hanging thus for about half an hour, facing the rising sun, they were taken down and compelled to dance for their persecutors. At evening, having been all day without food, they were again tied up in the same way, facing the setting sun. The next morning they were again suspended from the frames, this time with their faces looking for the last time upon the rising sun, while the whole tribe gathered around for the final tragedy. Fires were lighted by each family and large earthen pots filled with water were placed over the blaze. Two old men, each bearing in one hand a knife and in the other an earthen bowl, then advanced upon the helpless victims and stabbed them repeatedly until the blood gushed out in streams and was caught in the bowls held below. This was then poured into a pot and cooked until clotted, when it was eaten by the priests. The bodies were then dismembered and a portion given to each family, by whom it was at once cooked and eaten. The cannibal orgy concluded with a dance. Such was the savagery which the missionaries challenged.

Cabeza de Vaca may have met some of the Caddo in his aimless wanderings in Texas before 1536. De Soto's expedition entered their territory in 1541–2, and about the middle of the next century another Spanish expedition reached their country from Santa Fé. In 1687 the French explorers La Salle and Joutel came into friendly contact with their principal tribes. In May of 1690 the first mission among the Tejas was established under the name of San Francisco de los Tejas, on Trinity River, Texas, by a party of Franciscans under Father Damian Masanet. At this time the total population of the allied Caddo tribes must have been close to 10,000 souls, but in the winter of the same year a terrible epidemic, possibly of white origin, reduced their number by 3000, or perhaps one-third, which, with other causes, led to the abandonment of the mission effort in 1693, after three stations had been established. Although the missionaries were thus temporarily withdrawn, the cattle which they had introduced among the Indians were left behind to increase, and thus augment their food-resources and foster habits of industry. In 1716, the Indians having expressed a wish for the return of their teachers, Captain Diego Ramon, with an escort of troops and a party of twelve Franciscan priests and two lay brothers, came up from the Rio Grande, and after a friendly meeting with the chiefs concluded with them a treaty of peace on behalf of Spain. Four missions were at once established—San Francisco, Purisima Concepción, Guadalupe, and San José, among the Nakohodotsi, Hasinai, Neches, and Nasoni respectively—all within easy reach of Nacogdoches, where a small garrison was established. Later in the year the missions of Dolores and San Miguel de Cuellar were founded among the Hai-ish (Aes) and Adai, the last-named being within the present Louisiana, making six Caddo missions in all.

French hostility accomplished the abandonment and destruction of the missions the next year, but in 1721 five of them were re-established, with a strong Spanish post on their eastern frontier to keep out the French. The Indian population thus brought within mission influence was estimated at nearly 5000, not including the bands on Red River. The missions reached their highest prosperity about the

year 1760, when the Indian population attached to all the missions of Texas numbered about 15,000 souls. Then began a period of decline, brought about by the weakening of Spanish power, the increasing hostility of the wild tribes, and the wasting of the Indians under new diseases, which led to the final abandonment of the Caddo missions in 1773. Five years later the whole region was swept by small-pox, by which more than one-half the population was destroyed in a few months. In 1801 another visitation reduced the Caddo to about 1400. In 1835 those within Louisiana joined their kindred in Texas, then a separate government. Later difficulties with the Texans led to their removal, in 1859, to a reservation in Western Oklahoma. Here they still reside, being now legal citizens, upon individual allotments. They numbered 550 in 1906.

BANCROFT, *History of the North Mexican States and Texas* (2 vols., San Francisco, 1886 and 1889); *Annual Reports of Commissioner of Indian Affairs* (Washington, 1831–1907); LA HARPE, *Journal Historique de l'établissement des Français*, etc. (6 vols., Paris, 1876–1886): narratives of JOUTEL, LA HARPE, LA SALLE, SAINT-DENIS; MOONEY, *The Messiah Religion and the Ghost Dance* in *Fourteenth Annual Rep. of Bureau of Am. Ethnology* (Washington, 1896), part II; SIBLEY, *Historical Sketches of the Several Indian Tribes in Louisiana* (Washington, 1806).

JAMES MOONEY.

Cades.—The name, according to the Vulgate and the Septuagint, of three, or probably four cities mentioned in Scripture.

(1) Cades, or Cadesbarne [Heb. קדש (*Qādēsh*) "Holy", and ברנע (*Q. Bárnēă*); the meaning of *Bárnēă* is uncertain], a city on the extreme southern border of Palestine (Num., xx, 16; xxxiv, 4; Jos., xv, 3). In Ps. xxviii (xxix), 8 the name is extended to the surrounding desert. That Cades and Cadesbarne are one place is seen by comparing Num., xiii, 27, with Num., xxxii, 8, Deut., i, 19, etc. In Gen., xiv, 7, it is called Ên Mîshpāt (Vulg., *fontem Misphat*), "fountain of decision", or "judgment", which probably was its earlier name. The two names seem to indicate that a sanctuary with an oracle existed at the place in pre-Israelitic times. Cades, after Sinai, holds the most important place in the history of the forty years' wandering of the Israelites in the desert. They came from Horeb (Sinai) through the desert of Pharan, after eleven days' journey (Deut., i, 2, 19), with the intention of invading Chanaan from the south (ib., i, 20 sq.). From here spies were sent to explore the country, and here, on their return, forty days after, the discouraging reports of all but Caleb and Josue provoked a mutiny which changed the course of events. In punishment the people were condemned to wander thirty-eight years more, and all who had reached manhood, except Caleb and Josue, were to die in the desert. To escape this fate the mass of the people, instead of obeying the command to return towards the Red Sea, left Moses at Cades and pushed northward with the purpose of penetrating into the Promised Land, but met with disastrous defeat near Horma (Num., xiii, 2—xiv, 45; Deut., i, 22–44). During the stay at Cades occurred the death of Mary, the sister of Moses, and the second miraculous flow of water, on which latter occasion Moses and Aaron were excluded from the Land of Promise for their want of trust in God (Num., xx, 1–13). Cades was probably also the scene of the rebellion of Core, Dathan, and Abiron (Num., xvi). Lastly, it was from Cades that Moses, when about to begin the march to the table-land of Moab and the Jordan, sent to the King of Edom to obtain permission to pass through his territory. The permission being refused, the Israelites were forced to turn aside from Edom, passing probably through Wâdy el-Ithm, at the southern end of the valley of the Arabah (Num., xx, 14 sqq.; Deut., ii, 1 sqq.).

Opinions differ about the length of the stay at Cades. Many hold that the command to retrace their steps towards the Red Sea was carried out after the defeat of the Israelites near Horma, and that they came to Cades a second time at the beginning of the fortieth year of wandering. This second stay is said to be indicated by Num., xx, 1 sqq. In this opinion the stations (seats of headquarters and of the tabernacle) in Num., xxxiii, 19–35, i. e. from Remmomphares to Asiongaber, belong to the years of wandering between the first and the second visit to Cades. It is more probable, however, that the headquarters and the tabernacle remained at Cades all these years, while the people roamed about in the neighbouring desert in search of pasturage for their flocks and herds. This view seems more in accordance with Deut., i, 40, ii, 1 sqq. In this case the stations up to Hesmona (Num., xxxiii, 29) would belong to the journey from Sinai to Cades; those following Hesmona, to the march towards Moab. The insertion of verses 36–40 after verse 29 would then seem necessary, but the change would clear up this part of the itinerary.

A good deal of controversy has existed concerning the site of Cades, no less than eighteen places having been proposed. This may now be considered as settled in favour of 'Ain Qadîs or Gadîs, discovered by J. Rowlands in 1842, fifty miles south of Bersabee. Its only serious rival, 'Ain el-Weibeh, on the western edge of the Arabah, forty-five miles farther east, which was advocated by Robinson and others, is now generally abandoned. 'Ain Qadîs ("Holy Well") preserves the name *Cades* both in meaning and etymology, and best satisfies the Scriptural data. These place Cades to the south of, and close to, the Negeb, the "south" (Num., xiii, 30), or "south country" (Gen., xx, 1) of our English version (cf. Gen., xx, 1; Num., xiii, 23, 30; xiv, 43 sq.; Deut., i, 19, 20), in the Desert of Sin, which was north-east of the desert of Pharan (cf. Num., xx, 1; xxvii, 14; xxxiii, 36; Deut., xxxii, 51), near the middle of the southern frontier of the land assigned to Israel (Num., xxxiv, 4; Jos., xv, 3). It must therefore be sought in the north of the barren plateau Bâdiet et-Tîh, "the desert of wandering", about midway between the Arabah and the Mediterranean, that is in the region in which 'Ain Qadîs is situated. Moreover, the position of 'Ain Qadîs, at a short distance from the junction of the main roads leading north, and its abundant supply of good water, a rare thing in the desert, are advantages which must have made it an important point, and which would be most likely to attract the Israelites. Num., xx, 2 sqq., is no objection to the identification. Cades, wherever situated, must have been near a supply of water. The miracle in all likelihood occurred at a distance from the town. Still, it is quite possible that the springs (there are several) may for some reason have temporarily run dry, and the cliff from underneath which issue the waters of 'Ain Qadîs may well be the rock struck by Moses' rod. In the Vulgate text of Ecclus., xxiv, 18, mention is made of the palms of Cades. But the readings, ἐν Ἐγγάδοις, ἐν Γαδδί, ἐν Γάδδοις, found in some MSS., seem to show that Engaddi, where palms were abundant, was referred to by the sacred writer. The Sixtine ed. of the Septuagint has ἐν αἰγιαλοῖς, "on the seashore".

PALMER, *The Desert of the Exodus* (New York, 1872), 236, 282 sq., 420 sq.; TRUMBULL, *Kadesh Barnea* (New York, 1884); HULL, *Mount Seir* (London, 1889), 185; HOLLAND in *Pal Expl. Fund., Qu. St.* (1879), 60; (1884) 9; ROBINSON in *Biblic. World*, XVII, 327 sq.; LAGRANGE in *Rev. Bib.* (1906), 440 sq.; (1899), 3.3; (1900), 253 sq.; GUTHE in *Zeitschr. d. D. Pal. Ver.* (1885), 182–232; LEGENDRE in *Dict. de la Bible*, II, 16–20.

(2) CADES [Heb. קדש (Qódésh) "sanctuary"], a city of the Negeb or "south country" (Jos., xv, 23). It is sometimes identified with Cadesbarne, but is more probably distinct from it.

(3) CADES (or CEDES) OF THE HETHITES (HITTITES), a city which critical conjecture substitutes for Hodsi in II Kings, xxiv, 6. It is identified with

the *Qodshu* of Egyptian monuments, and is generally placed on the Lake of Homs (Emesa), Syria, at the point where the Orontes issues from it. (See also the article CEDES.)

SAYCE, *The Hittites* (London, 1888), 100; TOMPKINS in *Pal. Expl. Fund Qu. St.* (1882), 47; CONDER, *ibid.* (1881), 163–173; TOMPKINS in *Transact. Bibl. Archæol.* (1882), 395, 401; LIPSIUS, *Denkmäler*, III, 158, 159, 164; VIGOUROUX in *Dict. de la Bib.*, II, 367; ID., *Mélanges bibl.* (2nd ed.), 340 sq., 351 sq.; HUMMELAUER, *Com. in Lib. Sam.*, 448.

F. BECHTEL.

Cadesbarne. See CADES.

Cadillac, ANTOINE DE LAMOTHE, SIEUR DE, b. at Toulouse in 1657; d. at Castelsarrasin, 16 October, 1730. He was the son of a parliamentary councillor, and entered the army at the age of sixteen. Sent to Acadia in 1683 he served in the Port Royal garrison, studied the conditions of the English colonies, and in 1689 proposed the conquest of New York and Boston. He took part in the unsuccessful Caffinière expedition during which the English destroyed an establishment that he had just begun on Mount Desert Island, given him in 1688 by Governor de Denonville, together with an estate at the mouth of the Union River on the coast of Maine. Despite his advantageous marriage at Quebec (1687) with Thérèse Guyon, the daughter of a wealthy merchant, he returned to France in financial straits. The king took him under his protection, and in 1691 sent him out to Frontenac, Governor of New France. The latter, meditating an attack on the coast of New England, used all the information he could obtain from the crafty and resourceful young officer, who prepared several memoirs for this special purpose. Under these influential patrons Cadillac advanced, and was successively made captain of infantry, naval ensign, and, in 1694, commandant of Michillimakinac. In this last office he distinguished himself by his skill in controlling the savages of the West who threatened to unite with the Iroquois; but he likewise took advantage of his position to carry on illegal traffic, and quarrelled with the Jesuits who endeavoured to prevent his abuses in the brandy traffic. Returning to Quebec in 1697 he wrote an interesting account of Michillimakinac, and was sent to France by Frontenac for the purpose of making known the latter's views. Falling seriously ill, he promised to erect a chapel in the Franciscan church at Quebec, which promise he fulfilled in 1699. He then proposed to the Court to build a fortified post at the head of Lake Erie, thus to secure the line of fortifications from the West and prevent the Indians of the interior from trading with the English.

In June, 1701, Cadillac founded the city of Detroit, which he called Pont Chartrain in honour of his protector. Here he erected a church and a fort, attracted colonists, parcelled out land, gathered the Indians, proposing to civilize them by having them intermarry with the French, and, in 1705, obtained a monopoly of the trade of this post, at first given to a special company. He next aimed at making Detroit "the Paris of New France", suggested the cutting of a canal between Lakes Erie and Huron, and asked that the settlement be made a marquisate in his favour. Having become absolute master of Detroit, with a promise of being appointed its first governor, his ambition eventually led to his undoing. The merchants of Montreal complained that he was depriving their city of trade, Governor Vaudreuil objected to the power that he was arrogating to himself, and the Jesuits protested against abuses in his transactions with the Indians. Recalled to France in 1710, Cadillac was subsequently made Governor of Louisiana, where he arrived in 1712. Entering into partnership with Crozat, he devoted himself chiefly to mining and to trading with the Spaniards. However, in 1716 he was deposed, tried, and sentenced to the Bastille, whence he emerged in 1718, and was restored to favour. In 1722 he obtained a decree whereby he regained possession of his Detroit property and he was later made Governor of Castelsarrasin, department of Tarn and Garonne, where he died. His body was interred in the old Carmels church, since transformed into a prison. Cadillac was shrewd and far-seeing, and would have been capable of great things had not his career been blighted by a caustic temperament and an insatiable desire for gain.

Archives coloniales de France, series C., II; *Acadie*, II, *carton* 10; *Canada*, series C., II, XI–XXXI, series B., XIX–LXIII; *Archives des affaires étrangères, Canada*, IV; MARGE, *Découv. et Etablis.*, V, 133–346; ROCHEMONTEIX, *Jésuites et Nouv. France au 18e siècle*, I, 59–74, 242; SULTE, *Hist. Can. Franc.*, VI, viii; RAMEAU, *Notes historiques sur la colonie canadienne du Détroit* (1861); VERREAU, *Quelques notes sur Antoine Lamothe de Cadillac* in *Revue Canadienne* (1883); BURTON, *A Sketch of the Life of Antoine de la Mothe Cadillac* (Detroit, 1895); IDEM, *In the Footsteps of Cadillac* (1899).

J. EDMOND ROY.

Cadiz, DIOCESE OF (GADITANA ET SEPTENSIS), suffragan of Seville. Its jurisdiction covers nearly all the civil province of Cadiz; only a few places, like Sanlucar, belong to the Diocese of Seville, or, like Grazalema, to that of Malaga. Cadiz (369,382) is the residence of the bishop, and is situated on the Isle of Leon, separated from the mainland by a narrow and tortuous channel; very high and thick walls surround the city, which from the sea presents a very picturesque appearance. The greater part of the old town was consumed in the conflagration of 1569. This city was retaken in 1262 from the Moors, and raised by Urban IV to episcopal rank in 1263 at the request of Alfonso X. Its first bishop was Fray Juan Martínez. After the Christians had won from the Moors the Plaza (stronghold) de Algeciras, the ordinaries of Cadiz bore the title of Bishop of Cadiz and Algeciras, granted by Clement VI in 1352. This see counted amongst its prelates in 1441 Cardinal Fray Juan de Torquemada, an eminent Dominican theologian and jurisconsult, who took a leading part in the Councils of Basle and Florence, and defended in his "Summa de Ecclesiâ" the direct power of the pope in temporal matters. By the Concordat of 1851 the Diocese of Ceuta, also suffragan of Seville, was suppressed and incorporated with that of Cadiz, whose bishop is regularly Apostolic Administrator of Ceuta. There are in Cadiz 32 parishes and 110 priests; in Ceuta, 22 parishes, 26 priests, and 11,700 inhabitants.

CASTRO, *Historia de Cadiz y su provincia* (Cadiz, 1858), 207–8, 222, 248; LA FUENTE, *Hist. ec.ca de España* (Madrid, 1873–75), IV, 290; URRUTIA, *Descripción histórico-artístico de la catedral de Cadiz* (Cadiz, 1843).

EDUARDO DE HINOJOSA.

Cæcilia, See CECILIA, SAINT.

Cædmon, SAINT, author of Biblical poems in Anglo-Saxon, date of birth unknown; d. between 670 and 680. While Cædmon's part in the authorship of the so-called Cædmonian poems has been steadily narrowed by modern scholarship, the events in the life of this gifted religious poet are definitively established by the painstaking Bede, who lived in the nearby monastery of Wearmouth in the following generation (see BEDE). Bede tells us (Hist. Eccles., Bk. IV, ch. xxiv) that Cædmon, whose name is perhaps Celtic (Bradley), or a Hebrew or Chaldaic pseudonym (Palgrave, Cook), was at first attached as a labourer to the double monastery of Whitby (Streoneshalh), founded in 657 by St. Hilda, a friend of St. Aidan. (See AIDAN.) One night, when the servants of the monastery were gathered about the table for good-fellowship, and the harp was passed from hand to hand, Cædmon, knowing nothing of poetry, left the company for shame, as he had often done, and retired to the stable, as he was assigned that night to the care of the draught cattle. As he slept, there stood by him in vision one who called him by name, and bade him sing. "I cannot sing, and therefore

I left the feast." "Sing to me, however, sing of Creation." Thereupon Cædmon began to sing in praise of God verses which he had never heard before. Of these verses, called Cædmon's hymn, Bede gives the Latin equivalent, the Alfredian translation of Bede gives a West-Saxon poetic version, and one manuscript of Bede appends a Northumbrian poetic version, perhaps the very words of Cædmon. In the morning Cædmon recited his story and his verses to Hilda and the learned men of the monastery, and all agreed that he had received a Divine gift. Cædmon, having further shown his gift by turning into excellent verse some sacred stories recited to him, yielded to the exhortation of Hilda that he take the monastic habit. He was taught the whole series of sacred history, and then, like a clean animal ruminating, turned it into sweet verse. His poems treated of Genesis, Exodus, and stories from other books of the Old Testament, the Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, the Descent of the Holy Ghost, the teaching of the Apostles, the Last Judgment, Hell and Heaven. Bede ends his narrative with an account of Cædmon's holy death. According to William of Malmesbury, writing 1125, he was probably buried at Whitby, and his sanctity was attested by many miracles. His canonization was probably popular rather than formal.

Brooke, *Early English Literature* (London, 1892); Morley, *English Writers* (London, 1888), I; Ker, *Dark Ages* (New York, 1904); Hazlitt-Warton, *History of English Poetry* (London, 1873); Azarias, *Old English Thought* (New York, 1879); Lingard, *Anglo-Saxon Church* (London, 1852); Turner, *History of the Anglo-Saxons* (London, 1803); Ten Brink, *English Literature* (New York, 1882), I; Idem, *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur* (Strasburg, 1899), 98 and app.; Körting, *Grundriss der Geschichte der englischen Litteratur* (Münster, 1905); Wülcker, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Litt.*; Idem, *Cædmon u. Milton, Anglia*, IV, 40; Montalembert, *Monks of the West* (Edinburgh, 1861); *Acta Sanctorum*, 11 Feb.; Sievers, *Der Heliand und die angelsächsische Genesis* (Halle, 1875); Plummer, *Hist. Eccl. Gentis Anglor. Bedæ* (Oxford, 1896); Grein-Wülcker, *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie* (Kassel, 1894); Miller, *O. E. Version of Bede*, with tr. (London, 1890), 95, 96; Thorpe, *Cædmon's Metrical Paraphrase*, etc., with Eng. Tr. (London, 1832); Cook and Tinker, *Translations from Old English* (Boston, 1902); Palgrave in *Archæologia*, XXIV, 341; Cook, *Publications Modern Language Association*, VI, 9; Stevens in *The Academy*, 21 Oct., 1876; Gurteen, *Cædmon, Dante, and Milton* (New York, 1896); Zangemeister and Braune, *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* (1894), IV, 205; Holthausen, *Altsächsisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg, May, 1900).

J. Vincent Crowne.

Cælestius. See Pelagius.



Cædmon's Hymn, Eighth-Century MS., University of Cambridge

The Cædmonian poems, found in a unique tenth-century MS., now in the Bodleian Library, were first published and ascribed to Cædmon in 1655 by Francis Junius (du Jon), a friend of Milton, and librarian to the Earl of Arundel. The MS. consists of poems on Genesis, Exodus, Daniel, and a group of poems in a different hand, now called collectively "Christ and Satan", and containing the Fall of the Angels, the Descent into Hell, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Last Judgment, and the Temptation in the Wilderness. The tendency among Anglo-Saxon scholars has been to deny the Cædmonian authorship of most of these poems, except part of the "Genesis", called A, and parts of the "Christ and Satan". In 1875 Professor Sievers advanced the theory, on grounds of metre, language, and style, that the part of the "Genesis" called B, ll. 235–370, and ll. 421–851, an evident interpolation, was merely a translation and recension of a lost Old Saxon "Genesis" poem of the ninth century, whose extant New Testament part is known as the "Heliand". Old Saxon is the Old Low German dialect of the continental Saxons, who were converted in part from England. The Sievers theory, whose history is one of the brilliant episodes of modern philology, was established in 1894 by the discovery of fragments of an Old Saxon "Genesis". (Parallel passages in Cook and Tinker.)

Bede tells us that many English writers of sacred verse had imitated Cædmon, but that none had equalled him. The literary value of parts of the Cædmonian poems is undoubtedly of a high order. The Bible stories are not merely paraphrased, but have been brooded upon by the poet until developed into a vivid picture, with touches drawn from the English life and landscape about him. The story of the flight of Israel resounds with the tread of armies and the excitement of camp and battle. The "Genesis" and the "Christ and Satan" have the glow of dramatic life, and the character of Satan is sharply delineated. The poems, whether we say they are Cædmon's or of the school of Cædmon, mark a worthy beginning of the long and noble line of English sacred poetry.

Caen, University of, founded in 1432 by Henry VI of England, who was then master of Paris and of a large part of France. In the beginning it included only faculties of canon and civil law. To these were added, in 1437, a faculty of theology and a faculty of arts, and, in 1438, a faculty of medicine. The English having been repulsed from Paris, the purpose of these additions and of the many privileges granted by Henry VI was to give the students the same advantages they would have found in Paris, and thus prevent their going to the university of the capital. On the petition of the Estates of Normandy, Pope Eugenius IV granted a Bull of erection to the university and appointed the Bishop of Bayeux as chancellor (30 May, 1437). All those admitted to degrees were required to take an oath of fidelity to the Roman pontiff, and to pledge themselves never to attempt anything against the interests of the Church. The ceremony of the solemn inauguration took place in 1439, the first rector being an Englishman, Michael of Tregury, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin. From the beginning the University of Paris opposed very strongly the founding of a university at Caen. In 1433 protests were sent to the chancellor of the kingdom and to the Parlement of Paris. The same year the delegates of the university to the Council of Basle were instructed to ask for the suppression of the university at Caen. Later a petition was also sent to Eugenius IV. Notwithstanding this opposition, the University of Caen developed. In 1445 Henry VI declared it the only university in France enjoying the royal privileges. When Caen was conquered by the French in 1450, King Charles allowed the university to continue as before. It was, however, a mere tolera tion until the king should reach a final decision. This was given on 30 October, 1452, when Charles VII created anew the University of Caen and gave it a new charter, ignoring altogether its former charter and

privileges, and granting the same privileges enjoyed by French universities. Like the other universities in France, the University of Caen disappeared at the time of the French Revolution. The present university, founded in 1894, has fifty instructors and 750 students.

RASHDALL, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1895), II, Pt. I, 194; FOURNIER, *Les statuts et privilèges des universités françaises* (Paris, 1892), III, Pt. I, 145; DE BOURMONT, *La fondation de l'université de Caen* in *Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de Normandie* (Caen, 1884), XII; CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibliogr.*, 541.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Cæremoniale Episcoporum, a book containing the rites and ceremonies to be observed at Mass, Vespers, and other functions, by bishops and prelates of inferior rank, in metropolitan, cathedral, and collegiate churches. It treats also of the manner of precedence among ecclesiastics and official lay persons. From the earliest centuries of the Church there were many books which contained the rites and ceremonies to be observed in the performance of ecclesiastical functions. Shortly after Sixtus V had instituted (1587) the Congregation of Sacred Rites and Ceremonies, Clement VIII appointed a commission of learned prelates to correct the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum", which he promulgated by the Apostolic Letter "Cum novissime", 14 July, 1600. When in course of time errors crept into this, Innocent X had it revised by a commission of cardinals, and by his Constitution "Etsi alias" (30 July, 1650) ordered it to be observed everywhere. A revised edition became necessary during the pontificate of Benedict XIII, which was promulgated by the Bull "Licet alias" (7 March, 1727). Benedict XIV caused an amended and augmented edition to be published, the observance of which he made obligatory by Apostolic Briefs (15 May, 1741; 25 March, 1752). Finally a typical edition was published under the auspices of the Congregation of Sacred Rites to which all other editions were to conform (S. R. C., 17 Aug., 1886).

The "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" is divided into three books. The first portion concerns what a bishop must do after his election and immediately upon entrance into the diocese, regarding his ordinary dress, his duties and privileges, as indicated, when a legate, cardinal, nuncio, or other prelate is present (cc. i-iv); the duties of the master of ceremonies, sacristan, assistant priest, and other ministers of the bishop (cc. v-xi); the ornaments of the church and of the bishop's throne (cc. xii-xiv); the ecclesiastical dress of the bishop and canons, and the manner of entering and leaving the church (c. xv); the pallium, mitre, and crosier (cc. xvi-xvii); reverences, genuflexions, and other ceremonies, and sermons during Mass and at funerals (cc. xviii-xxv); the manner of supplying the places of canons and other ministers at solemn services (c. xxvi); the orations and their chant, the organ and organist (cc. xxvii-xxviii); the low Mass of the bishop or low Mass celebrated in his presence (cc. xxix-xxx); the rites and ceremonies to be observed at synods. The second book treats of the Divine Office and of Mass throughout the year celebrated (a) by the bishop; (b) in his presence; (c) in cathedrals and collegiate churches when the bishop is absent (cc. i-xxxiv); the anniversary of the election and of the consecration of the bishop (c. xxxv); the anniversary of the death of his predecessor and of all the bishops and canons of the cathedral (cc. xxxvi-xxxvii); the last illness and death of the bishop and the prayers to be said for the election of his successor (c. xxxviii); the chant of the Confiteor, the form of publishing an indulgence, and the blessing given by the bishop after the sermon (c. xxxix). The third book treats of the formalities to be observed by provincial presidents, prelatic governors, and vice-legates in their respective provinces and cities (cc. i-xi).

The "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" is obligatory not only in cathedrals and collegiate churches, but also in smaller churches, as far as it is applicable to the liturgical functions performed therein (S. R. C., 17 Aug., 1894), not only when a bishop pontificates, but also when a priest performs the ceremony. In this manner it explains and makes up the deficiencies in the rubrics of the Breviary and Missal. That the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" obliges in conscience is evident from the words of Benedict XIII, who, speaking of the rubrics contained in the official liturgical books of the Church, says: "Ritus . . . . qui in minimis etiam, *sine peccato* negligi, omitti vel mutari haud possunt" (Conc. Prov. Roman., 1725, tit. xv, cap. i). Although the Congregation of Sacred Rites (19 Aug., 1651) decreed: "Nihil addi, minui vel immutari posse, sed omnia in eodem Missali et *Cæremoniali* præscripta ad unguem servanda esse", yet ceremonials peculiar to individual churches may be retained, provided they do not conflict with the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" (Sixtus V in his Bull "Cum novissime" found at the beginning of the "Cærem. Episc.").

CATALANI, *Cæremoniale Episcoporum . . . commentariis illustratum* (Paris, 1860); DE HERDT, *Praxis Pontificalis* (Louvain, 1904); MENGHINI, *Elementa juris liturgici* (Rome, 1906); *Cérémonial des évêques commenté et expliqué. Par un évêque suffragant de la Province Ecclésiastique de Québec* (Paris, 1856).

A. J. SCHULTE.

Cærularius, MICHAEL. See MICHAEL CÆRULARIUS.

Cæsarea, a Latin titular see, and the seat of a residential Armenian bishopric, in Cappadocia (Asia Minor). The native name of this city was *Mazaka*, after Mosoch, the legendary Cappadocian hero. It was also called *Eusebeia* after King Ariarathes Eusebius, and took its new name, *Cæsarea*, from Tiberius in A. D. 17, when Cappadocia became a Roman province. When Valens divided this province, Cæsarea remained the metropolis of Cappadocia Prima. At all times it has been, and still is the first metropolis of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Lequien (I, 367) enumerates fifty bishops from the first to the eighteenth century. We may mention Primianus, the centurion who stood by the Cross on Calvary according to St. Gregory of Nyssa; Firmilian, a correspondent of St. Cyprian of Carthage; St. Basil the Great; Andrew and Arethas, two commentators of the Apocalypse; Soterichus, a famous Monophysite, and some others who became patriarchs of Constantinople. Among the principal saints are all the members of St. Basil's family; the martyrs St. Mamas, or Mammes, St. Gordius, and St. Julitta, whose panegyrics were pronounced by St. Basil. The illustrious monk St. Sabas, who founded the great monastery still existing near Jerusalem, was born in the Diocese of Cæsarea. At the time of St. Basil this diocese had fifty chorepiscopi or country bishops, which supposes a dense population. Councils were held at Cæsarea in 314, 358, 371, etc. As for the Latin bishops, four are known in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Lequien, III, 877).

Cæsarea, under the Turkish name Kaisarieh, is to-day the chief town of a sanjak in the vilayet of Angora. The ruins of the old city are still visible about a quarter of a mile to the west of the modern town at Eski Kaisarieh (Old Cæsarea). The present (1908) city seems to have been established in the early days of the Mussulman occupation. It is situated on the Kizil Yirmak (Halys), at an altitude of 3281 feet, at the foot of Mount Argæus (9996 feet), and has about 72,000 inhabitants: 45,000 Mussulmans, 9000 Gregorian Armenians, 1200 Protestant Armenians, 800 Catholic Armenians, and 15,000 Greeks (few Catholic Greeks). Kaisarieh, besides the Greek metropolitan see, is a diocese for the Gregorian, and a diocese for the Catholic, Armenians. The last-named see has only 2000 faithful with 2 parishes, 4 churches, and 3 priests. A flourishing school is conducted by the

Jesuits, a school and an orphanage by Sisters of St. Joseph de l'Apparition. An Assumptionist of the Greek Rite takes care of the Catholic Greeks. The bazaars are remarkable. The city has a trade in *pasterma* (preserved beef), woollens, cotton stuffs, and very beautiful carpets. There are at Kaisarieh ruins of a Seljuk fortress, a mosque of Houen (founder of an order of dervishes in the fourteenth century), and also old tombs. In the neighbourhood are ruins of churches dedicated to St. Basil, St. Mercurius, etc.

Belley in *Mém. de l'Acad. des inscript. et belles-lettres* (1780), XL, I, 124–48; Kinneir, *Journey through Asia Minor*, 98 sqq.; Texier, *Description de l'Asie Mineure*, II, 53 sqq.; Cuinet, *Turquie d'Asie*, I, 304–15; Chantre, *Mission en Cappadoce*, 119–21; Piolet, *Les missions cath. françaises au XIXe siècle*, I, 156 sqq.; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878), I, 469.

S. Vailhé.

Cæsarea Mauretaniæ, a titular see of North Africa. There was on the coast of Mauretania a town called Iol, where the famous Bocchus resided, that belonged occasionally to the Numidian kings. Juba II, when he had obtained Mauretania from Augustus, made it his capital and named it *Cæsarea*. After the deposition of his son Ptolemy, the city became the capital of the province named after it, *Mauretania Cæsarea*. Under Claudius it became a Roman colony, *Colonia Claudia Cæsarea*. At the end of the fourth century it was burned by the Moors, and in 533 it was besieged by the troops of Justinian, but the whole province was soon lost by the Byzantines. Captured by the French in 1840, it is now Cherchel, the chief town of an arrondissement in the department of Algiers (Algeria), and has 9100 inhabitants. There are in the vicinity ruins of Roman monuments. Cherchel boasts of marble and plaster quarries, iron mines, and a trade in oil, tobacco, and earthenware. The port, important in Roman times, has been partly filled up by alluvial deposits and by earthquakes. As to the religious history of Cæsarea, we know the names of four Catholic titulars of the see and one Donatist, from 314 to 484.

Morcelli, *Africa christiana* (Rome, 1816); Gams, *Series ep.*, 464; Mas-Latrie, *Trésor de chronologie*, 1872; Diehl, *L'Afrique byzantine*, 260; Waille in *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des inscript. et belles-lettres* (1887–1888), D, XV, 53; XVI, 35, 241; *De Cæsareæ monumentis* (Algiers, 1891); Gauckler, *Musée de Cherchel* (Paris, 1895); Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878), II, 59.

S. Pétridès.

Cæsarea Palæstinæ (Cæsarea Maritima), a titular see of Palestine. In Greek antiquity the city was called *Pyrgos Stratonos* (Straton's Tower), after a Greek adventurer or a Sidonian king; under this name it antedates, perhaps, Alexander the Great. King Herod named it Cæsarea in honour of Augustus, and built there temples, palaces, a theatre, an amphitheatre, a port, and numerous monuments, with colonnades and colossal statues. The civil life of the new city began in 13 B. C., from which time Cæsarea was the civil and military capital of Judæa, and as such was the official residence of the Roman procurators, e. g. Pilate and Felix. Vespasian and Titus made it a Roman colony, *Colonia Prima Flavia Augusta Cæsarea*. Under Alexander Severus it became the civil metropolis of Palestine, and later, when Palestine had been divided into three provinces, it remained the metropolis of Palæstina Prima. St. Peter established the Church there when he baptized the centurion Cornelius (Acts, x, xi); St. Paul often sojourned there (ix, 30, xviii, 22, xxi, 8), and was imprisoned there for two years before being taken to Rome (xxiii, 23, xxv, 1–13). However, there is no record of any bishops of Cæsarea until the second century. At the end of this century a council was held there to regulate the celebration of Easter. In the third century Origen took refuge at Cæsarea, and wrote there many of his exegetic and theological works, among others the famous "Hexapla", the manuscript of which was for a long time preserved in the episcopal library of that city. Through Origen and the scholarly priest, St. Pamphilus, the theological school of Cæsarea won a universal reputation. St. Gregory the Wonder-Worker, St. Basil the Great, and others came from afar to study there. Its ecclesiastical library passed for the richest in antiquity; it was there that St. Jerome performed much of



General View, Cæsarea

his Scriptural labours. The library was probably destroyed either in 614 by the Persians, or about 637 by the Saracens. As ecclesiastical metropolis of Palæstina Prima, subject to the Patriarchate of Antioch, Cæsarea had the Bishop of Jerusalem among its suffragans till 451, when Juvenalis succeeded in establishing the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Cæsarea had then thirty-two suffragan sees (Revue de l'Orient chrét., 1899, 56). Lequien (III, 533–74) mentions thirty-two Greek bishops of Cæsarea, but his list is very incomplete. Among the more celebrated are Theotecnus, a disciple of Origen; the famous church historian Eusebius, a disciple of St. Pamphilus; Acacius, the leader of an Arian group; the historian Gelasius of Cyzicus; St. John the Khozibite in the sixth century; and Anastasius, a writer of the eleventh century. During the persecution of Diocletian Cæsarea had many martyrs to whom Eusebius has consecrated an entire work (De martyribus Palæstinæ). Among them were St. Hadrian, whose church has just been discovered; Sts. Valens, Paul, Porphyrius, and others. Another illustrious personage of Cæsarea is the sixth-century Byzantine historian Procopius. When King Baldwin I took the city in 1101, it was still very rich. There was found the famous chalice known as the Holy Grail, believed to have been used at the Last Supper, preserved now at Paris, and often mentioned in medieval poems. The city was rebuilt by the crusaders, but on a smaller scale. A list of thirty-six Latin bishops, from 1101 to 1496, is given by Lequien (III, 1285–1290) and Eubel (I, 159; II, 126). During the Frankish occupation the Latin metropolis had ten suffragan sees. The metropolitan See of Cæsarea is still preserved by the Greeks of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, as it is by the Latins merely as a titular see. The present name of the city is Kaisariyeh. Since 1884 a colony of Mussulman Bosnians has occupied the medieval city, which covers a space of about 1800 feet, north to south, and 7500 feet, east to west. The ancient



The Pier, Cæsarea

walls, bastions, and ditches are well preserved. The ruins of the Roman city extend to a distance of about four miles; they are the largest in Palestine, and are used as a stone-quarry for Jaffa and Gaza, and even for Jerusalem. One sees there, crowded together, the haven of Herod, restored by the crusaders, the amphitheatre large enough to contain 20,000 spectators, remains of canals and aqueducts, a hippodrome with a splendid obelisk of rose granite, colonnades, ruins of temples and of at least two churches, and other stupendous relics of past greatness.

WILSON, *Lands of the Bible*, II, 250–53; *Discoveries at Cæsarea* in *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quart. Statement* (1888), 134 sq.; *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, II, 13–19; GUÉRIN, *Samarie*, II, 321–39.

S. VAILHÉ.

Cæsarea Philippi, a Greek Catholic residential see, and a Latin titular see, in Syria. The native name is unknown; under Antiochus the Great it bore already the Greek name *Panion* owing to a grotto consecrated to Pan's worship. It was given (20 B. C.) by Augustus to Herod, who built there a magnificent temple in honour of the emperor. Soon after, the tetrarch Philip embellished it and dedicated it to his imperial protector Tiberius, whence its new name *Cæsarea Philippi* or *Cæsarea Paneas*. Near this city took place the confession of St. Peter (Matt., xvi, 13–20). There lived the Hæmorrhoïssa (Matt., ix, 20); according to Eusebius she set up before her house a bronze monument representing her cure by Jesus; in this group Julian the Apostate substituted his own statue for that of Christ.

Cæsarea was at an early date a suffragan of Tyre in Phœnicia Prima. Five bishops (to 451) are mentioned by Lequien (II, 831), the first of whom, St. Erastus (Rom., xvi, 23), is obviously legendary. After the town's capture by the crusaders (about 1132) a Latin see was established there; four titulars are mentioned in Lequien (II, 1337); they must not be confounded with those of Panium, another see in Thracia. The modern name is Banias, a little village on a pleasing site, 990 feet above the level of the sea, at the foot of Mount Hermon, and forty-five miles south-west of Damascus, capital of the vilayet. The landscape is splendid, and the country very fertile, owing to the abundance of water. One of the main sources of the Jordan rises in the grotto of Pan, now partly blocked up and serving as a cattle shed. Among the ruins are many columns, capitals, sarcophagi, and a gate. The ancient church of St. George serves as a mosque. The citadel is partly preserved and is considered the most beautiful medieval ruin in Syria. Since 1886 Banias has been the see of a Greek Catholic (Melchite) bishop, with about 4000 faithful and 20 priests. Its first titular, Monseigneur Géraïgiry, built a number of churches and 26 schools; the residence of the bishop is near Banias at Gedaïdat-Margyoum.

WILSON, *Lands of the Bible*, II, 175 sq.; THOMSON, *The Land and the Book*, 228 sq.; GUÉRIN, *La Galilée*, II, 308 sq.

S. VAILHÉ.

Cæsarius, RULE OF SAINT. See CÆSARIUS OF ARLES, SAINT.

Cæsarius of Arles, SAINT, bishop, administrator, preacher, theologian, b. at Châlons in Burgundy, 470–71, d. at Arles, 27 August, 543, according to Malnory. He entered the monastery of Lérins when quite young, but his health giving way the abbot sent him to Arles in order to recuperate. Here he won the affection and esteem of the bishop, Æonus, who had him ordained deacon and priest. On the death of this bishop Cæsarius was unanimously chosen his successor (502 or 503). He ruled the See of Arles for forty years with apostolic courage and prudence, and stands out in the history of that unhappy period as the foremost bishop of Gaul. His episcopal city, near the mouth of the Rhone and close to Marseilles, retained yet its ancient importance in the social, commercial, and industrial life of Gaul, and the Mediterranean world generally; as a political centre, moreover, it was subject to all the vicissitudes that in the early decades of the sixth century fell to the lot of Visigoth and Ostrogoth, Burgundian and Frank. Eventually (538) the latter, under King Childebert, obtained full sway in ancient Gaul. During the long conflict, however, Cæsarius was more than once the object of barbarian suspicion. Under Alaric II he was accused of a treasonable intention to deliver the city to the Burgundians, and without examination or trial was exiled to Bordeaux. Soon, however, the Visigoth king relented, and left Cæsarius free to summon the important Council of Agde (506), while in harmonious cooperation with the Catholic hierarchy and clergy he himself published the famous adaptation of the Roman Law known as the "Breviarium Alarici", which eventually became the civil code of Gaul. Again in 508, after the siege of Arles, the victorious Ostrogoths suspected Cæsarius of having plotted to deliver the city to the besieging Franks and Burgundians, and caused him to be temporarily deported. Finally, in 513, he was compelled to appear at Ravenna before King Theodoric, who was, however, profoundly impressed by Cæsarius, exculpated him, and treated the holy bishop with much distinction. The latter profited by the occasion to visit Pope Symmachus at Rome. The pope conferred on him the pallium, said to be the first occasion on which it was granted to any Western bishop. He also granted to the clergy of Arles the use of the dalmatic, peculiar to the Roman clergy, confirmed him as metropolitan, and renewed for him personally (11 June, 514) the dignity of Vicar of the Apostolic See in Gaul, more or less regularly held by his predecessors (see VICAR APOSTOLIC; THESSALONICA; VIENNE), whereby the Apostolic See obtained in Southern Gaul, still Roman in language, temper, law, and social organization, an intelligent and devoted co-operator who did much to confirm the pontifical authority, not alone in his own province, but also throughout the rest of Gaul. He utilized his office of vicar to convoke the important series of councils forever connected with his name, presided over by him, and whose decrees are, in part or entirely, his own composition. These are five in number: Arles (524), Carpentras (527), Orange (II) and Vaison (529), and Marseilles (533), the latter called to judge a bishop, Contumeliosus of Riez, a self-confessed adulterer, but who managed later to obtain a reprieve through Pope Agapetus, on the plea of irregular procedure, the final outcome of the case being unknown. The other councils, whose text may be read in Clark's translation of Hefele's "History of the Councils" (Edinburgh, 1876–96), are of primary importance for the future religious and ecclesiastical life of the new barbarian kingdoms of the West. Not a few important provisions were then made that were later incorporated into the traditional or written law of the Western Church, e. g. concerning the nature and security of ecclesiastical property, the certainty of support for the parochial clergy, the education of ecclesiastics, simple and frequent preaching of the Word of God, especially in country parishes, etc. Cæsarius had already drawn up a famous résumé of earlier canonical collections known to historians of canon law as the "Statuta Ecclesiæ Antiqua", by the inadvertence of a medieval copyist wrongly attributed to the Fourth Council of Carthage (418), but by Malnory (below, 53–62, 291–93) proved to be the compilation of Cæsarius, after the Ballerini brothers had located them in the fifth century, and Maassen had pointed out Arles as the place of compilation. The rich archives of the Church of Arles, long before this a centre of imperial administration in the West and of papal direction, permitted him to put together, on the border-line of the old and the new, this valuable

summary, or *speculum*, of ancient Christian life in the Roman West, in its own way a counterpart of the Apostolic Constitutions (q. v.) and the Apostolic Canons (see CANONS APOSTOLIC) for the Christian Orient. If we add to these councils his own above-mentioned council of Agde, those of Gerona, Saragossa, Valencia and Lerida in Spain (516–524), and those of Epaone (517) and Orléans (538, 541) in Gaul (influenced by Cæsarius, Malnory, 115, 117), we have a contemporary documentary portrait of a great Gallo-Roman ecclesiastical legislator and reformer whose Christian code aimed at and obtained two things, a firm but merciful and humane discipline of clergy and people, and stability and decency of ecclesiastical life both clerical and monastic. To a Catholic mind the above-mentioned Second Council of Orange reflects special credit on Cæsarius, for in it was condemned the false doctrine concerning grace known as Semipelagianism (q. v.); there is good reason for believing that the council's decrees (Hefele, ad. an. 529; P. L., XXXIX, 1142–52) represent the work (otherwise lost) "De gratiâ et libero arbitrio" that Gennadius (De vir. ill., c. 86) attributes to Cæsarius, and which he says was approved and widely circulated by Felix IV (526–530). It is noteworthy that in the preface to the acts of the council, the Fathers say that they are assembled at the suggestion and by the authority of the Apostolic See, from which they have received certain propositions or decrees (*capitula*), gathered by the ancient Fathers from the Scriptures concerning the matter in hand; as a matter of fact the decrees of the council are taken almost word for word, says de la Bigne (op. cit., 1145–46), from St. Augustine. Finally, the confirmation of the council's doctrinal decrees by Boniface II (25 Jan., 531) made them authoritative in the Universal Church.

Cæsarius, however, was best known in his own day, and is still best remembered, as a popular preacher, the first great *Volksprediger* of the Christians whose sermons have come down to us. A certain number of these discourses, forty more or less, deal with Old Testament subjects, and follow the prevalent typology made popular by St. Augustine; they seek everywhere a mystic sense, but avoid all rhetorical pomp and subtleties, and draw much from the admirable psalm-commentary, "Enarrationes in Psalmos", of St. Augustine. Like the moral discourses, "Admoniones", they are quite brief (his usual limit was fifteen minutes), clear and simple in language, abounding in images and allusions drawn from the daily life of the townsman or the peasant, the sea, the market, the vineyard, the sheepfold, the soil, and reflecting in a hundred ways the yet vigorous Roman life of Southern Gaul, where Greek was still spoken in Arles and Asiatic merchants still haunted the delta of the Rhone. The sermon of Cæsarius opens usually with an easy and familiar introduction, offers a few plain truths set forth in an agreeable and practical way, and closes with a recapitulation. Most of the sermons deal with the principles of Christian morality, the Divine sanctions: hell and purgatory (for the latter see Malnory, 185–86), the various classes of sinners, and the principal vices of his day and surroundings: public vice, adultery and concubinage, drunkenness, neglect of Mass, love of (landed) wealth, the numerous survivals of a paganism that was only newly overcome. In them the popular life of the *Provincia* is reproduced, often with photographic accuracy, and frequently with naive good-nature. These sermons are a valuable thesaurus for historical students, whether of canon law, history of dogma, discipline, or liturgy.

Many of these sermons were frequently copied in with works of St. Augustine, whose text, as stated, they often reproduced. The *editio princeps* is that of Gilbertus Cognatus Nozarenus (Basle, 1558), and includes forty sermons, of which, according to Arnold (see below, 492), only about twenty-four were surely genuine. The great Maurists, Coustant and Blanchpain, made clear his title to 103, which they printed in the appendix to the fifth volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine (P. L., LXVII, 1041–90, 1121–25). Casimir Oudin, the ex-Premonstratensian and familiar in his Catholic period with the aforesaid Maurists, intended (1722) to bring out a special edition of the sermons and the writings of Cæsarius, the former of which he calculated as one hundred and fifty-eight in number. The Benedictine editors of the "Histoire Littéraire de la France" (III, 200–217) put down as surely genuine one hundred and twenty-two or one hundred and twenty-three. Joseph Fessler, Bishop of St. Pölten, had planned an edition of St. Cæsarius, but death (1872) surprised him, and his materials passed to the Benedictines of Maredsous in Belgium, who have confided this very important task to Dom Germain Morin. In the "Revue Bénédictine" (Feb., 1893) he made known the principles and the method of his new edition. Several other essays from the same pen and in the same place represent the choicest modern learning on the subject.

In the history of monastic life and reforms in Gaul, Cæsarius occupies an honourable place between St. Martin of Tours and St. Honoratus of Lérins on the one hand, and St. Columbanus on the other, while he is a contemporary of St. Benedict, and in fact survived him but a few months. He composed two rules, one for men ("Ad Monachos"), the other for women ("Ad Virgines"), both in Migne, P. L., LXVII, 1099 sqq., 1103 sqq., reprinted from Holstein-Brockie, "Codex regularum monasticarum" (Augsburg, 1759). The rule for monks is based on that of Lérins, as handed down by oral tradition, but adds the important element of stability of profession (*ut usque ad mortem suam ibi perseveret*, c. i), a legal renunciation of one's property, and a more perfect community of goods. This rule soon gave way to the Rule of Columbanus, and with the latter, eventually to the Rule of St. Benedict. The rule for nuns, however, had a different fate. "It was the work of his whole life", says Malnory (257) and into it he poured all his prudence, tenderness, experience, and foresight. It borrows much from the famous Epistle ccxi of St. Augustine and from John Cassian; nevertheless it was the first rule drawn up for women living in perfect community, and has remained the model of all such. Even to-day, says Malnory (263), "it unites all the conditions requisite for a cloistered nunnery of strict observance". His own sister, St. Cæsaria, was placed at the head of the monastery (first built in the famous Aliscamps, outside the walls of Arles, afterwards removed within the city), which at the death of the holy founder counted two hundred nuns. It astonished his contemporaries, who looked upon it as an ark of salvation for women in those stormy times, and drew from Pope Hormisdas a cry of admiration, preserved for us in the letter by which, at the request of Cæsarius, he approved and confirmed this new work (super clericorum et monasteriorum excubias consuetas puellarum quoque Dei choros noviter instituisse te, P. L., LXVII, 1285).

The pope also confirmed the full exemption of the abbess and her nuns from all episcopal authority; future bishops could only visit them occasionally, in the exercise of their pastoral duties, or in case of grave violation of the rule. Elections, constitution, internal administration, even the choice of the Mass-priest, were confided exclusively to the community in keeping with the rule that Cæsarius did not cease to perfect at all times; in the "Recapitulatio" which he finally added (and in his Testament) he insists again on the quasi-complete exemption of the monastery, as though this freedom from all external control or interference seemed to him in dispensable. The nuns on entering made a solemn promise to remain until death; moreover, at his re-

quest, Pope Symmachus invalidated the marriage of any professed nun (Malnory, 264). The convent furniture was of the simplest and no paintings were allowed (a provision afterwards distorted in favour of Iconoclasm). Spinning of wool, the manufacture of their own garments, the care of the monastery, were their chief occupations, apart from prayer and meditation. It is to be noted, however, that the bishop provided for the copying of the Scriptures (inter psalmos et jejunia, vigilias quoque ac lectiones libros divinos pulchre scriptitent virgines Christi) under the direction of Cæsaria. In the course of the sixth century the rule of the nuns was elsewhere in Gaul adapted to monasteries of men, while numerous monasteries of women adopted it outright, e. g. the famous Abbey of the Holy Cross at Poitiers founded by St. Radegundis. Its extension was also favoured by the fact that not a few of his disciples became bishops and abbots, and as such naturally introduced the ideal of rèligious life created by their venerated master. When his end drew near, he made his will (*Testamentum*), with all the formalism of Roman law, in favour of his beloved nuns (P. L., LXVII, 1139–40; Baronius, Ann. Eccl., ad an. 308, no. 25), commending them and their rule to the affection of his successor, and leaving to his sister, Cæsaria, as a special memento, a large cloak she had made for him (mantum majorem quem de cannabe fecit). The genuinity of this curious and valuable document has been called in question, but without sufficient reason. It is accepted by Malnory, and has been re-edited by Dom Morin (Revue Bénédictine, 1896, XVI, 433–43, 486). Cæsarius was a perfect monk in the episcopal chair, and as such his contemporaries revered him (ordine et officio clericus; humilitate, charitate, obedientia, cruce monachus permanet—Vita Cæsarii, I, 5). He was a pious and a peaceful shepherd amid barbarism and war, generous and charitable to a fault, yet a great benefactor of his Church, mindful of the helpless, tactful in dealing with the powerful and rich, in all his life a model of Catholic speech and action.

We may add that he was the first to introduce in his cathedral the Hours of Terce, Sext, and None; he also enriched with hymns the psalmody of every Hour.

MORIN in *Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous, 1891–1908), passim; LEJAY, *St. Césaire d'Arles* in *Revue du Clergé français* (Paris, 1895), IV, 97, 487, and *Revue biblique* (Paris, 1895), IV, 593; MALNORY, *St. Césaire Evêque d'Arles* (Paris, 1894), bibliography; ARNOLD (non-Catholic), *Cæsarius von Arelate und die gallische Kirche seiner Zeit* (Leipzig, 1894). For the long conflict concerning the primacy of Gaul, between the churches of Arles and Vienne, see GUNDLACH, *Der Streit der Bisthümer Arles und Vienne um den Primatus Galliarum* in *Neues Archiv* (1888–90), XIV, 251, XVI, 9, 233; DUCHESNE, *La primatie d'Arles*, in *Mém. de la Soc. des Antiquaires de France* (1891–92), II, 155; SCHMITZ, *Der Vikariat von Arles* in *Hist. Jahrbuch* (1891), XII, 11, 245.

For the general history of the Church of Arles at this period, see DU PORT, *Histoire de l'Eglise d'Arles, tirée des meilleurs auteurs* (Paris, 1690); SAXIUS, *Pontificium Arelatense* (Aix-en-Provence, 1629); TRICHAUD, *Hist. de la sainte église d'Arles* (Nîmes-Paris, 1856); and for the political and social life of the period, FAURIEL, *Hist. de la Gaule méridionale sous les conquérants germains* (Paris, 1856); DAHN, *Könige der Germanen* (Leipzig, 1885).

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Cæsarius of Heisterbach, a pious and learned monk of the Cistercian monastery of Heisterbach near Bonn, b. about 1170 at or near Cologne; d. about 1240 as Prior of Heisterbach. He received his education at the school of St Andrew in Cologne where he had Ensfried, Dean of St. Andrew, as teacher. He also heard at the Cathedral School the lectures of the learned Rudolph, who had previously been professor at the University of Paris. Under these two competent teachers Cæsarius studied the theology of St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and St. Gregory the Great; the philosophy of Boethius, and the literary masterpieces of Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, and Claudian. He was a gifted and diligent scholar and upon the completion of his studies was thoroughly conversant with the writings of the Fathers of the Church and master of a refined and fluent Latin style. Like most German educators of his time, he was a theologian rather than a philosopher and looked with suspicion upon the rationalistic tendencies of scholastic philosophy, as it was taught in many schools of France. Acting on the advice of Gevard, Abbot of Heisterbach, Cæsarius entered that monastery in 1199 and after some time was appointed to the responsible office of master of novices. It was his duty to imbue the candidates with the spirit of austere asceticism which then animated the Cistercian Order, and to instruct them in the necessary knowledge of theology. His fame as teacher soon spread far beyond the walls of his monastery and, yielding to requests from various quarters, Abbot Henry, Gevard's successor, asked Cæsarius to write an abstract of his teachings. This occasioned the famous "Dialogue". In 1228 Cæsarius was made prior of his monastery and thenceforth accompanied the abbot on many official visits in Germany and Friesland.

Cæsarius was one of the most popular writers of the thirteenth century. The numerous manuscripts, still extant, of many of his works show how highly his writings were esteemed and how greedily they were read by his contemporaries. About the year 1238 he wrote the so-called "Epistola Catalogica", a list of thirty-six works which he had published up to that date. By far the best known and most important work, however, of Cæsarius is his "Dialogue of Visions and Miracles" in twelve books (Dialogus magnus visionum atque miraculorum, Libri XII). It struck the fancy of his thirteenth-century readers to such an extent that it became probably the most popular book in Germany at that time. The people of that day of the later Crusades, owing greatly to the many fabulous stories brought from the Orient by returning crusaders, had an irresistible liking for the strange and marvellous. Like a true child of his times, Cæsarius relates in all seriousness the most incredible stories of saints and demons, but scrupulously avoids whatever may endanger the principles of true piety and sane morality. His purpose was not to relate facts of history, but to entertain and edify his readers. He accomplished this purpose most successfully. Though his "Dialogue" is merely a collection of ascetical romances, it has become one of the most important sources for the history of civilization during the thirteenth century. It presents to our view a living panorama of all that the student of the history of civilization cares to know. Popes and emperors, monks and priests, rich and poor, learned and illiterate, good and bad, all sorts and conditions of men, pass before our vision as if we were living among them. More than fifty manuscripts of the "Dialogue" are extant, and seven printed editions are known. The latest, in two volumes, was prepared by Strange (Cologne, 1851); an index to the same (Coblenz, 1857). Another work of Cæsarius identical in historical value with the preceding is his "Eight Books of Miracles" (Volumen diversarum visionum seu miraculorum, Libri VIII). Of this work only a fragment of three books is known; it was carefully edited with valuable critical notes by Meister (Rome, 1901). Though not in the form of a dialogue, it has the same scope as the preceding work. Because, despite diligent researches, no other fragments of the work could be found, Meister suspects that Cæsarius never completed it.

The principal historical work of Cæsarius is the life of the murdered St. Engelbert, Archbishop of Cologne (1204–25), entitled "Actus, passio et miracula domini Engelberti". It is composed of three books, the first of which is devoted to an impartial estimate of the character of the great archbishop; the second narrates with graphic vividness and tender pathos the circumstances of the sad catas-

trophe, while the third book, which was added ten years later (1237), recounts the miracles wrought through the relics of the archbishop after his death. Since the biography was begun immediately after the death of Engelbert, the author did not fully comprehend what fatal effects the murder of the best and most trusted adviser of the young King Henry was to have upon the future history of Germany; but in depicting the character of his hero, and in narrating the particulars of the foul deed, Cæsarius shows himself a master. There is scarcely another biography of the Middle Ages so artistically executed and so thoroughly reliable. It was printed by Surius in the "Acta Sanctorum", 7 November (1st ed. 1574; 2d ed., Cologne, 1617); by Gelenius (Cologne, 1633); finally, with the omission of the third book, by Böhmer in his "Fontes Rerum Germanicarum" (Stuttgart, 1843–68), II, 294–329. A good German translation was brought out by Bethany (Elberfeld, 1898). Cæsarius also wrote a biography (the oldest extant) of St. Elizabeth of Hungary, which, however, has never been printed, with the exception of a few fragments published by Montalembert, in "Sainte Elisabeth" (Paris, 1903), and by Börner, in "Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde" (Hanover, 1888), 503–506. It is merely a recasting of the "Libellus de dictis quatuor ancillarum", which was published by Mencken (Scr. rer. Germ., II, 2007 sqq). Another historical work of Cæsarius is the "Catalogus archiepiscoporum Coloniensium", a list of the Archbishops of Cologne between the years 94–1238, with important biographical data and concise but valuable reflections on the history of the times. Up to the accession of Philip of Heimsberg (1167) it is based on an older chronicle, but the rest is the original work of Cæsarius. It was published by Böhmer, op. cit., II, 271–282, and by Cardauns in "Mon. Germ. Hist: Script.", XXIV, 332–47. When still quite young, Cæsarius began to write sermons, most of which have been collected and published by Coppenstein: "Homiliæ sive fasciculus moralitatum" (Cologne, 1615). These sermons, though inferior in thought and style to the oratorical masterpieces of his great Franciscan contemporary, Berthold of Regensburg, were highly esteemed on account of their practical character and their suitability to the conditions of his hearers.

Kaufmann, *Cæsarius von Heisterbach* (2d ed., Cologne, 1862); Schönbach in *Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, No. 144 (Vienna, 1902); Meister, *Die Fragmente der Libri VIII miraculorum des Cæsarius von Heisterbach* in *13. Supplement-Heft zur Römischen Quartalschrift* (Rome, 1901); Poncelet, *Note sur les Libri VIII miraculorum* in *Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels, 1902); Hauck, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1903), IV, 454 sqq.; Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen* (Stuttgart, 1904); Cardauns in *Allg. d. Biogr.*, s. v. (Leipzig, 1875); Unkel in *Annalen des hist. Vereins für den Niederrhein*, No. 34 (Cologne, 1879), 1–67; Höfer, *ibid.*, No. 65 (Cologne, 1898), 237 sqq.; Kessel in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

Michael Ott.

Cæsarius of Nazianzus, Saint, physician, younger and only brother of Gregory of Nazianzus, b. probably c. 330 at Arianzus, near Nazianzus; d. at the end of 368 or the beginning of 369. He received a careful training from his saintly mother Nonna and his father Gregory, Bishop of Nazianzus. He studied probably at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and then at the celebrated schools of Alexandria. Here his favourite studies were geometry, astronomy, and especially medicine. In the last-named science he surpassed all his fellow-students. About 355 he came to Constantinople, and had already acquired a great reputation for his medical skill, when his brother Gregory, homeward bound from Athens, appeared there about 358. Cæsarius sacrificed a remunerative and honourable post and returned to his parents with Gregory. The capital, however, soon proved to be too great an attraction for him; we find him occupying an exalted position as physician at the court of Constantius and, much to the regret of his family, at that of Julian the Apostate. Julian failed in his efforts to win him over to Paganism. Cæsarius, more appreciative of his faith than of imperial favour, ultimately left the court, but returned to Constantinople after Julian's death. Under the Emperor Valens he became quæstor of Bithynia. His remarkable escape from the earthquake which shook Nicæa (11 October, 368) induced him to heed the insistent appeals of his brother and St. Basil, who urged him to leave the world. He was suddenly seized with a fatal illness, shortly after having received baptism, which he, like many others at the period, had deferred until late in life. He was unmarried, and directed that all his goods should be distributed to the poor, an injunction which his servants abused in their own interests. His remains were interred at Nazianzus, where his brother pronounced the funeral oration in the presence of his parents.

The admission of the identity of this Cæsarius with his namesake, the Prefect of Constantinople, who, in 365, was thrown into prison by Procopius, rests on an assumption of James Godefroy, the editor of the Theodosian Code (Lyons, 1665), and not on any solid historical ground. The four "Dialogues" of one hundred and ninety-seven questions and answers which go under his name, and are to be found in Migne, P. G., XXXVIII, 851–1190, can hardly be from his pen, owing to their nature, contents, and anachronisms. To-day they are generally looked upon as spurious.

Greg. Naz. in *P. G.*, XXXV, 751–88; Birks and Cazenove in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; Bardenhewer, *Patrologie* (Freiburg, 1901), 257; Verschaffel in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1905), II, 2185–86.

N. A. Weber.

Cæsarius of Prüm, Abbot of the Benedictine monastery, near Trier, afterwards a Cistercian monk at Heisterbach near Bonn, born of the noble family of Milendonk, and lived in the latter half of the twelfth and in the first half of the thirteenth century. At the beginning of the thirteenth century he entered the monastery of Prüm, where in 1212 he was elected abbot, to succeed Gerard of Vianden. Prüm was then one of the richest monasteries in Europe, with large estates scattered over Germany, France, and the Netherlands. Many of the monks were noblemen who had entered the monastery in order to live a life of comfort. Their example began to undermine the monastic simplicity and discipline, without which no monastery can prosper for any length of time. After ruling five years Cæsarius, probably because he desired to lead a more perfect life than he could as abbot of a rich and undisciplined monastery, resigned his abbatial dignity and became a humble monk at the flourishing Cistercian monastery of Heisterbach. Upon the request of Abbot Kuno of Prüm he wrote, in 1222, a commentary on the "Registrum Bonorum" or "Register of the Estates of Prüm", which had been drawn up by an unknown monk in 893. This commentary has become an important source for the history of law and civilization during the thirteenth century. The "Register", together with the commentary of Cæsarius, was published by Leibniz in his "Collectanea Etymologica" (Hanover, 1717), II, 409 sqq., and by Hontheim in his "Historia Trevirensis" (Augsburg, 1750), I, 661 sqq. The latest and best edition, made from the original manuscript of Cæsarius, which is preserved in the royal archives at Berlin, was brought out by Heinrich Beyer in "Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der mittelrheinischen Territorien" (Coblenz, 1860), I, 142–201. Schönbach in "Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften" (Vienna, 1902) after careful researches ascribes to Cæsarius of Milendonk the important historical work "De Abbatibus Prumi-

ensibus", which heretofore was believed to have been written by Cæsarius of Heisterbach.

ZIEGELBAUER, *Hist. Litt. O.S.B.* (Augsburg and Würzburg, 1754), III, 170; LAMPRECHT, *Deutsches Wirtschaftsleben im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1886), II, 60.

MICHAEL OTT.

Cæsar of Speyer (or SPIRES), Friar Minor, first minister provincial of the order in Germany, and leader of the Cæsarines, b. towards the close of the twelfth century; d. in 1239. He became renowned as a preacher, and the number of Albigenses who abandoned their errors as the result of his zealous efforts so enraged the heretics against him that he was obliged to leave his native city. In 1212 he went to Paris, where he studied theology under Conrad of Speyer, the famous crusade-preacher. While in the Holy Land in 1217, Cæsar of Speyer was received into the Franciscan Order by Brother Elias of Cortona, the first provincial of Syria; early in 1221 he returned to Italy with St. Francis and Peter of Catania. It is interesting to note that the Rule of 1223 was probably written by Cæsar of Speyer at the dictation of St. Francis, and it is very likely that St. Francis refers to him in the words of his "Testament": "et ego paucis verbis et simplicibus feci scribi et Dominus Papa confirmavit mihi." At the chapter of Pentecost held at Assisi in 1221, Cæsar, together with twenty-five companions, was chosen to go to Germany, and after three months' preparation in the valley of Spoleto, the missionaries set out on their journey northward. They were welcomed by both clergy and people at Trent, Brixen, and other cities, and in October of the same year the first provincial chapter of the order in Germany was convoked by Cæsar at Strasburg. The famous Tatar missionary, John of Piancarpino, and the chronicler, Jordan of Giano, were both present at this chapter; on its conclusion the friars dispersed throughout the different provinces of Germany, according to Cæsar's instructions, to meet again the following year.

In 1223 Cæsar, accompanied by Thomas of Celano, returned to Assisi to be present at the general chapter of Pentecost, and at his own request was relieved of the office of provincial minister by St. Francis. Of the remaining fifteen years of Cæsar's life little is known. He was probably in Italy, with Bernard of Quintavalle, Blessed Giles, and the other companions of St. Francis, encouraging the friars by word and work to remain faithful to their rule and life, and warning them against the innovations of the *Relaxati*. Jordan of Giano says of Cæsar of Speyer at this time: "He was a man wholly given to contemplation, most zealous for evangelical poverty and so commended by the other friars that he was esteemed the most saintly after St. Francis." Owing to his opposition towards the *Relaxati* Cæsar was imprisoned by order of the minister general, Brother Elias; he finally met a violent death at the hands of the lay brother who had been appointed to guard him. There seems, however, no warrant for the opinion expressed by some that he was murdered by order of Elias, and the slight colouring which Angelo Clareno and Ubertino of Casale give to their accounts of his tragic end is due to the bias and bitterness against Elias's party which characterize all the writings of the Spirituals.

WADDING, *Ann. Min.*, I, an. 1220, xxxiii; II, an. 1221, ix passim; *Analecta Franciscana* (Quaracchi, 1885), I, 1–19; EHRLE, *Archiv f. Litt. u. Kirchengesch. des M. A.* (Berlin, 1886), II, 353, 416; III, 409, 552; GOLUBOVITCH, *Bibl. Biobibliogr. della Terra Santa* (Quaracchi, 1906), I, 15, 37, 38, 40, 99, 100, 109, 117–19; ROBINSON, *A Short Introduction to Franciscan Literature* (New York, 1907), 9, 16–18

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Cæsaropolis, a titular see of Macedonia, the early name and the site of which have not yet been identified. It is mentioned in Gelzer's "Nova Tactica" (1717) and in Parthey's "Notitiæ episcopatuum", III (c. 1170–1179) and X (twelfth or thirteenth century) as a suffragan of Philippi in Macedonia. Lequien (II, 65) speaks of the see, but mentions no bishop. Manuscript notes give the names of two titulars, Meletius, who was alive in April, 1329, and Gabriel, in November, 1378. S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cagliari, ARCHDIOCESE OF (CALARITANA).—Cagliari, called by the ancients *Caralis* or *Calaris*, is the principal city and capital of the Island of Sardinia, and an important port on the Gulf of Cagliari. It was founded by the Carthaginians, and after the War of the Mercenaries fell into the hands of the Romans, but in the fifth century A. D. was seized by the Vandals, and in the eighth, like the whole of Sardinia, became subject to the Saracens. In 1022 the Saracens were expelled with the help of the Pisans, and from that time Cagliari was governed by a "Judge". In 1324 Jaime of Aragon captured Cagliari and with it the rest of the island, which remained under Spanish domination until 1714, when for a short time it acknowledged the authority of Emperor Charles VI; in 1717 it was placed under the Duke of Savoy, thenceforth known as the King of Sardinia. According to a legend, evidently false, the Gospel was preached in Cagliari by Bonifatius, a disciple of Christ. Historians give a long list of bishops of Cagliari, said to have suffered for the Faith during the persecutions, and St. Athanasius in his second letter to Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, speaks of his predecessors as martyrs. It is certain that St. Juvenal, during the reign of Diocletian, escaped death by flight. Quintasius, who attended the Council of Arles (314), is possibly identical with the Bishop of Cagliari, present at the Council of Sardica (343). The best known of the early bishops is Lucifer (354–71), the champion of orthodoxy against Arianism and friend of St. Athanasius. One of his contemporaries praises his unworldliness, his constancy in the Faith, and his knowledge of sacred literature. Towards the end of his life, however, he became the author of a schism, which persisted after his death. For this reason, considerable controversy arose in the seventeenth century as to the veneration of Lucifer. In 1615, the foundations of his church were discovered outside of the city, not far from the church of St. Saturninus, and in 1633 his relics were found in a marble urn, with two inscriptions. During the persecution of the Vandals, Sardinia, more especially Cagliari, offered a refuge to many Catholic bishops from North Africa, among them Sts. Eugenius and Fulgentius, who found there the freedom of worship denied them in their own country. Primasius was an important contemporary of these saints. St. Gregory the Great mentions in his correspondence two bishops of Cagliari, Thomas and Januarius. Deusdedit came twice to Rome during the reigns of Honorius I and Martin I. Citonatus assisted at the Second Council of Constantinople (681), was accused of treason, and proved his innocence. The acts of that council exhibit Cagliari at this early date as a metropolitan see. In 787, Bishop Thomas sent as representative to the Second Council of Nicæa the deacon Epiphanius. In 1075, Gregory VII reproached (Epp., VIII, x) the Bishop of Cagliari for wearing a beard, a fashion which had been introduced into Sardinia at an earlier date; the pope asked the "Judge" of Cagliari to oblige the clergy to abandon this custom. The same bishop and his colleagues were blamed by Victor III (1087) for neglect of their churches. Under this pope, the Archbishop of Cagliari became known as the Primate of Sardinia. Archbishop Peter restored many churches, among them that of the martyr St. Antiochus. In 1158, the title of Primate of Sardinia and Corsica was given to the Archbishop of Pisa, but in 1409 it was reassumed by the Archbishop of Cagliari, whence arose a controversy between those sees, which has not yet been settled. Other famous bishops of Cagliari were: Ilde-

fonso Lasso Sedeno (1597), commissioned by Clement VIII to reform the convents of Sardinia; Francesco Esquivel (1605), founder of the seminary; Ambrogio Machini, General of the Mercedarians, historian of Cagliari and advocate of the canonization of Lucifer. In time several other sees were united to Cagliari: Doglia (the ancient *Bona Dola*), incorporated with Cagliari by Julius II; Forum Trajani, which in the fifth century had its own bishop, and is believed to be the present Tortoli; Fasiana (Phausania), mentioned by St. Gregory the Great; Suello (Susaleo), which in the ninth century had its own bishop, and was united to Cagliari by Martin V (1427). The cathedral was built by the Pisans, but has undergone many restorations in the barocco style. The archdiocese has 143,000 inhabitants, 81 parishes, 118 churches and chapels, 162 secular, and 38 regular priests, and contains 7 religious communities of men and 2 of women. The suffragans are Galtelli-Nuoro, Iglesias, Ogliastra.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XIII; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907).

U. BENIGNI.

Cagli e Pergola, DIOCESE OF (CALLIENSIS ET PERGULENSIS), situated in Umbria (Italy), in the Province of Pesaro, suffragan of Urbino. Cagli is the old Roman colony of *Callium*. The first known bishop was Gratianus who, in 359, assisted at the Council of Rimini; in 500 we meet the name of Viticanus, present at the council of Rome, held on account of Pope Symmachus; in 751 Anastasius attended the Council of Rome held against the Iconoclasts. In 1045 Bishop Luitulphus resigned his see and devoted himself entirely to works of piety. St. Ranieri, a Benedictine, governed Cagli from 1156 to 1175, and was then transferred to Spalato (Dalmatia), where he was killed by some Slavs (1180) for having claimed for the church lands occupied unjustly by them. Bishop Egidio (1243–59) had many controversies with the municipality of Gubbio. Under his successor the Ghibellines revolted against the papal power. After the death of Bishop Jacopo (1276), the Ghibelline canons wished to elect a noble, Berardo Berardi, while the Guelphs elected Rinaldo Sicardi, Abbot of San Pietro di Massa. As a result the see remained vacant for some years. Finally Berardo was made bishop of Osimo, and Sicardi died, whereupon a certain Guglielmo was elected bishop (1285). Civil discords, however, did not cease, and after a terrible massacre, Cagli was burned by its own citizens. It was afterwards rebuilt on the plain of St. Angelo, and Nicholas IV named it St. Angelo of the Pope (*S. Angelo papale*). Later on, however, the original name of Cagli was substituted. In 1297 the first stone of the cathedral was laid by Archbishop Liturdo Cervati, and in 1398 Niccolò Marciari brought the building to completion. In 1503 the partisans of Cæsar Borgia killed the Franciscan bishop Gasparo Golfi. His successor, a Spanish Dominican, Ludovico di Lagoria, was nearly killed by the people. Giovanni Taleoni (1565) introduced the Tridentine reforms; Filippo Bigli (1610) restored the episcopal palace and governed with great wisdom; Bishop Bertozzi (1754) built the seminary. Mention should also be made of the pious and zealous Alfonso Cingari (1807–17). In 1817 Pergola which had been in the Diocese of Urbino was raised to the rank of an episcopal city and united to the See of Cagli. The diocese contains 30,000 Catholics, with 51 parishes, 102 churches and chapels, 102 secular, and 8 regular priests. It has 9 religious houses, among them the celebrated Camaldolese Abbey of Fonte Avellana. At an earlier period the Benedictine monasteries of San Geronzio, founded about 700, and San Pietro della Massa, founded in 850, were very famous.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844); *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 351–52.

U. BENIGNI.

Cahier, CHARLES, antiquarian, b. at Paris, 26 Feb., 1807; d. there 26 Feb., 1882. He made his preparatory studies at the College of Saint-Acheul, and entered the Society of Jesus 7 Sept., 1824. For some years he taught successively in its colleges at Paris, Brieg in the Swiss Canton of Wallis, at Turin, and at Brugelette in Belgium. The greater part of his life, however, was devoted to the collection, classification, and interpretation of the countless treasures of medieval art surviving in France, Belgium, Germany, and elsewhere in Europe. They interested him not only as relics of its artistic skill, but chiefly as evidences of its Catholic faith. As early as 1840 he began his collaboration with his Jesuit confrère, Father Arthur Martin, an excellent draughtsman, and chief collector of the mass of artistic material that Father Cahier classified and interpreted in the light of Catholic faith and theology. Their first important work was a folio on the thirteenth-century stained glass of the cathedral of Bourges, "Monographie de la cathédrale de Bourges, première partie. Vitraux du XIII^{e} siècle" (Paris, 1841–44); the substance of it is in Migne (Guinebaut), "Dict. d'Iconographie" (Paris, 1858), 921–38. Their most characteristic work is found in the valuable "Mélanges d'archéologie, d'histoire, et de littérature" etc. (Paris, 1848–56), four quarto volumes of illustrated dissertations on gold and silver church-plate, enamelled ware, carved ivories, tapestries, bas-reliefs, and paintings belonging to the Carlovingian and Romanesque periods (ninth to twelfth century). This important contribution to the history of medieval art was followed later by four more volumes: "Nouveaux mélanges d'archéologie, d'histoire, et de littérature sur le moyen-âge" etc. (Paris, 1874–77), in the first volume of which is to be found a memoir of Father Martin by his collaborator. In the meantime Father Cahier had published a monograph in two folio volumes on the saints as grasped by the popular imagination, "Caractéristiques des saints dans l'art populaire" (Paris, 1867). In spite of his numerous digressions and parentheses, says Father Brucker (Vacant, II, 1304), and a somewhat neglected style, Father Cahier is never wearisome; a vein of kindly but caustic humour runs through his pages, in which abound pungent words and phrases, dictated, however, by candour and the love of truth. He was deeply versed in all kinds of curious medieval lore, and particularly in the "people's calendar" or every-day usages and customs connected with the liturgical life of the Church. Specimens of his uncommon erudition in this respect may be seen in his studies on Christmas and on Epiphany in "Ami de la religion" (Paris, 1848-1849), and in his "Calendrier populaire du temps passé" in "Revue de l'art chrétien" (Paris, 1878).

For his life and writings see *Polybiblion* (Paris, 1882), I, 264–65; DE BACKER AND SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, I, 264–65; DANIEL, *Etudes religieuses* (Paris, 1868), 353–77, 729–50.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Cahill, DANIEL WILLIAM, lecturer and controversialist, born at Ashfield, Queen's County, Ireland, 28 November, 1796; died at Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A., 28 October, 1864. The third son of Daniel Cahill, a civil engineer, he was sent to Carlow College, and in 1816 entered Maynooth, where he became proficient in natural philosophy and languages. He was ordained a priest after he had passed through the Dunboyne establishment, and in 1825 was appointed professor of natural philosophy at Carlow College where he taught for some years. He then opened a school at Seapoint, Williamstown, which he conducted from 1835 to 1841. Meanwhile he wrote largely for the press, and for a time edited the Dublin "Telegraph". He became a distinguished preacher and lecturer, and his vigorous attacks on the Government and the Established Church of Ireland extended his reputation in all directions. In

December, 1859, he visited the United States and lectured on astronomy and other scientific subjects, and preached in many American and Canadian cities. As he generally gave his services for religious and charitable purposes, large sums of money were raised by him for Catholic objects. He was of commanding presence, being six feet five inches in height, and extremely handsome. He was buried in Boston, but his body was exhumed in 1885 and taken to Ireland, where it was buried in Glasnevin Cemetery, Dublin. His writings consist chiefly of lectures and addresses, with some letters to prominent Protestants. The most important of them were collected and published in Dublin in 1886 under the title "Life, Letters, and Lectures of Rev. Dr. Cahill".

The Lamp (London, 7 June, 1851); COMERFORD, *Collections* (1883), 198–200; BOASE, *Modern English Biography*, I; ALLIBONE, *Dictionary* (Supp. vol. I).

D. J. O'DONOGHUE.

Cahill, J. B. See PORTSMOUTH, DIOCESE OF.

Cahors, DIOCESE OF (CADURCENSIS), comprising the entire department of Lot, in France. In the beginning it was a suffragan of Bourges and later, from 1676 to the time of the Revolution, of Albi. From 1802 to 1822 Cahors was under the Archbishop of Toulouse, and combined the former Diocese of Rodez with a great part of the former Dioceses of Vabres and Montauban. However, in 1822 it was restored almost to its pristine limits and again made suffragan to Albi. According to a tradition connected with the legend of St. Martial (see LIMOGES), this saint, deputed by St. Peter, came to Cahors in the first century and there dedicated a church to St. Stephen, while his disciple, St. Amadour (Amator), the Zaccheus of the Gospel and husband of St. Veronica (see BORDEAUX), evangelized the diocese. In the seventeenth century these traditions were closely examined by the Abbé de Fouillac, a friend of Fénelon, and, according to him, the bones discovered at Rocamadour in 1166, and looked upon as the relics of Zaccheus, were in reality the bones of St. Amator, Bishop of Auxerre. A legend written about the year 1000 by the monks of Saint-Genou (in the Diocese of Bourges) relates that Genitus and his son Genulfus were sent to Gaul by Pope Sixtus II (257–59), and that Genulfus (Genou) was the first Bishop of Cahors. But Abbé Duchesne repudiates this tardy legend. The first historically known Bishop of Cahors is St. Florentius, correspondent of St. Paulinus of Nola (end of the fourth century). The Diocese of Cahors counted among its bishops: St. Alithus (fifth century); St. Maurilio and St. Ursicinus (sixth century); St. Rusticus, who was assassinated, his brother, St. Desiderius (Didier), the steward of King Dagobert, and St. Capuanus (seventh century); St. Ambrosius (eighth century); St. Gausbert (end of tenth century); Guillaume de Cavaillon (1208–34), who took part in the Albigensian crusade; Hugues Géraud (1312–16), implicated in the conspiracy against John XXII and sentenced to be burned alive; Bertrand de Cardaillac (1324–64) and Bégon de Castelnau (1366–87), both of whom contributed so powerfully to free Quercy from English rule; Alessandro Farnese (1554–57), nephew of Pope Paul III; the Venerable Alain de Solminihac (1636–59), one of the most active reformers of the clergy in the seventeenth century, and Louis-Antoine de Noailles (1679–80), subsequently Archbishop of Paris. The city of Cahors, visited by Pope Callistus II (1119–24), was the birthplace of Jacques d'Euse (1244–1334), who became pope in 1316 under the title of John XXII, and the tower of whose palace is still to be seen in Cahors. He built a university there, its law faculty being so celebrated as to boast at times of 1200 pupils. Fénelon studied at this institution, which, in 1751, was annexed to the University of Toulouse. In the sixteenth century the Diocese of Cahors was severely tried by religious wars, and the Pélegry College, which gratuitously sheltered a certain number of university students, became noted for the admirable way in which these young men defended Cahors against the Huguenots. The cathedral of Cahors, built at the end of the eleventh and restored in the fourteenth century, has a beautiful Gothic cloister. When, in the Middle Ages, the bishops officiated in this church they had the privilege, as barons and counts of Cahors, of depositing their sword and armour on the altar. In the diocese special homage is paid to St. Sacerdos, Bishop of Limoges, and his mother, Mundana (seventh century); Esperie (Speria), virgin and martyr (eighth century); St. Géraud, Count of Aurillac (beginning of the eleventh century); Blessed Christopher, companion of St. Francis of Assisi and founder of a Franciscan convent at Cahors in 1216, and Blessed Jean-Gabriel Perboyre, born in the village of Mongesty, 1802, and martyred in China, 1840. The city of Figeac owed its origin to a Benedictine abbey founded by Pepin in 755. The principal places of pilgrimage are: Notre-Dame de Rocamadour, visited by St. Louis (1245), Charles the Fair (1324), and Louis XI (1463), its bell being said to have rung miraculously several times to announce the deliverance of shipwrecked sufferers who had commended themselves to the Blessed Virgin; Notre-Dame de Félines and Notre-Dame de Verdale, both dating back to the eleventh century; Saint-Hilaire Lalbenque, where some highly-prized relics of St. Benedict Joseph Labre are preserved.

Prior to the enforcement of the Law of 1901 there were both Capuchins and Lazarists in the Diocese of Cahors. The schools are in charge of four important local orders of nuns: the Daughters of Jesus, numbering 800 (founded in 1820, with mother-house at Vaylats); the Sisters of Mercy, having a membership of 200 (founded in 1814, with mother-house at Monteng); the Sisters of Our Lady of Calvary, 1000 in number (founded in 1833, with mother-house at Gramat); and the Sisters of Saint-Joseph, numbering 150 (mother-house at Sainte-Colombe). A society composed of 8 diocesan missionaries is stationed at Rocamadour. The "Revue Catholique des Eglises" has recently begun an investigation of all the dioceses of France, and, although little has yet been done, this investigation has been completed in the Diocese of Cahors, and shows that, out of 85,000 men and 90,000 women, 60,000 men and over 80,000 women make their Easter duty; and here we would incidentally remark that, despite this favourable condition, the deputies and senators elected by the department vote for all anti-religious laws. In 1900 the Diocese of Cahors had the following religious institutions: 16 infant schools, 1 boys' orphanage, 6 girls' orphanages, 4 industrial schools, 1 house of shelter, 10 hospitals and asylums, 1 insane asylum, and 12 houses for religious nurses. In 1905 (at the close of the period under the Concordat) the population was 226,720, with 33 pastorates, 448 succursal parishes (mission churches), and 55 curacies supported by the State.

Gallia christiana (nova) (1751), I, 115–58, 1327; *Instrumenta*, 28–49, 203; PERIE, *Histoire politique, religieuse et littéraire du Quercy* (Cahors, 1861); GUILHOU, *Les évêques de Cahors* (Cahors, 1865); LACARRIÈRE, *Histoire des évêques de Cahors, des saints, des monastères et des principaux événements du Quercy* (Cahors, 1876); LONGNON, *Pouillé du diocèse de Cahors* (Paris, 1874); DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, II, 44–47, 126–28; CALVET in *Revue catholique des églises*, 25 Feb., 1905; CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibl.*, 543–44.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Caiazzo, DIOCESE OF (CAIACENSIS), situated in the province of Caserta, Italy, amid the mountains of Tifati near the river Volturno. During the Roman period it was known as *Calatia*, and was important, especially during the wars of the Samnites and of Han-

nibal. According to legend, Christianity was introduced by St. Priscus, first Bishop of Capua, of which see Caiazzo is suffragan. The first known bishop of Caiazzo was Arigisus, the exact time of whose episcopate is uncertain; however, as the name indicates, it could not have been before the beginning of the seventh century, when the Lombards settled in that region. Other bishops known to history were: Stefano, who had been Abbot of S. Salvatore in Capua (d. 1025), and his successor Ferdinando; Jacopo (d. 1253), exiled by Frederick II for his fidelity to the Holy See; Giuliano Frangipane, a man of great wisdom, elected in 1472; Vincio Maffa, elected in 1507, theologian at the Lateran Council (1512); Fabio Mirto, elected in 1537, who took part in the Council of Trent, and was Apostolic nuncio to Paris at the time of his death (1587); Ottavio Mirto Frangipane, elected in 1572; Orazio Acquaviva, who was captured by the Turks at the battle of Lepanto, and who on regaining his freedom became a Cistercian (1590); Sigismondo Taddeo, elected in 1641, distinguished for his learning. The Diocese of Caiazzo contains a population of 25,000, with 72 churches and chapels, 35 secular priests, and 3 religious institutes.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844); *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 353.

U. BENIGNI.

Caillau, ARMAND-BENJAMIN, priest and writer, b. at Paris, 22 Oct., 1794, d. there, 1850. Ordained in 1818, successively a member of the Missions de France, rector of Sainte-Geneviève, and chaplain of the Infirmerie Marie-Thérèse, he joined, in 1834, the Fathers of Mercy, newly re-organized by Father Rauzan. His love of missionary life made him decline episcopal honours and a chair at the Sorbonne, but was no obstacle to his literary pursuits. Besides many contributions to the "Bibliographie Catholique", Caillau wrote "Instructions sur l'oraison mentale" (Paris, 1833), a French translation of Tertullian's "De Spectaculis" (Paris, 1835), several monographs on Our Lady's Sanctuaries: "Roc-Amadour" (1834), "Loretto" (1843), "N. D. de Puy" (1846), "Litanies du St. Nom de Jésus" (Paris, 1845), "Les nouveaux illuminés" (Michel Vintras) (Orléans, 1849), etc. He is best known, however, by the following works: "Thesaurus Patrum" (Paris, 1823–5), a patristic digest modelled on Merz's "Thesaurus biblicus", with an introduction to patrology; "Collectio selecta Patrum" (Paris, 1829–1842), 133 octavo volumes, undertaken in collaboration with Mgr. Guillon and suspended at the announcement of Migne's "Patrology". The insertion of new sermons under the name of St. Augustine (P. L., XLVII) brought about a controversy between the two editors. "Histoire de la Vie des Saints" (Paris, 1835–1840), four octavo volumes; and also (Paris, 1863) five octavo volumes, written in collaboration with Abbé Juste; "S. Gregorii Nazianzeni opera" (Paris, 1842), two folio volumes (also P. G., XXVII and XXVIII), a splendid edition, partly from the manuscript notes of D. Clémencet, reviewed by Villemain in the "Journal des Savants" (1845 and 1847); "Rhetorica Patrum" (Paris, 1838), three volumes, never completed. A similar project of a "Bibliotheca Mariana" resulted only in the publication of a few opuscula of St. Ephrem, St. Bonaventure, Idiota (Jordan), and the Marial monographs noticed above. Caillau also re-edited Merz's "Thesaurus biblicus" (1822); "L'Année sainte" (1826); vols. III and IV of D. Ceillier's "Histoire des auteurs sacrés" (1838–9); and "Lettres de Scheffmacher" (1839).

DELAPORTE, *Vie du P. Rauzan* (Paris, 1857); *Bibliographie catholique*, X; MANGENOT in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v. See also index of CEILLIER, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés* (Paris, 1868).

J. F. SOLLIER.

Cain, the first-born of Adam and Eve. His name is derived, according to Gen., iv, 1, from the root *kanah*, to possess, being given to him in consequence of the words of his mother at his birth: "I have possessed a man by the favour of the Lord". No very serious objection can be urged against this derivation. The Book of Genesis, interested in this section in the origin of the different occupations of men, tells us that Cain became a husbandman while his brother Abel tended flocks. They both offered to the Lord a sacrifice, acknowledging, in a manner analogous to that later prescribed in the law, the sovereign power of the Creator. Cain offered of the fruits of the earth; Abel of the "firstlings of his flock and of their fat". By some means not indicated in the sacred text, perhaps, as has been thought, by some such sign as the fire which consumed the offering of Gedeon (Judges, vi, 21) or that of Elias (III Kings, xviii, 38), God manifested to the brothers that Abel and his sacrifice were acceptable to Him; that, on the contrary, He rejected Cain and his offering. We are not told the reason of this preference. Among the conjectures on the subject one that has found most favour among commentators is that which is incorporated in the Septuagint version of the words of God to Cain in verse vii: "If thou didst offer well but divide badly, hast thou not committed sin?" This implies that Cain committed the fault of presenting to God imperfect gifts, reserving to himself the better part of the produce of the land. However, St. Augustine, who was under the influence of the Septuagint, understood the division in another way. Cain, he tells us, gave God a part of his goods, but he did not give Him his heart (De Civitate Dei, XV, vii). This is in keeping with the cause more generally assigned for God's preference. The sequel of the story shows us the evil disposition of Cain's heart. St. John says that Cain slew Abel because his works were evil, while those of his brother were just (I John, iii, 12), and we read in Hebrews that "by faith Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain " (Heb., xi, 4).

Cain is angered by the Divine rejection. In verses 6 and 7 of chapter iv of Gen. we have God's rebuke and warning: "Why art thou wroth, and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou dost well, is not thy countenance raised up? If thou dost not well, sin crouches at the door. Its desire is toward thee, but thou rule over it." Sin is here represented under the figure of a wild beast crouching at the door of the heart ready to pounce upon its victim. Cain is able to resist temptation. But he does not, and the Bible story goes on to relate the terrible crime born of his anger and jealousy. He slays Abel. Questioned by the Lord as to the whereabouts of his brother, he answers defiantly that he knows not. To avenge the blood of Abel God pronounces a curse against the first homicide. The Hebrew text of the curse may be translated either: "Cursed be thou by the earth which has opened its mouth and drunk the blood of thy brother" etc., or "Cursed be thou from the earth" etc. The former translation refers the sentence to the words which follow: "When thou shalt till it, it shall not give thee its strength" i. e. its produce; the latter, to the banishment related afterwards. This banishment from the country where his parents lived and where, as we learn from such passages as the present one, God continued to manifest His presence in some special way, is spoken of as "going out from before the face of Jehovah" (verse 16). The country of Cain's banishment, where he was to lead a wandering, vagrant life, is called, in the Hebrew, the land of Nod, and is said to be east of Eden. As we do not know where Eden was, the location of Nod cannot be determined. The punishment seemed to Cain greater than he could bear; in answer to his words expressing fear that he might be killed, God gave him a promise of special protection for his life, and put upon him a sign. No indication as regards the nature of this sign is given us. The only event of the subsequent life of Cain

spoken of in the Bible is the founding of a city, called Henoch after a son of that name. A good many authors find that this tradition, which makes of Cain the first city builder, is not compatible with the story just related, which they say is best understood as a popular account of the origin of the wandering desert tribes. If we do not put into the history of the author of Genesis elements of which he seems to have been altogether unconscious, there is no reason to suppose he was wrong in regarding the words of the curse as consistent with the "building" of a city by Cain. Conservative commentators are probably right in their judgment that this "city" of Cain was not of notable extent or importance.

W. S. Reilly.

Cainites, a name used for (1) the descendants of Cain, (2) a sect of Gnostics and Antinomians.

(1) *The Descendants of Cain.*—The Bible (Gen., iv, 17–22) mentions nine of Cain's descendants in the direct line: Henoch, Irad, Maviael, Mathusael, and Lamech, who had four children: Jabel and Jubal by his wife Ada, and Tubalcain with his sister Noemi by his second wife Sella. The etymology of several of these names is obscure because it is uncertain whether they are Hebrew, Babylonian, or Sumerian. The derivation of Mathusael, however, is obvious, *mutu-sha-ilu* being the Babylonian for "vassal of God". Maviael, if the Septuagint reading is right, would mean "God is my life-giver"; but according to the Hebrew text Mehujael (מחויאל) would mean "wiped out by God". Most likely, however, the word is Babylonian and connected with *amel ilu*, "man of God". Lamech is perhaps connected with *lamga*, the Sumerian for "servant" (of God). Cain "built a city and called the name thereof by the name of his son Henoch". To some scholars this has suggested "dedication" as the Hebrew derivation of Henoch; but others see in it the name of the famous Sumerian city, Unug (later Uruk, Erech, Warka). For Irad no satisfactory etymology has been found; it means, perhaps, "scion" from *arada*, "to sprout". It is remarkable that amongst the Sethites four names occur similar to those of Cainites: Cainan, Mahalael, Jared, and Mathusala, and two, Henoch and Lamech, are identical in both pedigrees. Ada probably means "dawn", Sella, "shade", Jabel, "shepherd", Jubal, "musician". Noemi means "beautiful". The Septuagint omits Cain after Jubal, thereby suggesting connection with a tribe of Asia Minor (Gen., x, 2, Ez., xxvii, 13) called Tabalu by Assyrians and Τυβαρῆνοι by Herodotus. But the Massoretic *Tubalcain* (תובל קין) is certainly correct if it be connected with *Balgin*, the Sumerian Vulcan, as recently suggested. If we substitute English equivalents for proper names, Gen., iv, 19–22 would read: "God's servant took two wives, the name of the one was Dawn and the name of the other Shade. And Dawn brought forth Shepherd, the father of dwellers in tents and herdsmen and his brother's name was Musician, the father of harp- and pipe-players. But Shade brought forth Blacksmith, the forger of brass and iron, and Blacksmith's sister's name was Beautiful." This has led some to believe that the inspired narrative merely records under a figure of speech the introduction of polygamy and the spread of civilization.

A similar description existed amongst Phœnicians. As the most recent research has shown that iron was used in Egypt 3500 B.C., no argument for lateness of narrative can be drawn from the mention of iron. As for the six lines of Hebrew poetry (verses 23–24) put into the mouth of Lamech, though their origin and occasion will probably remain forever obscure, their general meaning is clear: Cain had committed deliberate murder, fratricide, yet he was not handed over to the lawless private vengeance of man. How much less was Lamech, who had only committed manslaughter in self-defence, i. e. slain a man for wounding him, or, in Hebrew parallelism, for bruising him. In Num., xxiv, 22, Jud., iv, 11, I Par., ii, 55, Cinites are mentioned as neighbours to Israel. The Hebrew consonants would allow the reading Cainites, which some scholars have adopted against the Massora and Septuagint; but this is at present mere conjecture.

(2) *A Gnostic Sect* of the second century was called Cainites, or Caianites. They regarded all characters held up to reprobation in the Old Testament as worthy of veneration, as having suffered at the hands of the cruel God of the Jews; hence Cain, as the first man cursed by Hystera, the Demiurg, claimed their special admiration. This sect of Antinomians never found many adherents, and Hippolytus at the beginning of the third century dismisses them with the bare mention of their name. (See Gnosticism.)

Driver, *Genesis* (London, 1906), 70–74; Haupt, *Polychrome Bible: Genesis*, notes on Hebrew text *in loco;* Bareille in *Dict. de théol. catholique* (Paris, 1904), s. v.

J. P. Arendzen.

Caiphas (Caiaphas), Joseph, according to Josephus (Antiquitates, XVIII, iv, 3) was appointed High-Priest of the Jews by the Roman procurator Valerius Gratus, the predecessor of Pontius Pilate, about A. D. 18 (Ant., XVIII, ii, 2), and removed from that office by the procurator Vitellius, shortly after he took charge of affairs in Palestine, A. D. 36 (Ant., XVIII, iv, 3). During this period the famous Annas, father-in-law of Caiphas (John, xviii, 13), who had been high-priest from A. D. 6 to 15, continued to exercise a controlling influence over Jewish affairs, as he did when his own sons held the position. This explains the rather puzzling expression of Luke, iii, 2, ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα (under the high-priest Annas and Caiphas; cf. Acts, iv, 6). Caiphas was certainly the only official high-priest at the time St. Luke refers to, at the beginning of the public life of Christ; but Annas still had his former title and a good deal of his former authority. The rôle assigned him in the trial of Christ, in John, xviii, points to the same continued influence. In the measures taken by the Jewish authorities to do away with Jesus, Caiphas certainly had the most discreditable part. After the raising of Lazarus, the priests and Pharisees held counsel to determine what was to be done in view of the manifest signs of the Prophet of Nazareth and what they were pleased to consider the danger resulting to the country. The words of Caiphas, the high-priest of that year, are reported by St. John: "You know nothing. Neither do you consider that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not" (xi, 49–50). They show a disdain for others, and a determination to get rid of this man who was displeasing to him, without any consideration of the justice of his cause. But while we may see in the declaration of Caiphas the manifestation of very unworthy sentiments, we are warned by St. John that it was prophetical. The high-priest expressed in a striking way the meaning of the sufferings of the Man-God (John, xi, 51, 52), though he could not have realized the full import of those mysterious words. The death of Jesus being resolved upon, the most unscrupulous means were employed in order to bring it about, and Caiphas is chiefly to blame. The meeting determined upon by the princes of the priests and the elders of the people, "that by subtilty they might apprehend Jesus", was held in the house of Caiphas (Matt., xxvi, 3–5). The hill south of Jerusalem where this house is said by tradition to have stood is called the "Hill of Evil Counsel". As high-priest, Caiphas was the official head of the Sanhedrin, and consequently responsible for the travesty of a trial to which Christ was submitted by the Jewish authorities, before they handed Him over to Pilate and stirred up the people to demand His death.

After the death of Jesus, Caiphas continued to persecute His followers. When Peter and John were brought before the Council after the cure of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple (Acts, iv, 6 sqq.), Caiphas was still high-priest, since he was removed only in A. D. 36 or 37. We can say with almost equal certainty that he was the high-priest before whom St. Stephen appeared (Acts, vii, 1), and that it is from him that Saul obtained letters authorizing him to bring the Christians of Damascus to Jerusalem (Acts, ix, 1–2). At a time when high-priests were made and unmade at will by the officials of Rome, and when the principal quality required seems to have been subserviency, it is no credit to the character of Caiphas to have enjoyed their favour so long. Josephus mentions his removal in connexion with a series of acts of Vitellius which were agreeable to the Jews. We are not told what became of him after his deposition.

W. S. REILLY.

Caius, a Christian author who lived about the beginning of the third century. Little is known about his personal history. Eusebius mentions him several times and tells us (Hist. Eccl., VI, xx), that he held a disputation with Proclus, a Montanist leader at Rome in the time of Pope Zephyrinus (199–217), and calls him a learned man and an ecclesiastic. This latter designation need not imply that he was a priest. Several extracts from the dialogue against Proclus are given by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., II, xxv; III, xxxi; VI, xx). Caius is also mentioned by Jerome (de Vir. Ill., 59), Theodoret (Hær. Fab., II, iii), and Nicephorus Callistus (Hist. Eccl., IV, xii-xx), all of whom derived their information from Eusebius. Photius (Bibl. Cod., 48) gives some additional data drawn from a marginal note in a manuscript copy of the work on the "Nature of the Universe" in which Caius is said to have been a presbyter of the Roman Church and to have been elected "Bishop of the Gentiles". These indications, resting as they do on a confusion of the Anti-Montanist Caius with Hippolytus, are absolutely valueless. Additional light has been thrown on the character of Caius's dialogue against Proclus by Gwynne's publication of some fragments from the work of Hippolytus "Contra Caium" (Hermathena, VI, p. 397 sq); from these it seems clear that Caius maintained that the Apocalypse of John was a work of the Gnostic Cerinthus.

We owe to Caius a very valuable evidence of the death of Sts. Peter and Paul at Rome, and the public veneration of their remains at Rome about the year 200. It is taken from the above-mentioned disputation with Proclus, and reads as follows (Euseb., Hist. Eccl., II, 25): "But I can show the trophies of the Apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian Way you will find the trophies of those who laid the foundations of this church". By "trophies" is of course understood the memorial chapel that preserved in each case the body of the Apostle (cf. Barnes, St. Peter in Rome, London, 1900, p 145).

The fragments of Caius are printed in ROUTH, *Reliquiæ Sacræ* (Oxford, 1846), II, 125–58, and in *P. G.*, X, 25–36. Cf. ZAHN, *Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons*, II, 985–991; HARNACK, *Chronologie*, II, 206, 223, 226; BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur* (Freiburg, 1901), I, 525.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Caius (KAY, KEY), JOHN, physician and scholar, b. at Norwich, 6 October, 1510; d. at London, 29 July, 1573. He entered the University of Cambridge in 1529, received the degree M. A. in 1535, and studied medicine under Montanus and Vesalius at Padua, where he received (1541) the degree of Doctor of Medicine. After a tour through Italy, France, and Germany, during which he met the most eminent scholars of the age, he returned to England in 1544, and for twenty years lectured on anatomy in London. He published "A Boke or Conseille against the Disease commonly called the Sweate or Sweatyng Sicknesse" (London, 1552), which is considered the best account of that epidemic. He also wrote translations of, and commentaries on, the works of Galen and Hippocrates (Basle, 1544). With the means acquired from his medical practice he refounded (1558) his college (Gonville) at Cambridge, which has since been known as Gonville and Caius College. Under Edward VI he became royal physician, a position which he retained under Elizabeth until he was dismissed (1568) on account of his adherence to the Catholic Faith. He was elected nine times president of the College of Physicians, an account of which—"Annales collegii medicorum 1520–1565"—he left in MSS. He was accused of atheism and of keeping secretly a collection of ornaments and vestments for Catholic use. The latter were found and burned in the College court. His last literary production was the history of Cambridge University—"Historia Cantabrigiensis Academiæ" (London, 1574).

MULLINGER, *The University of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1884); IDEM in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; CLARK, *Cambridge* (London, 1908).

E. A. PACE.

Caius and Soter, SAINTS AND POPES, have their feast together on 22 April, on which day they appear in most of the martyrologies, though Notker and a few others give Soter on the 21st and Caius on the 19th or 21st.

Soter was pope for eight years, c. 167 to 175 (Harnack prefers 166–174). We possess a fragment of an interesting letter addressed to him by St. Dionysius of Corinth, who writes: "From the beginning it has been your custom to do good to all the brethren in many ways, and to send alms to many churches in every city, refreshing the poverty of those who sent requests, or giving aid to the brethren in the mines, by the alms which you have had the habit of giving from of old, Romans keeping up the traditional custom of the Romans; which your blessed Bishop Soter has not only preserved, but has even increased, by providing the abundance which he has sent to the saints, and by further consoling with blessed words the brethren who came to him, as a loving father his children." "To-day, therefore, we have kept the holy Lord's day, on which we have read your letter, which we shall always have to read and be admonished, even as the former letter which was written to us by the ministry of Clement." (Euseb., Hist. Eccl., IV, xxiv.) The letter which Soter had written in the name of his church is lost, though Harnack and others have attempted to identify it with the so-called "Second Epistle of Clement" (see CLEMENT OF ROME). The reverence for the pope's paternal letter is to be noticed. The traditional generosity of the Roman Church is again referred to by St. Dionysius of Alexandria writing to Pope Dionysius in the middle of the third century, and Eusebius says it still continued in his time. Nothing further is known of this pope.

Caius was pope for twelve years, four months, and seven days, from 17 December, 283, to 22 April, 296, according to the Liberian catalogue (Harnack, Chronol., I, 155, after Lipsius and Lightfoot); Eusebius is wrong in giving him fifteen years. He is mentioned in the fourth-century "Depositio Episcoporum" (therefore not as a martyr): *X kl maii Caii in Callisti.* He was buried in the chapel of the popes in that cemetery. Nothing whatever is known of his life. He lived in the time of peace before the last great persecution.

Soter is said by the fifth-century writer known as PRÆDESTINATUS (c. XXVI) to have written a book against the Montanists; he adds that Tertullian wrote against Pope Soter and Apollonius. As we know (JEROME, *De Vir. ill.*, XL) that Tertullian wrote against Apollonius in his lost *De Ecstasi*, this may be true; see HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchristlich. Lit.*, I, 589; ZAHN, *Forschungen* (1893), V, 49.

On Caius in later Acts of Saints see TILLEMONT, IV; *Acta SS.*, 14 April; BECILLUS, *Acta S. Caii P. et M.* (Rome, 1628). The false decretals attributed to these two popes will be found

in the collections of councils, in COUSTANT, MIGNE, HINSCHIUS, etc. On a letter attributed to Caius by the Malabar Christians, see ROUTH, *Reliq. Sacræ*, II, 158, and HARNACK, *op. cit.*, 777.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Cajetan (GAETANO), SAINT, founder of the Theatines, b. Oct., 1480 at Vicenza in Venetian territory; d. at Naples in 1547. Under the care of a pious mother he passed a studious and exemplary youth, and took his degree as *doctor utriusque juris* at Padua in his twenty-fourth year. In 1506 he became at Rome a prothonotary Apostolic in the court of Julius II, and took an important share in reconciling the Republic of Venice with that pontiff. On the death of Julius in 1513 he withdrew from the court, and is credited with founding, shortly after, an association of pious priests and prelates called the Oratory of Divine Love, which spread to other Italian towns. Though remarkable for his intense love of God, he did not advance to the priesthood till 1516. Recalled to Vicenza in the following year by the death of his mother, he founded there a hospital for incurables, thus giving proof of the active charity that filled his whole life. But his zeal was more deeply moved by the spiritual diseases that, in those days of political disorder, infected the clergy of all ranks, and, like St. Augustine in earlier times, he strove to reform them by instituting a body of regular clergy, who should combine the spirit of monasticism with the exercises of the active ministry.

Returning to Rome in 1523 he laid the foundations of his new congregation, which was canonically erected by Clement VII in 1524. One of his four companions was Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, Bishop of Chieti (in Latin *Theate*), afterwards Paul IV, who was elected first superior, and from whose title arose the name, Theatines. The order grew but slowly. During the sack of Rome in 1527 the Theatines, then twelve in number, escaped to Venice after enduring many outrages from the heretic invaders. There Cajetan met St. Hieronymus Æmiliani (see SOMASCHI), whom he assisted in the establishment of his Congregation of Clerks Regular. In 1533 Cajetan founded a house in Naples, where he was able to check the advances of Lutheranism. In 1540 he was again at Venice, whence he extended his work to Verona and Vicenza. He passed the last four years of his life, a sort of seraphic existence, at Naples where he died finally of grief at the discords of the city, suffering in his last moments a kind of mystical crucifixion. He was beatified by Urban VIII in 1629, and canonized by Clement X in 1671. His feast is kept on the 7th of August.

Acta SS., August, II, 282; MAULDE DE LA CLAVIÈRE, *St. Cajetan* (2d ed., Paris, 1905); *Const. Cong. Cleric. Regul. S. P. Cajetan* (1706); LUBEN, *Der hl. Cajetan von Thine* (Ratisbon, 1883).

JOSEPH KEATING.

Cajetan, CONSTANTINO, a Benedictine savant, b. at Syracuse, Sicily, in 1560; d. at Rome, 17 September, 1650. While his brothers, Ottavio and Alfonso, joined the Society of Jesus, Constantino became a Benedictine (29 October, 1586) at San Nicolò d'Arena in Catania, and was soon called to Rome by Clement VIII, who confided to the promising young scholar an edition of the works of St. Peter Damian, which he executed in four folio volumes (Rome, 1606 *et sæp.*). His constant and successful researches in Roman archives won him the friendship of Cardinal Baronius, through whom he was made titular Abbot of San Baronzio in the Diocese of Pistoia, and Custodian of the Vatican Library; the latter important office he held under four popes until his death. Baronius was much indebted to him in the composition of his "Annales Ecclesiastici", and more than once praises Cajetan's thorough knowledge of the Roman archives (e. g. *ad an.* 1002, n. 10). He was a tireless worker in the field of ecclesiastical history; the long list of his writings may be seen in Ziegelbauer, "Hist. rei lit. O. S. B." (Augsburg, 1754, III, 380 sqq.). Among them are a life of the liturgist, St. Amalarius of Trier (Rome, 1612), annotated lives of St. Isidore of Seville, St. Ildephonsus of Toledo, Cardinal Gregory of Ostia, notes on the life of St. Anselm, an annotated edition of the "Vita Gelasii II" by Pandolfo of Pisa (Murat., Script. Rer. It., III, 367), treatises on the primacy and the Roman episcopate of St. Peter (Roccaberti, Bibl. max. pontif., VII). He was persuaded that St. Gregory the Great was a genuine disciple of St. Benedict, and wrote in defence of this thesis "De S. Gregorii monachatu benedictino libri duo" (Salzburg, 1620). The authorship of the "Imitation of Christ" interested him also, and he several times broke a lance for the Benedictine Jean Gersen ["Joannes Gersen, De Imit. Xti, acced. Defensio pro Gersen et methodo practicâ IV librorum" (Rome, 1616); "Concertatio, Apologetica responsio" (Rome, 1618); "Libellus apologeticus pro Gersen" (Rome, 1644), the latter two against Rosweyde]. His ardour for the glory of the Benedictine Order troubled his judgment occasionally, says Father Hurter, e. g. when he claimed for it such persons as St. Columbanus of Bobbio, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Ignatius Loyola. He inaugurated the controversy concerning the authorship of the work known as the "Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius" by his book "De religiosâ S. Ignatii, sive S. Enneconis fundatoris soc. Jesu per Benedictinos institutione, deque libello exercitiorum ejusdem ab Exercitatorio Cisnerii desumpto" (Venice, 1641), in which he claimed priority for the "Exercitatorium Spirituale" of Garcias de Cisneros, Benedictine Abbot of Montferrat (1455–1510). (See EXERCISES OF ST. IGNATIUS.) Both this work and the "Achates", or reply of Giovanni Rho, S. J., were placed on the Index of Forbidden Books in 1646. Cajetan was an intelligent and munificent collector of books, and at his death left his fortune to the "Bibliotheca Aniciana", founded by him in honour of the family of St. Gregory the Great (*Gens Anicia*); the books have since been divided between the Propaganda Library and that of the Sapienza, or Roman University. To many his chief title to fame will seem to rest on his claim to be considered the first promoter, if not the founder, of the Propaganda College at Rome. He had long hoped to found at Rome a *Collegium Gregorianum de propagandâ fide*, in which young Benedictines might be trained for foreign missions, after the spirit and teachings of St. Gregory the Great, Apostle of the Anglo-Saxons. He really opened a house of studies for this purpose in the monastery of San Benedetto in Piscinula at Rome, and this may be looked on as historically the germ of Propaganda. (Cf. his "De erectione collegii Gregoriani in Urbe epistola encyclica", Rome, 1622.) His idea was taken up seriously by Gregory XV (1621–23), and by him enlarged and modified until it took shape as the "*Collegium* [later *Urbanum*] *de propagandâ fide*". However, the enlightened zeal and pioneer labours of Dom Cajetan received due recognition by his nomination as first consultor of the new college. (See PROPAGANDA, COLLEGE OF).

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, I, 459; WOLFSGRUBER, in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; BUCHBERGER, *Kirchl. Handlex.* (Munich, 1906), s. v.; HEURTEBIZE, in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Cajetan, TOMMASO DE VIO GAETANI (baptized GIACOMO), Dominican cardinal, philosopher, theologian, and exegete; b. 20 Feb., 1469 at Gaeta, Italy; d. 9 Aug., 1534 at Rome. He came of noble stock, and in early boyhood was devout and fond of study. Against the will of his parents he entered the Domini-

can Order before the age of sixteen. As a student at Naples, Bologna, and Padua he was the wonder of his fellow-students and preceptors. As bachelor of theology (19 March, 1492), and afterwards master of students, he began to attract attention by his lectures and writings. Promoted to the chair of metaphysics at the University of Padua, he made a close study of the prevailing Humanism and Philosophism. Besides engaging in controversy with the Scotist Trombetta, he took a stand against the Averroistic tendencies or teachings of such men as Vernias, Pompanazzi, and Niphus, directing against them his celebrated work, "De Ente et Essentiâ", counted the most subtle and abstruse of his productions. At a general chapter of the order (Ferrara, 1494) Cajetan was selected to conduct the customary defence of theses in presence of the assembled dignitaries. He had to face Pico della Mirandola among others, and such was his success that the students bore him in triumph on their shoulders to receive the felicitations of the master general. He was immediately made master of sacred theology, and for several years expounded the "Summa" of St. Thomas, principally at Brescia and Pavia, to which latter chair he had been called by the Duke of Milan, Ludovico Sforza. After two years he resigned and repaired to Milan, whence in 1500 Cardinal Oliviero Caraffa procured his transfer to Rome. In 1501 he was made procurator general of his order and appointed to the chairs of philosophy and exegesis at the Sapienza. On the death of the master general, John Clérée, in 1507, Cajetan was named vicar-general of the order, and the next year he was elected to the generalship. With foresight and ability, he devoted his energies to the promotion of religious discipline, emphasizing the study of sacred science as the chief means of attaining the end of the order. His encyclical letters and the acts of chapters promulgated during his term of office bear witness to his lofty ideals and to his unceasing efforts to realize them. He was wont to say that he could hardly excuse from grievous sin a brother Dominican who failed to devote at least four hours a day to study. "Let others rejoice in their prerogatives", he once wrote, "but the work of our Order is at an end unless sacred doctrine be our commendation." He was himself a model of diligence, and it was said of him that he could quote almost the entire "Summa" from memory. About the fourth year of his generalship Cajetan rendered important service to the Holy See by appearing before the Pseudo-Council of Pisa (1511), where he denounced the disobedience of the participating cardinals and bishops and overwhelmed them with his arguments. This was the occasion of his defence of the power and monarchical supremacy of the pope. It is chiefly to his endeavours that is ascribed the failure of this schismatical movement, abetted by Louis XII of France. He was one of the first to counsel Pope Julius II to convoke a real œcumenical council, i. e. the Fifth Lateran. In this council Cajetan was deputed by the principal religious orders to defend their common interests. Under the same pontiff he was instrumental in granting to Ferdinand of Spain the first Dominican missionaries who devoted organized effort to the conversion of the natives of America.

On 1 July, 1517, Cajetan was created cardinal by Pope Leo X. He was also appointed Archbishop of Palermo, but opposition on the part of the Sicilian senate prevented his taking possession and he resigned 8 Feb., 1518. On the demand of Charles V, however, he was later made Bishop of Gaeta, but this was after he had been sent in 1518 as Apostolic legate to Germany, bringing the insignia of the cardinalate to Albert of Brandenburg, and a sword blessed by the pope to Emperor Maximilian. On this occasion he was empowered to confer with the latter and with the King of Denmark on the terms of an alliance against the Turks. He also represented the pope at the Diet of Frankfort (1519), and took an active part in the election of Charles V (1519), thereby winning that emperor's friendship and gratitude. While executing these missions, the more serious duty of meeting Luther, then started on his career of rebellion, was assigned to him. Cajetan's theological learning and humane disposition seemed to fit him for the task of successfully treating with the proud and obstinate monk, and Protestants have admitted that in all his relations with the latter Cajetan exhibited a spirit of moderation, that did honour to his lofty character. But neither pleading, learning, nor conciliatory words availed to secure the desired submission. Luther parleyed and temporized as he had done with the Holy See itself, and finally showed the insincerity of his earlier protestations by spurning the pope and his representative alike. Some have blamed Cajetan for his failure to avert Luther's defection, but others like Hefele and Hergenröther exonerate him. In 1523 he was sent by Adrian VI as legate to King Louis of Hungary to encourage the Christians in their resistance to the Turks. Recalled in the following year by Clement VII, he became one of the pope's chief advisers. During the sack of Rome by the imperialist army (1527) Cajetan, like other principal persons, was seized, and obtained the release of himself and household only on payment of five thousand Roman crowns of gold, a sum which he had to borrow and which he later made up by the strictest economy in the affairs of his diocese. He was one of the nineteen cardinals who, in a solemn consistory held by Clement VII (23 March, 1534), pronounced definitively for the validity of the marriage of Henry VIII and Catharine of Aragon. This was about the last public act of his life, for he died the same year and was buried, as he had requested, in an humble tomb in the vestibule of the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva. It was the common opinion of his contemporaries that had he lived, he would have succeeded Clement VII on the papal throne. Much interest attaches to a portrait of Cajetan, the only one known, recently discovered by Père Berthier, O.P. in a collection of notables of the Reformation, owned by Count Krasinski of Warsaw, Poland (see bibliography).

Cajetan has been described as small in bodily stature but gigantic in intellect. In all his varied and laborious offices he never omitted his daily study and writing, nor failed in the practices of the religious life. He faced the trying issues of his times calmly and fearlessly, and endeavoured by learning, tact, and charity to pacify hostile minds, to lead back the erring, to stem the tide of heresy, and to prevent schism. His written solutions of living moral problems cover a wide field. His circumstances and position often required him to take part in polemical discussions, yet he is said never to have given personal offence in his writings. His style, purely scientific and unrhetorical, is the more noteworthy for having attained its directness and simplicity in the golden age of Humanism. More than any other philosopher and theologian of his epoch, he ministered to actual intellectual needs of the Church. With penetration and sagacity he ranged beyond the confines of contemporary thought, and in his tentative solutions of grave problems, still open and unsettled, displayed judgment and frankness. It is not strange that he developed tendencies which surprised the more conservative, and essayed opinions which in some instances were, and have remained, unusual and occasionally erroneous. He found numerous critics, even in his own order, who were as censorious of him as his friends were zealous in upholding his merits. Among his opponents, the learned Dominican Bartholomew Spina (d. 1542) was conspicuous. His persistent antagonism began, strangely enough, after he had written a laudatory preface to Cajetan's commentary

on the "Secunda Secundæ" (second section of the second part of the "Summa") of St. Thomas, whose publication he supervised for the author in 1517. The next year, in his refutation of Pompanazzi, Spina appears to have considered Cajetan as falling partly within the scope of his strictures because of certain alleged concessions to the prevalent Averroistic rationalism in a commentary on the "De Animâ" of Aristotle. Cajetan held that Averroes had correctly exhibited the Stagirite as a believer in monopsychism, or the doctrine of the unity of one intellectual soul for humanity and the mortality of individual souls. Whilst working for, and concurring in the council's condemnation of this doctrine in 1513, Cajetan had not favoured the requirement that in their public lectures professors of philosophy should bring up no teachings in conflict with Christian faith without refuting them; this, he contended, was the proper office of theologians. Elsewhere Cajetan had also intimated that reason left to itself could not adequately and conclusively demonstrate the soul's immortality. From these beginnings, Spina, who during his later years was Master of the Sacred Palace, relentlessly pursued Cajetan living and dead. On these slender grounds some writers, including Renan (Averroés et l'Averroïsme, Paris, 1867, 351) and Botta (Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, tr. Morris, New York, 1903, II, Appendix II), have misrepresented Cajetan as "boldly asserting the eternity of the universe and the destruction of personality at death", and have classed him with the very men against whom he wrote, as an initiator of a new period in the development of anti-Scholastic philosophy.

In theology Cajetan is justly ranked as one of the foremost defenders and exponents of the Thomistic school His commentaries on the "Summa Theologica", the first in that extensive field, begun in 1507 and finished 1522, are his greatest work and were speedily recognized as a classic in Scholastic literature. The work is primarily a defence of St. Thomas against the attacks of Scotus. In the third part it reviews the aberrations of the Reformers, especially Luther. The important relation between Cajetan and the Angelic Doctor was emphasized by Leo XIII, when by his Pontifical Letters of 15 Oct., 1879, he ordered the former's commentaries and those of Ferrariensis to be incorporated with the text of the "Summa" in the official Leonine edition of the complete works of St. Thomas, the first volume of which appeared at Rome in 1882. This edition has restored a number of passages which St. Pius V desired to have expunged from the texts, the publication of which he ordered in 1570. The suppressed parts, now for the most part inoffensive, were largely in the nature of personal views and had no direct bearing on Thomistic doctrine as a system. In his exegetical work, begun in 1523 and continued to the time of his death, Cajetan sought to counteract the Biblical extravagances of the Humanists and to defeat the Lutheran movement on the ground from which it had chosen to reject the authority of the Church and of tradition. Chiefly with rabbinical assistance, it is said, being himself unversed in Hebrew, and with the aid of current Greek versions he prepared a literal translation of the Bible, including the Old Testament as far as the end of the third chapter of Isaias, and all the New Testament except the Apocalypse, which on account of its difficulties he was unwilling to undertake. It was his object, he declared in a dedicatory letter to Clement VII published in his edition of the Gospels, to ascertain the true literal sense of the Scriptures, and he did not hesitate to adopt new renderings, provided they did not conflict with the Sacred Word and with the teachings of the Church. This position, much criticized in his time, is now quite in line with the common method of Catholic exegetics. Though closely following St. Jerome on the authenticity of the Biblical texts and utilizing the New Testament version and notes of Erasmus, with whom he was on friendly terms, he produced a work whose importance was not overlooked, but whose freedom and wide departure from the Fathers and the theological schools created distrust and alarm. In his critical interpretation, for instance, he ventured an allegorical explanation of the first chapters of Genesis, and he seemed more than three centuries in advance of his day in questioning the authenticity of the last chapter of St. Mark, the authorship of several epistles, viz., Hebrews, James, II Peter, II and III John, Jude, the genuineness of the passage of the three witnesses (I John, v, 7), etc. In this field also he was bitterly assailed, especially by Ambrose Catharinus, an extraordinary but erratic genius, who had abandoned the law to enter the Dominican Order, and had become a bishop. Cajetan's accompanying theological observations, however, are important, and many scholars have profitably studied them in conjunction with his commentaries on the "Summa".

It has been significantly said of Cajetan that his positive teaching was regarded as a guide for others and his silence as an implicit censure. His rectitude, candour, and moderation were praised even by his enemies. Always obedient, and submitting his works to ecclesiastical authority, he presented a striking contrast to the leaders of heresy and revolt, whom he strove to save from their folly. To Clement VII he was the "lamp of the Church", and everywhere in his career, as the theological light of Italy, he was heard with respect and pleasure by cardinals, universities, the clergy, nobility, and people. The works of Cajetan aggregate about 115 titles. The commentaries on the several parts of the "Summa" exist in many editions. Of complete editions, sometimes including the text of the "Summa" and sometimes without it, the following are noteworthy: 10 vols. fol., Lyons, 1540; edition of Pius V in complete works of St. Thomas, Rome, 1570; 7 vols. 8vo, with commentaries of Javelli and Capponi, Venice, 1596; 10 vols. fol., Rome, 1773; Leonine edition of St. Thomas (Summa) Rome, 1888. Other works of Cajetan are: (1) "Opuscula omnia tribus tomis distincta" (fol., Lyons, 1558; Venice, 1588; Antwerp, 1612), a collection of fifty-nine treatises; (2) "Commentaria super tractatum de ente et essentiâ Thomæ de Aquino; super libros posteriorum Aristotelis et prædicamenta", etc. (fol., Venice, 1506); (3) "In prædicabilia Porphyrii, prædicamenta et libros posteriorum analyticorum Aristotelis castigatissima commentaria" (8vo, Venice, 1587, 1599); (4) "Super libros Aristotelis de Animâ", etc. (Rome, 1512; Venice, 1514; Paris, 1539); (5) "Summula de peccatis" (Rome, 1525, and in many other corrected and augmented editions); (6) "Jentacula N.T., expositio literalis sexaginta quatuor notabilium sententiarum Novi Test.", etc. (Rome, 1525); (7) "In quinque libros Mosis juxta sensum lit. commentarii" (Rome, 1531, fol.; Paris, 1539); (8) "In libros Jehosuæ, Judicum, Ruth, Regum, Paralipomenon, Hezræ, Nechemiæ et Esther" (Rome, 1533; Paris, 1546); (9) "In librum Job" (Rome, 1535); (10) "In psalmos" (Venice, 1530; Paris, 1532); (11) "In parabolas Salomonis, in Ecclesiasten, in Esaiæ tria priora capita" (Rome, 1542; Lyons, 1545; Paris, 1587); (12) "In Evangelia Matt., Marci, Lucæ, Joannis" (Venice, 1530); (13) "In Acta Apostolorum" [Venice, 1530; Paris (with Gospels), 1536]; (14) "In Epistolas Pauli" (Paris, 1532); (15) "Opera omnia quotquot in sacræ Scripturæ expositionem reperiuntur, curâ atque industriâ insignis collegii S.Thomæ Complutensis, O.P." (5 vols. fol., Lyons, 1639).

FONSECA, Biographical notice of Cajetan in introduction to *Commentary on Pentateuch* (Paris, 1539); QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.* (Paris, 1719), II, 14; CIACCONIUS, *Vitæ et res gestæ pontificum Romanorum et cardinalium* (Rome, 1675), III, 392; TOURON, *Hist. des hommes illus.* (Paris, 1743), IV, 1–76; LIMBOURG, *Kardinal Cajetan* in *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol.* (Innsbruck, 1880), IV, 139–179; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Inns-

bruck, 1903), II, 1201; Cossio, *Il Cardinale Gaetano e la Riforma* (Cividale, 1902); Mandonnet in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1904); Berthier, *Il Ritratto del Gaetano in Il Rosario* (Rome, Aug., Sep., 1907), ser. II, vol. IX, No. 476–477.

John R. Volz.

Cajus. See Caius.

Calabozo (Calaboso), Diocese of.—Calabozo is a town in the State of Miranda, Venezuela, on the River Guárico, 120 miles south-south-west of Caracas. Originally an Indian village, it was founded as a town in 1730 by the Compania Guipuzcoana. The city is situated on low ground, and in the rainy season the surrounding lands are inundated. In its vicinity are thermal springs. It is well built, has a college and public schools, and enjoys a considerable trade. The principal occupation of its inhabitants is cattle-raising. The Diocese of Calabozo was created 7 March, 1863, by Pius IX, and its first bishop was consecrated 30 October, 1881. It embraces the section of Guárico and portions of the sections of Apure, Zamora, Portuguesa, Cojedes, and Guzman Blanco. It has 310,000 Catholics, 38 priests, and 70 churches and chapels. Calabozo is a suffragan of Caracas (Santiago de Venezuela).

Battandier, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1908); Herder, *Konversations-Lex.* (St. Louis, 1903), s. v.; Werner, *Orbis Terrarum Catholicus* (Freiburg, 1890); Streit, *Katholischer Missionsatlas* (Steyl, 1906).

Leo A. Kelly.

Calahorra and La Calzada, Diocese of (Calagurritana et Calceatensis), suffragan of Burgos, comprising almost all the province of Logroño and part of the provinces of Navarre and Soria. Calahorra, the episcopal city, has 9475 inhabitants; it is the centre of a judicial district, and possesses a collegiate church and a chapter. It has been asserted, but without historical foundation, that St. Paul preached at Calahorra and ordained as its first bishop one of his disciples, Felix. According to Prudentius, a Christian poet of the fourth century, the brothers Emeterius and Celedonius, soldiers of the *Legio VII Gemina*, suffered for the Faith at Calahorra, but the exact date of their martyrdom is unknown. In the fourth century pilgrims from distant lands came to pray at the tomb of these saints, whose relics are yet preserved in the cathedral of Calahorra. The first known bishop of this see is Silvanus. About 465 the bishops of the province of Tarragona denounced to Pope Hilary the conduct of this prelate, who had consecrated two bishops in violation of the sacred canons. During the rule of the Visigoths (415–711) the bishops of Calahorra took part in several councils of Toledo. From 792 to 871 it is certain that the see was occupied by Mozarabic bishops, among them Theodemir at the end of the eighth and Recared in the ninth century. Calahorra was reconquered from the Moors by King García of Navarre, and in 1045 the see was restored; its first bishop, Sancho, also Bishop of Nájera, adopted then the title of Bishop of Calahorra and Nájera. In 1236 the see was transferred to Santo Domingo de la Calzada, a city in the same province of Logroño, where it remained for some time. Hence the existence of a cathedral and a chapter in each town and the double title of the bishop, who is chosen alternately by the chapter of each cathedral (Battandier). Among the bishops worthy of mention is Rodríguez Sánchez de Arévalo (d. 1470), afterwards commander of the Castle of Sant' Angelo in Rome, author of numerous theological and historical works and a vigorous champion of papal authority. The Catholic population of the united dioceses is 65,000; there are 363 parishes, 600 priests, 393 churches, and 268 chapels.

Risco, *Las antigüedades civiles y eclesiásticas de Calahorra*, in *España Sagrada*, XXXIII, 113–222, 271–330; La Fuente, *Hist. ec.ca de España* (Madrid, 1873–75), II, 81–83, 421–22; Battandier, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1907), 217.

Eduardo de Hinojosa.

Calama, a titular see of Africa. Calama appears to be the Roman name of Suthul, a city in Numidia, besieged by Postumius 110 B. C. (Sallust, Bel. Jugurth., xxxvii). It became a Roman *municipium* as early as Hadrian, and a colony a little later. In the time of Diocletian it was included in Proconsular Africa, but its bishops were subject to Numidia. The city was captured by the Vandals on their arrival in Africa (429). Count Bonifacius was defeated near the city in 431. A great many inscriptions found at Guelma have proved that it is the modern substitute for Calama. Guelma, occupied by the French in 1836, is to-day the chief town of a district, or arrondissement, in the department of Constantine, Algeria; it is situated near the River Seybouse and the Djebel Mahonna, about 81 miles east of Constantine. It has 7300 inhabitants (1500 French), and is an important cattle market. Among its ruins are a Byzantine citadel and walls built by the Patricius Solomon during the Byzantine reoccupation. Four bishops are known: Donatus, 305; Megalius, who consecrated St. Augustine in 395 and died in 397; St. Possidius, elected in 397; Quodvultdeus in 484. Possidius was a disciple of Augustine in the monastic life; at Calama he suffered grievous persecution from heathens and Donatists, and was obliged to leave his city for some time. The contemporary Donatist bishop was Crispinus; among the heathens we know a certain Nectarius, a correspondent of St. Augustine. Possidius disarmed his enemies by his charity. After the sack of Calama by the Vandals, he retired to Hippo and attended St. Augustine on his death-bed. He also wrote the life and a catalogue of the works of his master.

Morcelli, *Africa christiana*, I, 115; Gams, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiæ Cath.* (Ratisbon, 1873), I, 464; Ravoisié, *Exploration scientif. de l'Afrique*, II; Gsell, *Monuments antiques de l'Algérie* (Paris, 1901); Reboud, *Recueil de not. et mém. de la soc. de Constantine* (1882–1883), C, I, 24–51.

S. Pétridès.

Calamus. See Communion, Holy.

Calancha, Fray Antonio de la, an erudite Augustinian monk, b. 1584 at Chuquisaca (now Sucre) in Bolivia; d. 1 March, 1654. Both his parents were of Spanish descent. He studied at Lima, where he entered the Order of St. Augustine, and was successively definitor, secretary of the province, and rector of the College of San Ildefonso. During the earthquake that made great ravages in Truxillo, 14 February, 1619, he was at the head of the convent at that city and afterwards became prior at Lima. His most important work is the "Corónica moralizada de la orden de N. S. P. S. Agustín en el Peru", the first volume of which appeared in 1638 and the second in 1653. Both have become very rare. They are bulky tomes written in a ponderous style, but replete with valuable information on the Indians of Peru and Bolivia. In regard to the natives of the Peruvian coast, it must be said that, while Calancha had ample opportunity to gather information on the spot, he still prefers to rest mostly on the authority of the Jesuits Arriaga and Terhuel, and in regard to the Lake Titicaca region he follows almost exclusively the Augustinian Ramos Gavilán. On primitive traditions Calancha discourses extensively, but not always in a critical spirit, following therein the conditions and tendencies of the age in which he lived. The book is indispensable for the study of the aborigines and antiquities of South America. His book was also published in Latin by Brullius in 1651. Of other works of his, only two, one on the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and the other on beavers (probably seals), were printed, the former in 1629, the latter in 1642.

Antonio, *Bibliotheca hispana nova* (Madrid, 1733–38); Mendiburú, *Dic. hist. biog.* (Lima, 1876), II; León y Pinelo, *Epitome* etca (1737–38); Jiménez de la Espada, *Tres Relaciones peruanas* (Madrid, 1880).

Ad. F. Bandelier.

Calas Case, THE.—Jean Calas was a French Calvinist, b. 19 March, 1698, at La Caparède near Castres, in the department of Tarn; executed 10 March, 1762, at Toulouse. At the time of the events which made his name famous, he was a prominent merchant of Toulouse, where he had resided for some forty years. In 1731 he married Anne-Rose Cabibel, and had six children: four sons, Marc-Antoine, Louis, Pierre, and Donat, and two daughters, Rose and Anne. One of the sons, Louis, was converted to Catholicity about 1760. His brother, Marc-Antoine, also manifested an inclination to alter his faith, but, possibly owing to opposition on the part of the family, never took the final step. On 13 October, 1761, a number of people, attracted by the excitement, gathered around the house of Jean Calas. Marc-Antoine had been found hanged in his father's warehouse. The news spread rapidly; the *capitouls,* or highest civil magistrates, hurried to the scene. One of the multitude cried out that Antoine had been murdered by his father to prevent him from abjuring Protestantism. The crowd immediately took up the idea, and the members of the family were arrested. The dead son was looked upon as a martyr by the Catholic population, and his obsequies were celebrated with great ceremony. In the interrogatory the accused involved themselves in contradictions, and, on 9 March, 1762, the Parliament of Toulouse, by a vote of 8 to 5, pronounced sentence against Jean Calas. He was condemned to the torture, ordinary and extraordinary, was then to be broken upon the wheel, and finally burnt. The sentence was executed the following day. Calas suffered with admirable courage and, until his last breath, never ceased to protest his innocence. The property of the family was confiscated. Madame Calas was liberated; but her two daughters, who were absent from home at the time of their brother's death, were forced into a convent of the Visitation. Pierre and Donat escaped to Geneva. Voltaire, then living at Ferney, made the acquaintance of the family and employed his all-powerful influence to have the dead father's innocence officially proclaimed, at the same time using the latter's condemnation as a welcome source of new attacks upon the hated Catholic Church. In letters and pamphlets he defended the cause of Calas, and interested his many powerful friends in the case, which now began to attract world-wide attention. On 9 March, 1765, a Parisian tribunal unanimously pronounced Calas innocent. The Parliament of Toulouse was ordered to revoke the death sentence, but never obeyed the injunction. The remnant of the property was restored to the family, which, by a subscription and by gifts of money from King Louis XV, was enabled to live in moderate circumstances. The Calas Case was not without its effect on contemporary art and literature. Over a hundred publications relating to it are in existence. It forms the subject of plays by F.-L. Laya (produced for the first time in Paris in 1790), Lemierre d'Argy (Paris, 1790), Marie-Joseph Chénier (Paris, 1791), and Victor Du Cange (Paris, 1819). Madame Calas and her daughters were living in Paris, when several of these were presented on the stage. Some historians, carried away perhaps by too great a desire to bring the innocence of Jean Calas to the fore, assert that Marc-Antoine committed suicide. But there are weighty reasons to doubt the father's innocence (Barthélemy). Voltaire cannot be considered an impartial historian of the case, owing to his preconceived desire to present a strong indictment against the Catholic Church, rather than to state the facts in their true light. The responsibility of the condemnation in no way rested with the ecclesiastical authorities, and the penalty was inflicted not for a mere religious offence, but for murder alleged to have been committed for a religious motive.

COQUEREL, *Jean Calas et sa famille* (Paris, 1869); BARTHÉLEMY, *Erreurs et mensonges historiques* (Paris, 1886), 2d series, 1–73; KREITEN, *Voltaire* (1884), 413 sqq.; TALLENTYRE, *Life of Voltaire* (London, 1893), II, 150–69 passim; MAYNARD, *Voltaire* (Paris, 1868), II, 429–42.

N. A. WEBER.

Calasio, MARIO DI, Friar Minor and lexicographer, b. at Calasio in the Kingdom of Naples about 1550; d. at Rome, 1 February, 1620. Having entered the Franciscan Order, he devoted himself to the study of Hebrew with such success that the pope called him to Rome, where he taught Hebrew in the Franciscan convents of Ara Cœli and San Pietro in Montorio. Calasio enjoyed the special favour of Paul V who made him his confessor and bestowed upon him all the titles and privileges generally accorded to doctors of theology. When he was dying he caused the Passion to be read to him and expired while chanting the Psalms of David in Hebrew. Calasio's reputation as a scholar in the Semitic languages rests mainly upon his "Concordantiæ Sacrorum Bibliorum Hebraicorum" which was published at Rome in 1622, two years after his death. Another, though inferior, edition of the same work appeared at London in 1747. Besides this work Calasio wrote a "Dictionarium Hebraicum" and "Canones Generales linguæ sanctæ".

APOLLINAIRE in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris, 1899), II, 54–55.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Calatayud, PEDRO DE, Jesuit missionary, b. in Navarre, 1 Aug., 1689; d. in Bologna, 27 Feb., 1773. He joined the Society of Jesus, 21 Oct., 1710. In the Academy of Madrid there is an account of one of his missions in Bilbao which is described as "portentosa". He had the title of Master in Theology, and has left a number of pious and theological works. Among them are: "The Flame of Holy Love for the Sacred Heart"; "Various Sentences from the Scriptures for the Use of Missionaries"; "Practice of a Sweet and Reasonable Christian Life"; "Regrets of a Contrite Heart"; "Practical Doctrines for Explanation on the Missions", a book which seems to have been particularly famous; "Doctrinal Compendium", which was an extended edition of Pinamonti's work; "Practical Catechism"; "Spiritual Exercises for Priests and Ordinandi"—one proposition of which (doctrine IV, p. 111), about restitution by a negligent priest, was made a subject of criticism; "Practical and Doctrinal Methods for Religious". He published a great number of pamphlets and brochures. He was living at the time of the suppression of the Society of Jesus and was expelled from Spain. He died shortly afterwards.

BOERO, *Menologio*, II, 503; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bib. des écr. de la c. de J.*

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Calatrava, MILITARY ORDER OF, founded in Castile, in the twelfth century, as a military branch of the great Cistercian family.

In the Cistercian Order, then only recently formed (1098), there had been a large number of knights or sons of knights. In Calatrava, on the contrary, those who had been monks became knights. Monastic life has been called "a warfare", and it would be a mistake to suppose that those rough medieval warriors sought in the cloister only a comfortable asylum after a troublous career. In both lives there was an heroic struggle to sustain, whether against one's passions or against the Moslems, and the austerities of an ascetic life could not have been more dreadful to them than the privations of camp life and the wounds of battle. These impetuous natures, who did nothing by halves, were eager to take Heaven, as they took earthly strongholds, by storm (Matt., xi, 12). However, the Order of Calatrava owes its origin not to any deliberately prepared plan, but to fortuitous circumstances, the recital of which would seem to be mere romance if the teller, Rodrigo of Toledo, did not add that he himself had known in his youth the hero of the story. It runs as follows:—

Calatrava is the Arabic name of a castle recovered from the Moslems, in 1147, by the King of Castile, Alfonso VII, called *el Emperador*. Situated on the extreme southern borders of Castile, this conquest was more difficult to keep than to make, at a time when neither standing armies nor garrisons were known. It was this deficiency that the military orders, and first of all the Knights Templars, intended to supply by fulfilling their vow of perpetual war against the Moslem. To the Templars the king had recourse, but after a vain attempt to defend Calatrava they abandoned it, and the king was looking in vain for another defender when Raymond, Abbot of the Cistercian monastery of Fitero, offered himself. This step is said to have been suggested to the abbot by Diego Velasquez, a simple monk, but one who had been a knight, was well acquainted with military matters, and was inspired with the idea of employing the lay brothers of the abbey to defend Calatrava. These Cistercian lay brothers—at that time a recent innovation in religious life—not being in Holy orders, were variously employed as herdsmen, as labourers, as husbandmen, and so on; Diego employed them as soldiers of the Cross. They laid down the hammer and the shepherd's crook, and took up the sword. Thus a new order was created, which received the name of Calatrava from the castle given up by the king (1157).



A Knight of Calatrava

Once provided with arms, these brethren, filled with warlike enthusiasm, were eager to take the offensive against the Moors. With this end in view, they chose, when the Abbot Raymond died (1163), a certain Don García to lead them in battle as their first grand master. At the same time, the choir monks, not without protest, left Calatrava to live under an abbot whom they had chosen, in the monastery of Cirvelos. Only Velasquez and a few other clerics, to act as chaplains, remained in Calatrava with the knights, Velasquez becoming prior of the whole community. This somewhat revolutionary arrangement was approved by the general chapter at Cîteaux, and by Pope Alexander III (1164). A general chapter held at Cîteaux in 1187 gave to the Knights of Calatrava their definitive rule, which was approved in the same year by Pope Gregory VIII. This rule, modelled upon the Cistercian customs for lay brothers, imposed upon the knights, besides the obligations of the three religious vows, the rules of silence in the refectory, dormitory, and oratory; of abstinence on four days a week, besides several fast-days during the year; they were also obliged to recite a fixed number of paternosters for each day Hour of the Office; to sleep in their armour; to wear, as their full dress, the Cistercian white mantle with the scarlet cross *fleurdelisée*. Calatrava was subject not to Cîteaux, but to Morimond in Burgundy, the mother-house of Fiterò, from which Calatrava had sprung. Consequently, the Abbot of Morimond possessed the right of visiting the houses and of reforming the statutes of Calatrava, while the highest ecclesiastical dignity of the order, that of grand prior, could be held only by a monk of Morimond.

The first military services of the Knights of Calatrava had been brilliant, and in return for the great services they had rendered they received from the King of Castile new grants of land, which formed their first commanderies. They had already been called into the neighbouring Kingdom of Aragon, and been rewarded by a new *encomienda* (landed estate), that of Alcañiz (1179). But these successes were followed by a series of misfortunes, due in the first instance to the unfortunate partition which Alfonso had made of his possessions, and the consequent rivalry which ensued between the Castilian and Leonese branches of his dynasty. On the other hand, the Moors of Spain, wishing to recover their lost dominions, called to their aid the Moors of Africa, thus bringing on the new and formidable invasion of the Almohades. The first encounter resulted in a defeat for Spain. In the disastrous battle of Alarcos, the knights were overpowered and, in spite of splendid heroism, were obliged to leave their bulwark of Calatrava in the power of the Moslem (1195). Velasquez lived just long enough to be the sorrowful witness of the failure of his daring scheme. He died next year in the monastery of Gumiel (1196). It seemed as if the order was ruined in Castile, and this opinion so far prevailed that the branch of Aragon regarded itself as having succeeded the other. The Knights of Alcañiz actually proceeded to elect a new grand master, but the grand master still living in Castile claimed his right. Finally, by a compromise, the master of Alcañiz was recognized as second in dignity, with the title of Grand Commander for Aragon.

The scattered remains of Calatrava had meanwhile found a common shelter in the Cistercian monastery of Cirvelos, and there they began to repair their losses by a large accession of new knights. They soon felt themselves strong enough to erect a new bulwark against the Moslems at Salvatierra, where they took the name, which they kept for fourteen years, of Knights of Salvatierra (1198). But in the course of a fresh invasion of the Almohades, Salvatierra, in spite of a desperate defence, shared the fate of Calatrava (1209). Upon the fall of this Castilian stronghold dismay spread from Spain throughout Western Europe. Summoned by the voice of the great Pope Innocent III, foreign crusaders hastened from all sides to help the Spanish Christians. The first event in this holy war, now a European one, was the reconquest of Calatrava (1212), which was given back to its former masters. In the same year the famous victory of Las Navas de Tolosa marked the incipient decline of Moslem domination in Western Europe. Having thus recovered possession of the stronghold, and resumed the title of Calatrava (1216), the order nevertheless removed to more secure quarters at Calatrava la Nueva, eight miles from old Calatrava (1218). From this centre their influence spread to the remotest parts of the Peninsula; new orders sprang up—Alcántara (q. v.) in the Kingdom of Leon, Aviz (q. v.) in Portugal, both begun under Calatrava's protection and the visitation of its grand master. This spirit of generous emulation, spreading among all classes of society, marks the climax of Spanish chivalry: it was then that King Ferdinand the Saint, after the definitive coalition of Castile and Leon (1229) dealt a mortal blow to the Moslem power in the conquest (1235) of their capital city, Cordova, soon followed by the surrender of Murcia, Jaen, and Seville. The European crusade seemed at an end. Encouraged by these victories, Ferdinand's successor, Alfonso X, the Wise, planned a crusade in the East

and contemplated marching, with his Spanish chivalry, to restore the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem (1272). But the Moors still held out in their little Kingdom of Granada, which was to remain for two centuries longer an open door, exposing Western Europe to the constant danger of African invasion. For the perpetuation of this menace, Christendom had to thank its own dissensions—not only international, but personal and dynastic. Into these factious quarrels the Knights of Calatrava, like other knights of the Cross, were unhappily drawn.

Calatrava, with its abundant resources of men and material wealth, had by this time become a power in the State. It had lands and castles scattered along the borders of Castile. It exercised feudal lordship over thousands of peasants and vassals. Thus, more than once, we see the order bringing to the field, as its individual contributions, 1200 to 2000 knights, a considerable force in the Middle Ages. Moreover, it enjoyed autonomy, being by its constitutions independent in temporal matters and acknowledging only spiritual superiors—the Abbot of Morimond and, in appeal, the pope. These authorities interfered, in consequence of a schism which first broke out in 1296 through the simultaneous election of two grand masters, García Lopez and Gautier Perez. Lopez, dispossessed a first time by a delegate of Morimond, appealed to Pope Boniface VIII, who quashed the sentence and referred the case to the general chapter at Cîteaux, where Lopez was re-established in his dignity (1302). Dispossessed a second time, in consequence of a quarrel with his lieutenant, Juan Nuñez, Lopez voluntarily resigned in favour of Nuñez, who had taken his place (1328), on condition that he should keep the commandery of Zurita; as this condition was violated, Lopez again, for the third time, took the title of Grand Master in Aragon, where he died in 1336.—These facts sufficiently prove that after the fourteenth century the rigorous discipline and fervent observance of the order's earlier times had, under the relaxing influence of prosperity, given place to a spirit of intrigue and ambition.

With the accession of Pedro the Cruel began a conflict between the Crown and the order. That prince caused three grand masters in succession to be put to death, as having incurred his suspicion: the first of these was beheaded (1355) on a charge of having entered into a league with the King of Aragon; the second, Estevañez, having competed for the grand mastership with the king's candidate, García de Padilla, was murdered in the royal palace, by the king's own treacherous hand; lastly, García de Padilla himself, a brother of the royal mistress, fell into disgrace, upon deserting the king's party for that of his half brother, Henry the Bastard, and died in prison (1369). Amid all these troubles the war against the Moslem, which was the very reason of the order's existence, was reduced to a mere episode in its history. The greater part of its activities were employed in purely political conflicts, and its arms, consecrated to the defence of the Faith, were turned against Christians. An even more pitiable spectacle was that of the knights divided among themselves into rival and mutually hostile factions. At the same time began the encroachments of royal authority in the election of the grand master, whose power was a check upon that of the king. For instance, in 1404, Henry of Villena was elected 24th grand master merely through the favour of Henry III of Castile, although Villena was married, a stranger to the order, and by papal dispensation entered upon his high functions without even the preliminary of a novitiate. A schism in the order ensued and was healed only after the king's death, in 1414, when a general chapter, held at Cîteaux, cancelled the election of Villena and acknowledged his competitor, Luis Guzman, as the only legitimate master. After the death of Guzman, a new encroachment of King John II of Castile gave rise to a new schism. He had succeeded in forcing upon the electors his own candidate, Alfonso, a bastard, of the royal stock of Aragon (1443); but Alfonso having joined a party formed against him, the king sought to have him deposed by the chapter of the order. This time the electors divided, and a double election issued in not fewer than three grand masters: Pedro Giron, who took possession of Calatrava; Ramirez de Guzman, who occupied the castles of Andalusia; and the bastard Alfonso of Aragon, who continued to be recognized by the knights of the Aragonese branch. At last, through the withdrawal of his rivals one after the other, Pedro Giron remained the only grand master (1457). Giron belonged to an eminent Castilian family; an ambitious intriguer, more anxious about his family interests than about those of his order, he played an important part as a leader in the factions which disturbed the wretched reigns of John II and Henry IV, the last two lamentably weak descendants of St. Ferdinand of Castile.

By turns, Giron sustained first Henry IV, in a war against his father, John II, then Alfonso, who pretended to the throne, against Henry IV. Such was Giron's importance that Henry IV, in order to attach him to his cause, offered him the hand of his own sister, the famous Isabella of Castile. Giron had already had his vow of celibacy annulled by the pope, and was on his way to the court, when he died, thus saving the future Queen of Castile from an unworthy consort (1466). The same pope, Pius II, granted to Pedro Giron the extravagant privilege of resigning his high dignity in favour of his bastard, Rodrigo Telles Giron, a child eight years old. Thus the grand mastership fell into the hands of guardians—an unheard of event. The Abbot of Morimond was called upon to devise a temporary administration, until Telles should reach his majority. The administration was entrusted to four knights elected by the chapter, and from this period date the definitive statutes of the order known as "Rules of Abbot William III" (1467). These statutes recognized in the order seven high dignitaries: the grand master; the *clavero* (guardian of the castle and lieutenant of the grand master); two grand *comendadores*, one for Castile and the other for Aragon; the grand prior, representing the Abbot of Morimond in the spiritual government; the *sacrista* (guardian of the relics); the *obrero* (supervisor of buildings).

The order, having reached its apogee of prosperity, now held sway over fifty-six commanderies and sixteen priories, or cures, distributed between the Diocese of Jaen and the Vicariate of Ciudad Real. Its lordships included sixty-four villages, with a population of 200,000 souls, and produced an annual income which may be estimated at 50,000 ducats. The kings whose fortune the mismanagement of the late reigns had depleted could not but covet these riches, while such formidable military power filled with distrust the monarchs who were obliged to tolerate the autonomous existence of the order. During the struggle between Alfonso V of Portugal and Ferdinand of Aragon for the right of succession to Henry IV of Castile, the last male of his house (1474), much depended upon the attitude of Calatrava. The knights were divided. While the grand master, Rodrigo Giron, supported Portugal, his lieutenant, Lopez de Padilla, stood by Aragon. The battle of Toro (1479), where the pretensions of Portugal were annihilated, ended this schism, the last in the history of the order. The grand master, reconciled with Ferdinand of Aragon, fell, during the war against the Moors, at the siege of Loja (1482). His lieutenant, Lopez de Padilla, succeeded him and, as the last of the twenty-seven independent grand masters of Calatrava, revived for a season the heroic virtues of his order's better days. A mortified monk in his cell, a fearless

warrior on the battlefield, the glory of Padilla shed its last rays in the war of the conquest of Granada, which he did not live to see completed. At his death (1487), Ferdinand of Aragon exhibited to the chapter, assembled for the election of a new grand master, a Bull of Innocent VIII which invested him with authority to administer the order, and to this decree he compelled the electors to submit. Thus ended the political autonomy of the Order of Calatrava. The reason of its being—the struggle against the Moors—seemed, indeed, to end with the fall of Granada (1492).

The canonical bond between Calatrava and Morimond had been relaxing more and more. The King of Spain was too jealous of his authority to tolerate any foreign—especially French—intervention in the affairs of his kingdom. The canonical visits of the Abbot of Morimond ceased; difficulties were raised when the grand prior came from Morimond to take possession of his dignity. The last French prior was Nicholas of Avesnes, who died in 1552. After a long contest, a compromise was effected in 1630, leaving to Morimond its right of electing the grand prior, but limiting its choice to Spanish Cistercians. Moreover, the knights of the order were virtually secularized: Pope Paul III commuted their vow of celibacy to one of conjugal fidelity (1540). As members of the order were allowed to found families, and were authorized by Julius III (1551) to make free use of their personal property, the vow of poverty also passed into virtual desuetude. In 1652, under Philip IV, the three Spanish orders took a new vow: that of defending the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This was the last manifestation of any religious spirit in the orders. The military spirit, too, had long since disappeared. The orders had, in fact, fallen into a state of utter inactivity. The commanderies were but so many pensions at the king's free disposal, and granted by him rather to the high-born than to the deserving. In 1628 the Order of Calatrava was declared to be inaccessible not only to tradesmen, but even to sons of tradesmen. The last attempt to employ the knights of the three orders for a military purpose was that of Philip IV, in quelling the rebellion of the Catalans (1640–50), but the orders restricted their efforts to the complete equipment of one regiment, which has since been known in the Spanish army as "The Regiment of the Orders".

When the Bourbon dynasty occupied the throne, Charles III, having founded the personal order of his name, levied upon the old orders a contribution of a million reals to pension 200 knights of the new order (1775). Their revenues being the only remaining *raison d'être* of the order, confiscation necessarily led to dissolution. Confiscated by King Joseph (1808), re-established by Ferdinand VII at the Restoration (1814), the possessions of Calatrava were finally dissipated in the general secularization of 1838. (See ALCÁNTARA; MILITARY ORDERS.)

Definiciones de la Orden y Cavalleria de Calatrava (Valladolid, 1600); MANRIQUE, *Series præfectorum militiæ Calatravæ*, in his *Annales*, III, Appendix; JONGELINUS, *Origines equestrium militarium ordinis cisterciensis* (Cologne, 1640); ZAPATER, *Cister militante* (Saragossa, 1662); DUBOIS, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Morimond avec les principaux ordres militaires d'Espagne et de Portugal* (Paris, 1851).

CH. MOELLER.

Calcutta, ARCHDIOCESE OF, in British India.—THE ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF CALCUTTA comprises practically the old province of Bengal, where the Catholic Faith was introduced very early. About the middle of the sixteenth century Portuguese merchants were trading with the ports of Bengal. But they did not stay in the country; their ships came to Bengal with the monsoon at the end of May, and went back to Cochin in October. About 1571 they obtained from Akbar, the great Mogul emperor then residing in Agra, very important concessions: they were allowed to build a town in Hugli, to erect churches, send for priests and baptize the natives who might wish to become Christians. Portuguese merchants and settlers soon flocked to Hugli, many natives became Christians, so that in 1598 the number of Catholics in Hugli was five thousand, of Portuguese, native, or mixed origin.

Quite different were the origin and the character of the other Catholic communities which sprang up all over Bengal at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. Native rulers, whose states were continually exposed to the raids of their enemies, appealed for protection to the Portuguese adventurers then numerous in India and famous for their undaunted bravery. They settled in *bandels*, generally situated on the bank of a river, and received for their military services lands, a monthly pay, and a share of the booty. Their numbers increased rapidly, for they married native women, and many native converts came to them for protection and security. These converts were called *topassees*, because they wore a hat, like the Portuguese (*topa* means hat). In 1598 there were on the coast of Chittagong and Arracan 2500 Catholics of Portuguese or mixed origin, besides the native Christians. All the Catholic communities of Bengal were under the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Cochin, erected in 1557. But no regular provision had been made for the supply of priests and the building of churches. Hugli alone had a church and a parish priest. Elsewhere Catholics depended for spiritual ministrations on any priest who happened to be travelling through the country. On 9 January, 1606, the Diocese of San Thomé de Meliapur was erected, and Bengal was put under its jurisdiction.

Two Jesuits had gone to Bengal temporarily in 1579, and two others were sent there from Cochin in 1598 to report on the hopes and prospects of a Catholic mission. They erected in Hugli a school and hospital; in Chittagong two churches and residences; in Chandecan a church and residence; two churches were contemplated or begun in Siripur and Bacala. The native rulers were very favourable, and even generously endowed the new missions. But political disturbances ruined these happy beginnings; churches and residences were destroyed in 1603, and the four Jesuits then in Bengal were recalled by their superiors. In the meantime a permanent provision had been made for the Catholics of Bengal by the Bishop of Cochin, Don Fray André, a Franciscan. He had entrusted Bengal to the Augustinians of Goa, and is said to have conferred upon them the exclusive right to the parishes of the country. In 1599 five Augustinians landed in Hugli, built a convent of St. Nicholas of Tolentino, and took possession of the church or churches existing in the town. A few years afterwards we find them established in Angelim (Hidgelee), Tambolim (Tumlook), Pipli; about 1612 in Dacca, Noricul, Siripur, Katrabo; in 1621 in Chittagong; and after 1640 in Balasore, Ossumpoor, and Rangamati.

Chittagong deserves a special notice. The Moguls of Bengal were continually trying to wrest Chittagong from the dominion of the Emperor of Arracan. Twice they almost succeeded in taking it by surprise, and from that time this potentate always kept a large body of Portuguese in his service at Dianga, near Chittagong. Instead of waiting for the attacks of the Moguls, these Portuguese found it easier and more effective to carry the war into the enemy's territory, and they began to make periodical raids on the coasts of Bengal, carrying away whole populations of Hindu and Mohammedan villages. Thus between 1621 and 1634 they brought back with them to Chittagong 42,000 slaves, of whom the Augustinians baptized 28,000. They converted besides five thousand natives of the country, called Mugs or Mogos.

This barbarous warfare of the Portuguese of Chittagong brought about, amongst other causes, the ruin of Hugli in 1632. Shah Jehan, the Mogul emperor, ordered Khasim Khan, Nawab of Bengal, to destroy Hugli. After a siege of three months, the town was stormed; four priests and many Christians were sent prisoners to Agra. However, the Portuguese were restored to favour the next year (1633). Either by the exertions of the Jesuits of Agra and Lahore, the intervention of a Mogul prince called Assofokhan, or the negotiations of the Viceroy of Goa, Christians were allowed to settle, not in Hugli itself, but on a spot outside the town, called to this day Bandel. They erected there in 1660 a church and an Augustinian convent, still existing. The prior of the convent was the captain of the bandel, with power to try minor but not capital offences. There also was erected a convent of Augustinian nuns, which has been the occasion of the accusations levelled by travellers against the morality of Bandel. The canonical standing of this convent seems to have been rather undefined. In 1666 Aurangzeb succeeded in taking Chittagong, and the Portuguese colony was transferred to Feringhee Bazar, near Dacca.

The Jesuits went back to Bengal about 1612. Their ministry was hampered by the rivalry of the Augustinians, who strongly maintained their exclusive privilege. The former soon confined their exertions to their church and college of St. Paul in Hugli. These were built in 1621, destroyed or damaged in 1632, and reappear in 1655. For many years only one Jesuit priest was stationed there, till, in 1746, church and college were given up. In 1688 the French started a factory in Chandernagore, a few miles from Hugli. The Augustinians of Bandel claimed the right to be the parish priests of the new town, but, yielding to the representations of the French authorities, the Bishop of Meliapur created there on 10 of April, 1696, a special parish entrusted to the French Jesuits. In 1753 there were in Chandernagore 102,000 inhabitants and only 4000 Catholics. The Capuchins had settled there and built a church in 1726.

In 1690 Charnock founded Calcutta. Portuguese from Hugli settled in the new town. They built a chapel and were attended by Augustinian priests. In 1799 the chapel was replaced by the beautiful church dedicated to Our Blessed Lady of the Rosary, which is used to-day as the cathedral. The Augustinians of Bengal have been severely criticized by Protestant travellers, and, it must be granted, not without foundation. It can cause no surprise if in some cases the conduct of half-trained priests who were sent to outstations, far from any spiritual help or control, should not always have been exemplary. Besides, they were living in the midst of Pagan, Mohammedan, and Christian corruption. The defect lay in the way they were recruited. The Augustinians of Goa refused all candidates of native or mixed origin, and were therefore compelled to accept all European candidates, however unfit. As the supply was not equal to the demand, the training was necessarily short. Even so, Catholic communities had to remain without a priest for many years. The Augustinian superiors of Lisbon did not approve of such a policy; they pointed out that it was much better to select the best of the native candidates than to accept indiscriminately the young adventurers whom their families had sent to India to get rid of them. These superiors, and the King of Portugal himself, in virtue of his right of patronage, threatened more than once to recall the Augustinians from Bengal. The bishops of Meliapur insisted on better organization and discipline. All was useless; the best regulations, the most stringent orders could not be enforced at such a distance and on Mogul territory. Francis Laynez, S. J., Bishop of Meliapur, visited all the stations of Bengal in 1712, but his efforts were fruitless. In all questions of reform clergy and people were against him. They even went so far as to appeal to the Mogul authorities to stop the exercise of his episcopal jurisdiction.

At the end of the eighteenth century there were Augustinians in Calcutta and Bandel only; elsewhere the Catholics were attended by clerics from Goa. The condition of the 25,000 Catholics then living in the eleven parishes of Bengal may be summed up in two words: ignorance and corruption. They were an easy prey for Kiernander, called "the first Protestant missionary in Bengal", who went to Calcutta in 1758. But what did more for the perversion of Catholics was the erection, at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century, of a number of well-endowed Protestant schools. There was no Catholic school in Bengal before 1830. About 1829 division set in among the Catholics of Calcutta. One party, with the parish priest of the principal church at its head, wrote to Rome to obtain a British vicar Apostolic and British priests. On 18 April, 1834, the pope created the Vicariate Apostolic of Bengal, and entrusted it to the Jesuits of England. Robert St. Leger, an Irish Jesuit, was nominated first Vicar Apostolic of Bengal, and landed in Calcutta with five companions in October, 1834. The parish priest of the principal church received him in his church. The companions of St. Leger started a little college of St. Francis Xavier, which increased slowly. Most of the Catholics accepted the authority of the vicar Apostolic; only a few sided with the Goanese priests of the Boytakhana church, which was interdicted by St. Leger. St. Leger was recalled in 1838, and Mgr. Taberd, titular Bishop of Isauropolis and Vicar Apostolic of Cochin China, then living in Bengal, was appointed Vicar Apostolic of Bengal *ad interim*. He earnestly promoted Catholic education and endeared himself to all, but died suddenly 31 July, 1840. Division set in again amongst the Catholics of Calcutta. Dr. Carew, who had just succeeded Dr. O'Connor as Vicar Apostolic of Madras, was appointed Vicar Apostolic of Bengal, 20 November, 1840. He built in Calcutta the church of St. Thomas, founded schools, orphanages, asylums, and the little college of St. John. Difficulties arose between him and the Jesuits. The latter were recalled by their superior and their flourishing college of St. Francis Xavier was closed in 1846.

In 1850 Eastern Bengal and Arracan were constituted a separate vicariate, which became in 1886 the Diocese of Dacca. Dr. Oliffe, coadjutor of Dr. Carew, consecrated in October, 1843, was appointed Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Bengal. In 1852 the districts of Bengal south of the Mahanadi River were entrusted by Dr. Carew to Bishop Neyret, Vicar Apostolic of Vizigapatam. In 1853 the Foreign Missions of Paris consented to take over Assam, which has since become a prefecture Apostolic. In 1855 Dr. Carew made over to the Foreign Missions of Milan the districts of Central Bengal, which became in 1870 a prefecture Apostolic, and in 1886 the Diocese of Khrishnagur. Dr. Carew remained Vicar Apostolic of Western Bengal, and died 2 November, 1855.

THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CALCUTTA extends along the sea-coast from the Khabadak to the Mahanundi River. After the death of Dr. Carew, Dr. Oliffe, the Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Bengal, took possession of the Vicariate of Western Bengal. This vicariate, increased by the addition of the districts of Hazaribagh in 1871, Kurseong in 1881. Purneah, Santhal Parganahs, Darjeeling in 1887, is today the Archdiocese of Calcutta, with two suffragan dioceses, Dacca and Khrishnagur, and the Prefecture Apostolic of Assam. Taught by experience, Dr. Oliffe entrusted at once, with the approval of the Propaganda, his former vicariate to the Fathers of the Holy Cross. Three years afterwards he also obtained permission to put the Jesuits in charge of his Vicariate of Western Bengal.

The British Jesuits being unable to undertake the work on account of their small number, the pope entrusted the Bengal Mission to the Belgian Jesuits. Dr. Oliffe died at Naples in May, 1858. On 28 November, 1859, four Belgian and two English Jesuits, with a lay brother, landed in Calcutta and started at once, in the old St. John's College, the new College of St. Francis Xavier. In 1842 their predecessors estimated the Catholic population of Calcutta at 8000. Carew's estimate was 15,000, which seems much too high, for the Belgian Jesuits found only 6000 Catholics in Calcutta in 1859. A few hundreds were spread over Western Bengal. As the new mission was still in its experimental stage, no vicar Apostolic was appointed till 9 September, 1864, when Father Augustus Van Heule, S. J., was nominated Vicar Apostolic of Western Bengal. Unfortunately he had been only four months in Calcutta when he died suddenly, 9 June, 1865.

On 11 January, 1867, the Very Rev. Walter Steins, S. J., Vicar Apostolic of Bombay, was transferred to the Vicariate Apostolic of Western Bengal. He had accompanied in 1859 the first Belgian Jesuits to Calcutta to help them with his experience, and had been appointed in 1861 Vicar Apostolic of Bombay. He left Calcutta in 1877 for Australia, where he was appointed Bishop of Auckland. He died there 1 September, 1881. On 31 December, 1877, Father Paul Goethals, S. J., was nominated titular Archbishop of Hierapolis and Vicar Apostolic of Western Bengal. On 23 June, 1886, a new concordat was concluded between Pope Leo XIII and the King of Portugal. A concordat had already been signed between Pope Pius IX and the King of Portugal in 1857, but the difficulties caused by the double jurisdiction had subsisted in Bengal, though in a lesser degree than elsewhere. The new concordat established a permanent peace. On 1 September, 1886, the Bull "Humanæ Salutis Auctor" erected the Catholic hierarchy in India. Leo XIII sent to India Mgr. Agliardi as Apostolic Delegate, to carry out the dispositions of the Bull and settle the minor points connected with the *padroado* or Portuguese patronage. On 25 November, 1886, Dr. Goethals was appointed Archbishop of Calcutta, and the ecclesiastical province of Calcutta was constituted as above explained. In the archdiocese two churches remain under the Portuguese jurisdiction: the church of Boytakhana in Calcutta and the church of Bandel with its annexed chapel of Chinsurah. The Augustinians having given up Bengal in 1867, these churches are attended by secular priests of the Diocese of Meliapur. Their jurisdiction is personal over all those who were adhering to the Portuguese priests at the time of the Concordat of 1857 and all those who go to Calcutta, Bandel, or Chinsurah from a territory belonging to the Diocese of Meliapur.

On 9 January, 1894, the first council of the province of Calcutta opened. His Excellency Mgr. Ladislas Zaleski, titular Archbishop of Thebes and Delegate Apostolic, presided, and there were present, Archbishop Goethals of Calcutta; Bishop Francis Pozzi of Khrishnagur; Bishop Augustine Louage of Dacca, and the Very Rev. Angelus Muenzloher, S. D. S., Prefect Apostolic of Assam. The Constitutions of this council, revised at Rome, were promulgated 25 July, 1905. Archbishop Goethals's health had for some time been declining, and he died, July, 1901, at the age of sixty. Father Brice Meuleman, S. J., Superior of the Bengal Mission, was nominated Archbishop of Calcutta, 21 March, 1902, and consecrated in the cathedral 25 June following.

The area of the Archdiocese of Calcutta is about one hundred thousand square miles, inhabited by a population of about twenty-seven millions. Of these, according to the statistics of 1906, 126,529 were Catholics; 81,770 were baptized, and 44,759 were catechumens. The number has increased during 1906–1907 by about 25,000 new catechumens. There are besides in Calcutta and Bandel about 1200 natives belonging to the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Meliapur.

One hundred and ninety-three Jesuits, most of them Belgians, of whom 107 are priests, are working in the mission. Besides there are two secular priests. In Calcutta there are about 13,000 Catholics under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. They are mostly of mixed blood, called Eurasians, and many are very poor. The town is divided into eight parishes attached to the following churches: the Cathedral of Our Lady of the Rosary, St. John's, St. Xavier's, St. Thomas's, St. Theresa's, St. Patrick's (Fort-William), St. Joseph's (for the Madrassees), and the church of the Sacred Heart.

Educational and Charitable Work.—To give an exact idea of the Calcutta Mission it will be best to consider the educational and charitable work carried on exclusively by religious communities, the railway and military chaplains, and the native missions. The Jesuits have built for the training of their junior members a house of theological studies (St. Mary's), in Kurseong, and a house of probation (Manresa House), in Ranchi. They have opened two colleges for boys, St. Xavier's in Calcutta with about 800 boys and St. Joseph's in Darjeeling with about 200 boarders. In 1847 Dr. Carew had begun in Calcutta a little congregation of Brothers, which Goethals succeeded in affiliating to the Irish Christian Brothers in 1890. In Calcutta they have charge of the Male Orphanage with 300 boys and St. Joseph's High School with 800; in Howrah, of St. Aloysius' School with 70; in Assansol, of St. Patrick's High School with 240; in Kurseong, of the Goethals Memorial Orphanage with 150. Thirty-five Brothers are working in the archdiocese. The Loreto nuns from Rathfarnam, Ireland, went to Calcutta in 1842. They have charge, in Calcutta, of the Chowringhee, Bowbazar, Dhurrumtollah, and Sealdah schools and the Entally orphanage, with about 1500 pupils; in Assansol, of a school with 140 girls; in Darjeeling, of a boarding school with 160, and in Morapai, of 160 native Bengali girls. There are ninety nuns of this order. The Daughters of the Cross of Liège, Belgium, located in Calcutta on 22 December, 1868. They have charge, in Calcutta, of St. Vincent's Home with 252 inmates; in Howrah, of a school with 120 girls; in Chaybassa, of a native school and orphanage with 70 girls; in Kurseong, of St. Helen's High School with 220 pupils. There are forty-five nuns. The Ursulines of Thildonck, Belgium, went to Bengal in January, 1903. They have twelve nuns in charge of the native girls' schools in the Chotanagpore Mission, and convents in Ranchi, Khunti, Tongo, Rengarih. The Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny have had charge since 1903 of the native girls' orphanage in Balasore, where five nuns take care of 80 inmates. The Daughters of St. Anne are a native congregation begun five or six years ago. The Bengali branch is under the direction of the Loreto nuns in Morapai, the Chotanagpore branch under the direction of the Ursulines in Ranchi.

Railway and Military Chaplains.—For British Catholic soldiers in Bengal there are four military chaplains stationed at Darjeeling, Dumdum, Calcutta (Fort-William). They are paid by the Government. The priest at Serampore attends to the soldiers stationed at Barrackpore. Railway employees are attended to by seven railway chaplains stationed at Sealdah, Assansol, Khargpur, Purneah, Kurseong. All these chaplains attend also to the Catholic population not belonging to the railway or the army.

Native Missions.—One of the great difficulties met with in the conversion of the natives is the thirty-five languages spoken in the archdiocese. The Mohammedans seem to give no hope of conversion, the Hindus little more. But the Catholic Faith has made great progress among the aborigines during the last

twenty-five years. There are small native missions in Kurseong, Darjeeling, Purneah, Jhargram, each with a few hundred Catholics. During the famine of 1866 Father Sapart gathered at Balasore a number of native orphans. Later on the station of Khrishnochondronur was founded in the native state of Morbhunj. The number of Ouryia converts is about 1800. There are two priests, one church in Balasore, 6 native chapels, 5 schools with about 220 children. The Sunderbunds missions were started in 1868 among the Bengalis who cultivate the marshy swamps of the Gangetic Delta, south of Calcutta. There are two central stations with two priests each, Morapai and Raghabpur; 3200 Bengali converts are spread over a great many villages. There are 2 churches, 22 native chapels, 7 schools with 450 children. In the Chotanagpore missions, west of Calcutta, the population is mostly of Dravidian (Ouraons) or Mogul (Mundas) origin with a few minor tribes. They believe in one Supreme God who, however, they say, is so good that they need not trouble about him; they worship the devil who can do them harm, and to him they offer sacrifices. At the end of 1868 a priest started a mission in Chaybassa without great success. In February, 1876, another priest was sent to Ranchi to take care of 200 Madrassee soldiers stationed there, and opened a native mission in Buruma, in the direction of Chaybassa. The priest of Chaybassa started then a mission in Burudi, in the direction of Ranchi.

It was only in 1885, when Father Lievens, the real founder of the Chotanagpore mission, appeared on the scene, that the mission began to make great progress. His policy, followed by his successors, was to help the natives in every way, to protect them against the tyranny of their landlords and the native police, and to feed them in times of scarcity. In return he wanted them to send their children to his schools, where they were trained as good Christians. The Lutherans of the Gossner Mission had been working for more than fifty years in Chotanagpore, and had met till then with great success. But they opposed in vain Father Lievens's generous efforts. He never spared himself, and within six years broke down in health. He returned to Belgium in September, 1892, and died at Louvain in November, 1893, of consumption. But he had started the work on permanent lines, and it did not die with him. Today there are in Chotanagpore more than 100,000 converts, baptized or catechumens; in the year 1906–1907 more than 25,000 catechumens joined the Catholic Church. The difficulty is to cope with such a number of catechumens, to instruct them in the Faith, and to take care of such a large number spread over an immense country. There are fifteen stations with thirty priests. In all these stations there are central schools; in villages more important a catechist and a school. The four convents built by the Ursulines in Ranchi, Khunti, Tongo, and Rengarih exercise a great influence for good in the family life of these neophytes. Ranchi is the head-quarters of the mission, and has a central boys' school for select pupils from the districts, an Apostolic school to train catechists and help vocations to the priesthood, and a central girls' school, where the native Daughters of St. Ann are trained under the Ursuline nuns. The needs of this mission may be summed up in these two words: men and money. More men and more money would allow the mission to extend indefinitely the field of operations westwards, so as to create a zone of Catholic country across the whole of India from Calcutta to Bombay. This mission has 8 churches, 281 native chapels, 85 schools, with more than 3000 pupils.

Missiones Catholicæ (Rome, Propaganda press, 1907), 202–4; BATTANDIER, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1907), 217; WERNER, *Orbis terrarum Catholicus* (Freiburg, 1880); STREIT, *Atlas des Missions Catholiques* (Steyl, Holland, 1906); HUNTER, *Statistical Account of Bengal* (20 vols., London, 1877) and *History of British India* (annual, London, 1899——); *Statistical Abstract for British India;* WILLIAMS, *Modern India* (1879); IDEM, *Religious Thought and Life in India* (1883); *Statesman's Year-Book* (London, 1907), 136–79. For the minor events of the history of the Bengal Mission, see the files of the Bengal *Catholic Expositor* (1839–1840); Bengal *Catholic Herald* (1840–57); *Indo-European Correspondence* (1865–1902). In 1903 the name of the last paper was changed to *The Catholic Herald of India;* it is published weekly in Calcutta.

LEOPOLD DELAUNOIT.

Caldara, POLIDORO (DA CARAVAGGIO), an Italian painter, b. at Caravaggio, 1492 (or 1495); d. at Messina, 1543. He passed his boyhood in poverty and misery, leaving Caravaggio when eighteen years old to seek work. Going to Rome, he was employed to carry mortar for the artists in the Vatican who were painting frescoes for Leo X. He watched them copying Raphael's designs, and soon emulated them so successfully that he attracted Raphael's attention and became his pupil. Maturino and Udine, for whom he prepared plaster, were his first instructors. He studied the antique, and the friezes and other ornaments he made for Raphael's pictures are noted for their appropriateness and Athenian purity. Caldara was the first of the Roman masters to employ chiaroscuro, probably from his profound study of the antique; and colour was a secondary consideration with him. He decorated the exterior of many Roman palaces in sgraffito, a form of painting where, over a dark background, often stucco, a lighter-coloured layer was painted, and designs, scratched through the light layer, only showed dark on light (*en camaieu*).

These designs are known to-day only from reproductive etchings and engravings from the hands of Alberti and Goltzius. When Rome was sacked in 1527, Caldara went to Naples, where he was helped by Andrea da Salerna. He started a school and received many commissions for frescoes. He left Naples for Sicily and in Messina attained great success. He painted the triumphal arches erected on the return of Charles V from Tunis, and in 1534 produced his masterpiece, "Christ Bearing the Cross". This oil is grand in conception and composition, and is treated in a far more naturalistic style than any of his other paintings. One of his "Magdalens" is celebrated for its beautiful landscape background. He was about to return to Rome (1543) when his Sicilian servant murdered him for his money. Naples and Messina possess many of his paintings. Some of his noteworthy works are: friezes in the Vatican; "Psyche received into Olympus", in the Louvre, Paris; "Passage of the Red Sea", in the Brera, Milan.

LIPPMAN, *Engraving and Etching*, tr. HARDIE (New York, 1906); LÜBKE, *Geschichte der italienischen Malerei* (Stuttgart, 1878); MUTHER, *History of Painting*, tr. KRIEHN; WORNUM, *Epochs of Painting Characterized* (London, 1847).

LEIGH HUNT.

Caldas-Barbosa, DOMINGOS, a Brazilian poet, b. of a white father and a negro mother at Rio Janeiro in 1740; d. in Lisbon, 9 Nov., 1800. Trained at the Jesuit college in Rio Janeiro, he developed a power of literary improvisation which he indulged at the expense of the Portuguese whites and thereby stirred them up against him. His enemies had him forcibly enrolled in a body of troops setting forth for the colony of Sacramento, where he remained until 1762. Returning to Rio Janeiro he soon embarked for Portugal, and there obtained the patronage of two nobles of the Vasconcellos family, the Conde de Pombeiro and the Marquez de Castello Melhor. Taking minor orders he received a religious benefice, being attached as chaplain to the Casa da Supplicação.

Although he was a mulatto, he obtained entrance into high society in the Portuguese capital, chiefly because he was a clever entertainer who could improvise *cantigas* and play his own accompaniment on the viol. Hence the somewhat humiliating sobriquet of *cantor de viola* which was given to him. Well aware that his social status was an uncertain one, he retained his self-possession even in the face of the insulting attitude of the poet Bocage and others. With most of the

Portuguese poets of the time he had pleasant relations, consorting with them in one or another literary academy. His *cantigas* acquired great popularity, and it is sometimes difficult to single out his compositions from the mass of those claimed by the people as their own. Yet he was not a great genius; he was rather a minor poet of a facile vein, able to express himself simply, and to avoid the bombast and the sensuality so common in his age. His poetical definition of the characteristically Portuguese quality of *saudades* remains famous.

See edition of his poems published under his academic name of LERENO, *Viola de Lereno: collecçao das suas cantigas*, etc. (Lisbon, 1825); DE VARNHAGEN, *Florilegio da poesia brazileira* (Lisbon, 1850), I, II, III (Madrid, 1853); WOLF, *Le Brésil littéraire* (Berlin, 1863); SYLVIO ROMERO, *Hist. da litt. brazileira* (Rio de Janeiro, 1902).

J. D. M. FORD.

Calderon de la Barca, PEDRO, b. 1600; d. 1681; a Spanish dramatist whose activity marks the second half of the golden age of Spanish literature. His time was one of social and political decay under the rule of Philip III and Philip IV, when all things indicated the irretrievable loss of the mighty foreign empire which Spain had acquired during previous reigns; yet, even in this melancholy period Spain produced a poet of lasting national significance in the person of Calderon. Undoubtedly the value of Calderon has been overrated, in so far as the modern world has allowed him to outshine Lope de Vega, for it should be remembered that Calderon inherited the scenic traditions of the sixteenth century, to which Lope had given a magnificent development. Yet Calderon must be credited with giving to those traditions an interpretation which clearly captivated his contemporaries as it did the more recent race of the Romantics in Germany. By giving full expression in his theatre to purely national qualities he endeared himself to his own people in a way that will always safeguard his repute wherever Spanish is spoken and the past glory of Spain is revered. Like Lope de Vega, he came of a northern (Asturian) stock, although he was born in Madrid. After a preliminary training in the capital, he went to the University of Salamanca at a time when that institution was at the acme of its glory, and there he spent six years. The few facts ascertainable for the years ensuing upon his residence at Salamanca show him figuring in the Spanish campaigns in Italy and in the Netherlands, and then returning to Madrid to undertake the management of the theatre of the Buen Retiro. The reigning monarch, Philip IV, was exceedingly attached to him and showed him favour in various ways, as by bestowing a pension on him, by urging him to constant dramatic composition, and by providing funds for the expenses involved in splendid and costly performances of his plays. In 1637 he was appointed to membership in the Order of Santiago, and three years later he served with his order in the campaign against the rebellious Catalans. Like Lope, he turned to Holy orders when his prime was passing, for in 1651 he was ordained to the priesthood; but, quite unlike Lope, he was an exemplary member of the ministry. Honours came to him in his new vocation; thus, in 1663 he was appointed an honorary chaplain to the sovereign, and in 1666 he was made superior of the Congregation of St. Peter. His dramatic labours were carried on unabated after his ordination and continued down to the year of his death. Of less varied genius than his predecessor, Lope de Vega, Calderon gave expression to himself in his dramas only; for his non-dramatic prose works are of very minor value—a treatise on painting is perhaps the most notable—and his lyrics, although many in number, are to be sought in his plays and not in any considerable separate collections. It is to be observed, none the less, that he is a great lyric poet, and that his lyrism saturates his dramatic compositions from first to last. With the collected editions of his plays published during his lifetime, Calderon was not concerned at all, except that he superintended the preparation of the edition of his *autos* (sacred allegorical dramas) which appeared in 1676. On the basis of a list of his pieces which he prepared in 1681, his biographer, Vera Tasis, published after his death a nine-volume edition of them. This was made up somewhat *ad libitum*, as the critic Menéndez y Pelayo has pointed out; yet, in default of a better edition, it still remains authoritative, in spite of the fact that it was put forth by one of the most culteranistic disciples of the poet. We should be glad to believe, as some scholars are inclined to do, that the offensive Gongorism of many passages in Calderon's best pieces, their obscurity and extravagant bombast, should be charged to the account of a meddlesome collector and editor, that is, to Vera Tasis, and not to Calderon. The extant works of Calderon embrace some 120 *comedias*, including individual works and those written in collaboration with others, and, furthermore, some 70 or 80 *autos sacramentales* (sacred allegorical dramas on the Eucharist). In so far as regards the *comedias*, the modern editions reproduce the text of Vera Tasis; he did not print the *autos* in his collection. The fullest modern edition of all Calderon's plays is that of J. G. Keil (4 vols., Leipzig, 1827–30); the most accessible is, as yet, that in the "Biblioteca de autores españoles", vols. VII, IX, XII and XIV, which also has some of the *autos* in vol. LVIII. The best edition of the *autos* continues to be that of J. Fernandez de Apontes (1759–60). Vera Tasis stated in his "Fama póstuma de Calderón" that the poet had written a great number of *entremeses* and *sainetes* (interludes and short farces); as a matter of fact, not more than a score of such briefer pieces, interludes and the like, can now be found. Were one to contrast Shakspeare with Lope de Vega, he would discover that, while Shakspeare belongs to all men and all time, Lope is the particular property of Spain, and is bounded by national limitations. The character of Calderon is even more limited still; he is not only Spanish rather than universal, but, as a Spaniard, he typifies the sentiments and ideals of a narrowly restricted period, the seventeenth century. It may be added that in his theatre and in his daily life he was a model of the truly Christian and knightly poet of his period. The ideas most distinctive of his age which we see reflected in Calderon's dramatic works are: (1) intense devotion to the Catholic Faith; (2) absolute and unquestioning loyalty to the Spanish sovereign; and (3) a highly developed, even much exaggerated, feeling of honour (the *pundonor*). His religious fervour is exemplified in his *comedias devotas* (sacred dramas not allegorical) as, for instance, in his "Príncipe constante" and his "Purgatorio de San Patricio", the latter being one of the most famous of the literary treatments of the legend of St. Patrick's Purgatory, and especially in his *autos sacramentales*. These little pieces (see AUTOS SACRAMENTALES) deal only with the Eucharistic Mystery, which is set forth through the medium of allegorical characters. In the production of them Calderon has never been surpassed. For while "his set pieces", in the opinion of Fitzmaurice-Kelly, who is a competent judge, "are disfigured by want of humour and by over-refinement", these faults "turn to virtues in the *autos*, where abstractions are wedded to the noblest poetry, where the Beyond is brought down to earth, and where doctrinal subtleties are embellished." Typical *autos* are "Los encantos de la culpa", which D. F. MacCarthy translated so skillfully under the title of "The Sorceries of Sin", "La viña del Señor", "La siembra del Señor", and "La semilla y la cizaña".

In his strictly secular pieces Calderon has succeeded rather by virtue of his lyrism, which is undoubtedly of transcendent quality, than because of

any considerable dramatic ingenuity of his own. In fact, fertility of conception as to plot and incident was strikingly lacking in him, he was not in the least loath to borrow ideas from his predecessors and contemporaries, and sometimes he went so far as to appropriate whole sections of their dramas. In the creation and development of character he achieved any high degree of success only occasionally. There is, on the whole, so much of a sameness about his personages and their behaviour as to justify the charge of monotony brought against him. To the national principle of blind and unreasoning fealty to the monarch he gives expression in a number of his most read plays, among which are the "El Príncipe constante", "La banda y la flor", and "Guárdate de agua mansa". The point of honour, often carried to morbid extremes, provides the *motif* in such characteristic pieces as the "Alcalde de Zalamea", the "Pintor de su deshonra", the "Médico de su honra", and "A secreto agravio secreta venganza." The actuating principle in these works can hardly appeal to us; we can feel little sympathy with a personage who methodically and in cold blood slays the one by whom his honour has been affronted. For us such an action is a perversion of the ideals of chivalry. That Calderon could, when he chose to exert himself, attain to some depth of philosophic thought is proved by "La vida es sueño", in which there is a wealth of fancy that charms us even despite the occasional bombast and obscurity of the style. A noteworthy piece because of its relation to a philosophic question agitated by Goethe and Marlowe is the "Mágico prodigioso", wherein we have a Spanish treatment of the Faust legend. In conclusion, there may be set down the final judgment upon Calderon by Fitzmaurice-Kelly, a critic not at all too favourable and yet disposed to do justice to his subject. He says that "Calderon takes rank among the greatest authors of the Spanish theatre in that he is the greatest Spanish poet who has had recourse to the dramatic form. His race, his faith, his temperament, his especial environment prevented him from becoming a universal poet; his majesty, his devout lyrism, his decorative fancy suffice to put him in the first rank of national poets."

FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *History of Spanish Literature* (London and New York, 1907); TRENCH, *Calderon* (London, 1880), still useful, although a little antiquated; MACCOLL, *Selected Plays of Calderon* (London, 1888); MACCARTHY, *Love the Greatest Enchantment*, etc. (London, 1861); KRENKEL, *Klassische Bühnendichtungen der Spanier* (annotated edition of three leading plays, Leipzig, 1881–87); MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO ed., *Teatro selecto de Calderón* (4 vols., Madrid, 1881); ROUANET, *Drames religieux de Calderon* (Paris, 1888); *Poesías inéditas de Calderón* (Madrid, 1881); MOREL-FATIO, *Calderon* in *Revue critique des travaux d'érudition* (Paris, 1881); GÜNTHER, *Calderon und seine Werke* (2 vols., Freiburg im Br., 1888).

J. D. M. FORD.

Caleb (Heb. כָּלֵב). (1) CALEB, SON OF JEPHONE, THE CENEZITE, the representative of the tribe of Juda among the spies sent from Cades to explore Chanaan. On their return he and Josue combated the exaggerated reports of the other spies and endeavoured to reassure the people, but without success, and in the mutiny which broke out they nearly fell victims to the popular fury. In reward for their conduct they were exempted from the decree condemning the adult population to die in the desert (Num., xiii, xiv; Deut., i, 19–36). Caleb was appointed one of the commissioners to divide the Promised Land among the tribes (Num., xxxiv, 19). On the strength of the Divine promise made to him at Cades at the time of the mutiny (Num., xiv, 24), he asked and obtained as his portion the district of Hebron (Jos., xiv, 6 sq.); the city itself was, however, assigned to the priests (Jos., xxi, 11–13). Though he was then in his eighty-fifth year, he still possessed the full vigour of manhood, and took the field to conquer the territory allotted to him (Jos., xiv, 7 sq.; xv, 13 sq.). We last hear of him in connexion with the marriage of his daughter Axa to his brother Othoniel (Jos., xv, 16–19; Judges, i, 12–15). It may be remarked that probably neither "brother" nor "daughter" is to be taken in the strict sense. Caleb is praised by the son of Sirach with the great men of Israel (Ecclus., xlvi, 9 sq.), and Mathathias numbers him among the Israelites distinguished for their zeal and faith (I Mach., ii, 56). Although a prominent figure in Hebrew history, Caleb seems not to have been an Israelite by birth, but to have become a member of the Chosen People by adoption into the Tribe of Juda. This is intimated by Jos., xv, 13, where Caleb is distinguished from the sons of Juda, by the designation Cenezite (*hâqqenizzî*), which is a gentilitial form, and by the absence of Cenez and Jephone from the genealogical lists of Juda in I Par., ii. A Cenez appears among the grandchildren of Esau (Gen., xxxvi, 11, 15, 42), and a tribe of Cenezites, no doubt descendants of this Cenez, is mentioned in Gen., xv, 19. Caleb probably was connected with this tribe. Admission to full tribal membership of strangers who embraced the Hebrew religion and customs was not foreign to Hebrew practice, and the Edomites, children of Abraham and Isaac, would be readily received because of their racial affinity. (Cf. Deut., xxiii, 7–8, where, however, admission is restricted to the third generation.)

(2) CALEB, SON OF HESRON, a descendant of Juda (I Par., ii, 18, 42 sq.), also called Calubi [Heb., *Kelûbâi* (ib., ii, 9)]. He is only mentioned in the genealogical tables of I Par., ii, where his descendants by different wives are enumerated. Many identify this Caleb with the son of Jephone, who, in the view stated above, would be merely the legal son of Hesron through adoption into his family. The reason for this identification is that both had a daughter named Achsa (written Axa in the Vulgate, Jos., xv, 16, 17; Judges, i, 12, 13). But, to touch only one difficulty, the son of Jephone could not have been the great-grandfather of Beseleel, who was a skilled artificer when Caleb was barely forty years old (cf. Jos., xiv, 7). To get rid of the difficulty, as Hummelauer does (Com. in Num., 202), by making Uri and Beseleel adopted sons of Hur, or by rejecting I Par., ii, 20, is too arbitrary a solution to commend itself.

(3) A man of Juda, the brother of Sua and father of Mahir, whose name according to the Heb. text is Kelûb (I Par., iv, 11).

(4) The name of a clan of the tribe of Juda, derived from Caleb, the son of Jephone, and his Cenezite followers—the Calebites. As said above [under (1)], they were not of Israelitic origin. They settled in the territory around Hebron (Jos., xiv, 12–14), chiefly to the south, it would seem. They must have reached as far south as the Negeb (the "south" or "south country" in D. V.), since Caleb gave land in the Negeb to his daughter Axa for dowry (Jos., xv, 19; Jud., i, 15; cf. Heb. text), and a district of the Negeb was called the Negeb of Caleb ("south of Caleb", D. V., I Kings, xxx, 14). In David's time we find the Calebite Nabal, the husband of Abigail, dwelling in Maon and having possessions in Carmel, now el-Kurmul, ten miles south of Hebron. The statement that Caleb is a totem name, derived from the tribe's totem, the dog, and therefore equivalent to "dog-tribe", rests on no better foundation than the questionable etymological connexion of *Caleb* with *Kélêb*, "dog".

(5) CALEB, THE NEGEB OF (I Kings, xxx, 14).—One of the districts of the Negeb, or "south country", a region extending from the "mountain" or "hill country" of Juda to the Desert of Sin. The Negeb of Caleb is said to be the district in which lay Ziph, Maon, Carmel (el-Kurmul), and Jota; in Jos., xv, 55, however, these cities are included in "the mountain". [See Palmer, Desert of the Exodus (New York, 1872), 238, 358 sq.]

(6) CALEB-EPHRATA.—The name of a place, according to the Masoretic text (I Par., ii, 24); but there is little or no doubt that, with the Vulgate and Septuagint, we should read "Caleb went in to Ephrata" (his wife), instead of "in Caleb-Ephrata".

F. BECHTEL.

Calendar, CHRISTIAN.—GENERALITIES.—All civilized peoples and even those which seem to be only just emerging from utter barbarism keep some kind of record of the flight of time and are prone to recognize certain days, recurring at regular intervals, as days of special rejoicing or mourning, or occasions for the propitiation of the powers of the unseen world. In ancient Egypt and Babylonia, in China and Hindostan, and again on the American Continent, among the Aztecs or the ancient Peruvians, definite traces have been found of a more or less elaborate calculation of seasons serving as a basis for religious observances. Only of recent years, i. e. in Nov., 1897, a remarkable discovery was made at Coligny in the department of Ain, France, when certain inscribed stone slabs were brought to light in which all are agreed in recognizing an ancient Celtic calendar, probably pre-Christian, though the precise interpretation of the details still remains a matter of lively controversy. Again, both Greece and Rome possessed highly developed calendars, and the *Fasti* of Ovid, for example, preserve a detailed description in verse of the chief celebrations of the Roman year.

What more nearly concerns us here is the Jewish calendar, outlined in Lev., xxiii. The computation of time among the Jews was based primarily upon the lunar month. The year consisted normally of twelve such months, alternately of 29 and 30 days each; such a year, however, contains only 354 days, which by no means agrees with the number of days in the mean solar year. Moreover, the exact length of the mean lunar month is not exactly 29½ days as the above arrangement would suggest. To compensate for the irregularity two corrections were introduced. First, a day was added to the month Hesvan (Heshwan) or subtracted from the month Kislev (Kislew), as need arose, in order to keep the months in agreement with the moon; secondly, eight years out of every nineteen were made "embolismic", i. e. an intercalary month seems to have been introduced when necessary, at this point, in order to prevent the 14th day of Nisan from arriving too early. On that day (Lev., xxiii, 5, 10) the firstfruits of corn in the ear had to be brought to the priests and the paschal lamb sacrificed. This made it necessary to delay the Pasch (14 Nisan) until the corn was in ear and the lambs were ready, and the rule was accordingly established that 14 Nisan must fall when the sun first passed the equinox and was in the constellation of Aries (a sign not [illegible]—Josephus, Ant., I, i, 6). Down to the time of the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, it would seem that in the insertion of this intercalary month the Jews followed no fixed rule based on astronomical principles, but that the Sanhedrim decided each time whether the year should be embolismic or not, being influenced in their decision not by astronomical considerations alone, but also, in some measure, by the forwardness or backwardness of the season. It was the difficulty created by such a system and by the impossibility of accommodating it to the Julian chronology, adopted throughout the greater part of the Roman Empire, which led to those troubles about the determination of Easter (the Paschal controversy) that played so important a part in the history of the early Church. Besides the Pasch and the week of the unleavened bread (or azymes), of which the Pasch formed the first day, the Jewish calendar, of course, included many other feasts. That of Pentecost, or "of the weeks", 50 days after the Pasch, is of importance because it also found a place in the Christian Dispensation. The other great celebrations of the Jewish year occurred in autumn, in the month Tishri. The Day of Atonement fell on 10 Tishri and the Feast of Tabernacles extended from the 14th to the 21st, with a sort of octave day on the 22nd, but these had no direct bearing on the calendar of the Christian Church. The same may be said of the minor Jewish festivals, e. g. the Encænia mentioned in the Gospel of St. John, which were, for the most part, of later institution.

It might almost be laid down as a general law that in the ancient world holy days were also holidays. In the Jewish system, besides the weekly sabbath, rest from work was enjoined on seven other days of the year, to wit: the first and last day of the Azymes, the feast of Pentecost, the Neomenia of the Seventh month, the day of Propitiation, the first day of Tabernacles, and 22 Tishri which immediately followed. It is not wonderful that this principle was recognized later in the Christian Church, for it had pagan example also in its favour. "The Greeks and barbarians", says Strabo (X, 39), "have this in common that they accompany their sacred rites by a festal remission of labour". So without seeking to derive the Jewish sabbath from any Babylonian institution, for which there is certainly no warrant, we may note that the new moon and the 7th, 15th, and 22nd seem to have been regarded among the Babylonians as times for propitiating the gods and unlucky; the result being that on these days no new work was begun and affairs of importance were suspended. In the Christian system the day of rest has been transferred from the Sabbath to the Sunday. Constantine made provision that his Christian soldiers should be free to attend service on the Sunday (Euseb., Vita Const., IV, 19, 20), and he also forbade the courts of justice to sit on that day (Sozom., I, 8). THEODOSIUS II in 425 decreed that games in the circus and theatrical representations should also be prohibited on the day of rest, and these and similar edicts were frequently repeated.

In the Roman chronological system of the Augustan age the week as a division of time was practically unknown, though the twelve calendar months existed as we have them now. In the course of the first and second century after Christ, the hebdomadal or seven-day period became universally familiar, though not immediately through Jewish or Christian influence. The arrangement seems to have been astrological in origin and to have come to Rome from Egypt. The seven planets, as then conceived of—Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the Moon, thus arranged in the order of their periodic times (Saturn taking the longest and the Moon the shortest time to complete the round of the heavens by their proper motion)—were supposed to preside over each hour successively, and the day was designated by that planet which presided over its first hour. Beginning on the first day with the planets in order, the first hour would be Saturn's, the second Jupiter's, the seventh the Moon's, the eighth Saturn's again, and so on. Continuing thus, the twenty-fifth hour, i. e. the first hour of the second day, and consequently the second day itself, would belong to the Sun; and the forty-ninth hour, and consequently the third day, to the Moon. Following always the same plan the seventy-second hour and the fourth day would fall to Mars, the 73rd day to Mercury, the sixth to Jupiter, the seventh to Venus, and the eighth again to Saturn. Hence, apparently, were derived the Latin names for the days of the week, which are still retained (except Samedi and Dimanche) in modern French and other Romance tongues. These names from an early date were often used by the Christians themselves, and we find them already in Justin Martyr. The special honour which the faithful paid to the Sunday [illegible] coupled perhaps with the celebration of Christmas on the day designated the *natalis invicti* [*solis*]

(see CHRISTMAS), may have helped, later on, to produce the impression that the Christians had much in common with the worshippers of Mithras.

FOUNDATIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN CALENDAR.—*The Easter Cycle.*—The starting-point of the Christian system of feasts was of course the commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ on Easter day (q. v.). The fact that for a long time Jews must have formed the vast majority of the members of the infant Church, rendered it impossible for them to forget that each returning Passover celebrated by their countrymen brought with it the anniversary of their Redeemer's Passion and of His glorious Resurrection from the dead. Moreover, as they had all their lives been accustomed to observe a weekly day of rest and prayer, it must have been almost inevitable that they should wish so to modify this holiday that it might serve as a weekly commemoration of the source of all their new hopes. Probably at first they did not wholly withdraw from the Synagogue, and the Sunday must have seemed rather a prolongation of, than a substitution for, the old familiar Sabbath. But it was not long before the observance of the first day of the week became distinctive of Christian worship. St. Paul (Coloss., ii, 16) evidently considered that the converts from paganism were not bound to the observance of the Jewish festivals or of the Sabbath proper. On the other hand, the name "the Lord's day" (*dies dominica, ἡ κυριακή*) meets us in the Apocalypse, i, 10, and was no doubt familiar at a much earlier date (cf. I Cor., xvi, 2). From the beginning the Sunday seems to have been frankly recognized among Christians for what it was, viz. the weekly commemoration of Christ's Resurrection. (Cf. The Epistle of Barnabas, xv.) It was presumably marked by the celebration of the liturgy, for St. Luke writes in the Acts: "And on the first day of the week, when we were assembled to break bread" (Acts, xx, 7); and we may infer from somewhat later ordinances that it was always regarded as joyful in character, a day when fasting was out of place, and when the faithful were instructed to pray standing, not kneeling. "Die dominico", says Tertullian, "jejunium nefas dicimus vel de geniculis adorare" (De orat., 14). In fact this upright position in prayer was, according to Pseudo (?) Irenæus, typical of the Resurrection (Irenæus, Frag., 7). But for a fuller account of this first element of the Christian calendar the reader must be referred to the article SUNDAY.

That the early Christians kept with especial honour the anniversary of the Resurrection itself is more a matter of inference than of positive knowledge. No writer before Justin Martyr seems to mention such a celebration, but the fact that in the latter half of the second century the controversy about the time of keeping Easter almost rent the Church in twain may be taken as an indication of the importance attached to the feast. Moreover the paschal fast of preparation, though its primitive duration was probably not forty days (Cf. Funk, Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen, I, 242 sq.), was constantly referred to by the Early Church as a matter of ancient and even Apostolic institution. In any case, all our earliest liturgical monuments both of East and West, for example the "Apostolical Constitutions" and the "Apostolic Canons", which are a still earlier document according to Funk and Harnack, are agreed in giving to Easter the place of honour among the feasts of the year. It is as the Roman Martyrologium describes it, *festum festorum* and *solemnitas solemnitatum*. With it have naturally always been associated the commemoration of the events of Christ's Passion, the Last Supper on the Thursday, the Crucifixion on the Friday, and on the eve itself that great vigil or night watch when the paschal candle and the fonts were blessed and the catechumens, after long weeks of preparation, were at last admitted to the Sacrament of Baptism. Data are lacking concerning these separate elements in the great paschal celebration as it was observed in the earliest times. It may, however, be noted that in Tertullian the word *pascha* clearly designates not the Sunday alone but rather a period, and in particular, the day of the Parasceve, or as we now call it, Good Friday; while in Origen a definite distinction is drawn between two kindred terms: *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον* (the Resurrection Pasch on Easter Sunday), and *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον* (the Crucifixion Pasch, i. e. Good Friday); but both were equally memorable as celebrations.

Closely dependent upon Easter and gradually developing in number as time went on were other observances also belonging to the cycle of what we now call the movable feasts. Whitsunday (see PENTECOST), the anniversary of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, was probably regarded as next in importance to Easter itself, and as Easter was determined by the Jewish Pasch, there can be little doubt, seeing that Whitsunday stood in the same close relation to the Jewish feast of Pentecost, that the Jewish converts observed both a Christian Pasch and a Christian Pentecost from the very beginning. Ascension day, though determined in position by the fact that it was forty days after Easter (Acts, i, 3) and ten before Whitsuntide, was not superimposed on any Jewish feast. We do not, consequently, find it attested by any writer earlier than Eusebius (De sol. pasch., Migne, P. G. xxiv, 679). Lent, which all admit to have been known as a forty days' fast in the early years of the fourth century (cf. the various Festal Letters of St. Athanasius), had of course a fixed *terminus ad quem* in Easter itself, but its *terminus a quo* seems to have varied considerably in different parts of the world. In some places the understanding seemed to be that Lent was a season of forty days in which there was much fasting but not necessarily a daily fast—the Sundays in any case, and in the East Saturdays also, were always exempt. Elsewhere it was held that Lent must necessarily include forty actual fasting-days. Again there were places where the fasting in Holy Week was regarded as something independent, which had to be superadded to the forty days of Lent. The time, therefore, of commencing the Lenten fast varied considerably, just as there was considerable diversity in the severity with which the fast was kept. (For these details see LENT.) All that we need notice here is that this penitential season, which at a considerably later period was thrown back to the Sunday known as Septuagesima (strictly the Sunday within the period of seventy days before Easter), began earlier or later according to the day on which Easter Sunday fell, while the later additions at the other end—such as Trinity Sunday, Corpus Christi, and in still more recent times, the Feast of the Sacred Heart—all equally formed part of the same festal cycle.

There can be little doubt that the early Christians felt as we do the inconvenience of this movable element in the otherwise stable framework of the Julian calendar. But we have to remember that the movable element was established there by right of prior occupation. Since the Jewish Christians, as explained above, had never known any other computation of time than that based on the lunar month, the only way which could have occurred to them of fixing the anniversary of Our Saviour's Resurrection was by referring it to the Jewish Pasch. But while accepting this situation, they also showed a certain independence. It seems to have been decided that the occurrence of the Resurrection feast on the first day of the week, the day which followed the Sabbath, was an essential feature. Hence, instead of determining that the second day after the Jewish Pasch (17 Nisan) should always be counted as the anniversary of the Resurrection, independently of the day of the week

upon which it might fall, the Apostles appear to have settled, though in this we have very little positive evidence, that that Sunday was to be kept as the Christian Pasch which fell within the Azymes, or days of the unleavened bread, whether it occurred at the beginning, middle, or end of the term. This arrangement had the drawback that it made the Christian feast dependent upon the computation of the Jewish calendar. When the destruction of Jerusalem practically deprived the Jews of the dispersion of any norm or standard of uniformity, they probably fell into erroneous or divergent reckonings, and this in turn entailed a difference of opinion among the Christians. If it had been possible to ascertain in terms of the Julian chronology the day of the month on which Christ actually suffered, it would probably have been simplest for Christians all over the Roman world to celebrate their Easter, as later on they celebrated Christmas or St. Peter's day, upon a fixed anniversary. Yet this, be it noticed, would have interfered with the established position of "the Lord's day" as the weekly memorial of the great Sunday *par excellence*, for Easter, as a fixed feast, would of course have fallen upon all the days of the week in turn. However, though Tertullian declares without misgiving that Christ suffered upon 25 March, a tradition perpetuated in numberless calendars throughout the Middle Ages, this date was certainly wrong. Moreover it was probably quite impossible at that period, owing to the arbitrary manner in which the Jewish embolismic years had been intercalated, to calculate back to the true date. For the various phases of the disputes which first broke out in the second century and were renewed long afterwards in the British Isles we must refer the reader to the article EASTER CONTROVERSY. It will suffice here to say that a decision seems to have been arrived at in the Council of Nicæa, which, though it is strangely absent from the canons of the council as now preserved to us (Turner, Monumenta Nicæna, 152), is believed to have determined that Easter was to be celebrated on the first Sunday after the first full moon which follows the spring equinox. According to this rule, which has ever since been accepted, the earliest day upon which Easter can now fall is 22 March, and the latest 25 April.

The Nativity of Christ.—A second element which fundamentally influences the Christian calendar and which, though less primitive than the Easter celebrations, is also of early date, may be described as the *Nativity Cycle*. Of the origin and history of the feast of Christmas, dealt with in a separate article, little need now be said. We may take it as certain that the feast of Christ's Nativity was kept in Rome on 25 December before the year 354. It was introduced by St. John Chrysostom into Constantinople and definitively adopted in 395. On the other hand, the Epiphany feast on 6 January, which also in the beginning seems to have commemorated the birth of Jesus Christ, is referred to as of partial observance in that character by Clement of Alexandria (Strom., I, 21), though a recently discovered discourse of Hippolytus for this day (*εἰς τὰ ἅγια θεοφάνεια*) is entirely devoted to the theme of Christ's baptism. This last, in fact, is and has long been the primary aspect of the feast in the Oriental churches. But the feast of the Nativity is of importance in the calendar not only for itself, as one of the greatest celebrations of the year, but also for the other days which depend upon it. These are mostly of later date in point of origin, but are ecclesiastically of high rank. Thus on this supposition, however questionable as a fact of history, that the exact date of Christ's nativity was 25 December, we have first the Circumcision on 1 January, the eighth day, a festival greatly utilized in the attempt to divert the newly converted peoples from the superstitious and often idolatrous pagan practices which immemorial custom associated with the beginning of the year. The Mass for this day in the Missals is often headed, *Ad prohibendum ab idolis*, and its contents correspond with that designation. At the same time other service books preserve conspicuous traces of a time when this day was treated as a festival of the Blessed Virgin. On the other hand, the eighth day before Christmas (18 Dec.) is kept as the feast of the Expectation of Our Lady, which was only added to the Roman calendar as lately as the seventeenth century, but represents an old Spanish feast of the Blessed Virgin. It was not, however, known in ancient times by its present designation of *Expectatio partus*.

Again, forty days after Christmas, following, as in the case of the Circumcision, the data of the Jewish law, we have the Presentation in the Temple. This, under its Greek name of Hypapante (*ὑπαπαντή*, "the meeting"), was originally treated as a feast of Our Saviour rather than of His Blessed Mother. It is older than any other Marian feast—being mentioned c. 380 in the Pilgrimage of "Sylvia", i. e. the Spanish lady Etheria—though in Jerusalem at that date it was kept forty days after the feast which is known to us as the Epiphany (6 Jan.), but which, as we have seen, then commemorated the Birth as well as the Baptism of Christ. For some reason, of which no adequate explanation seems to be forthcoming, the solemn benediction of candles and the procession were attached at an early period to this feast. It was long known in England as Candlemas Day and in France as *la Chandeleur*. The Annunciation, or, as it was sometimes anciently called, the Conception of Our Lord, seems to be heard of in the East in the sixth century and to have been transported thence to Western Europe not long afterwards. Its connexion with the Nativity is obvious, and it is even possible, as Duchesne and others have suggested, that the Incarnation of Our Saviour was assigned to the 25th of March because this day, as early as Tertullian, was believed to be the date of His Passion. If this were true, the 25th of December would have been determined by the 25th of March and not vice versa. But certainly the Annunciation as a feast is heard of considerably later than the Nativity. Still later in the year another early feast, already familiar in the time of St. Augustine (Serm., 307–308), meets us in the Nativity of St. John the Baptist. On 25 March, the Fathers calculated, St. Elizabeth had already been six months with child; its birth accordingly would have taken place exactly three months later. Neither does the 24th of June (instead of 25th) assigned to the Nativity of the Baptist present any difficulty, for in the Roman way of counting both 25 March and 24 June are equally *octavo kalendas*, the eighth day before the kalends of the next month. Yet another feast, the Conception of the Baptist, found in the Greek Church and in certain Carlovingian calendars on 24 September, hardly needs mention. It is chiefly interesting to us as paving the way for the feast of the Conception of Our Lady and hence for that also of her Immaculate Conception.

Saints' Days.—Another, and that the most substantial, element in the formation of the calendar is the record of the birthdays of the saints. It must be remembered that this word birthday (*γενέθλιος, natalis*) had come to mean little more than commemoration. Already, before the Christian Era, various royal personages who were deified after death commonly had their "birthdays" kept as festivals; but it is very doubtful whether these really represented the day upon which they were born into this world (see Rohde, Psyche, 3d ed., I, 235). Hence we are not so surprised at a later period to meet in Christian liturgical books such phrases as *natalis calicis* as a designation for the feast of Maunday Thursday, or *natalis episcopi*, which seems to mean the day of a bishop's consecration. Anyhow, there can be no doubt that

the same word was used, and that from a very early period, to describe the day upon which a martyr suffered death. It is commonly explained as meaning the birthday which introduced him into a new and glorious life in heaven, but we cannot, perhaps, be quite certain that those who first used the term of a Christian martyr had this interpretation consciously present to their minds. We are fortunate, however, in possessing in the contemporary account written from Smyrna of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp (about A. D. 145) a clear statement that the Jews and pagans fully anticipated that the Christians would try to recover the martyr's body as a precious treasure to which they might pay *cultus*, and would institute a birth-feast (γενέθλιος) in his honour. Here, then, we have the most conclusive evidence that the Christians already in the first half of the second century were accustomed to celebrate the feasts of the martyrs. Probably for a long time these celebrations remained almost entirely local. They were confined to the place where the martyr suffered or where a considerable portion of his remains were preserved over which the Holy Sacrifice would be offered. But in the course of time the practice of moving such relics freely from place to place enlarged the circle of the martyr's clients. All the churches that possessed these relics felt entitled to keep his "birthday" with some degree of solemnity, and thus we soon find martyrs from Africa, for example, obtaining recognition in Rome and eventually being honoured by all the Church. This seems to be, in brief, the history of the inclusion of saints' days in the calendar. At first the number of such days was very small, depending generally upon some special local tie, and rigorously limited to those who had shed their blood for Christ. But before very long the names of confessors also began to find a place in the lists, for confessors and bishops were already written in the diptychs, and in those days the line between praying to a departed servant of God and praying for him was by no means so clearly defined as it is with us now. This was the process which was already being inaugurated in the fourth century and which has continued ever since.

Our Earliest Calendars.—As feasts and Saints' days multiplied, it became desirable that some sort of record should be kept of them. We may divide the documents of this kind, roughly speaking, into two categories: *Calendars* and *Martyrologia*, both officially recognized by the Church. A calendar in its ecclesiastical sense is simply a list of the feasts kept in any particular church, diocese, or country, arranged in order under their proper dates. A martyrologium was originally, as its name implies, a record of martyrs, but it soon assumed a more general character, extending to all classes of saints and embracing all parts of the world. The entries which are included in a martyrologium are independent of the fact of actual liturgical cultus in any particular place. They follow the same orderly arrangement by months and days which we observe in a calendar, but under each day not one but many names of saints are given, while certain topographical and biographical details are often added. It will, however, be readily understood that it is not always easy to draw a hard and fast line between calendars and martyrologia. They naturally shade into one another. Thus the ancient Irish poem commonly known as the "Calendar of Aengus" is more properly a martyrologium, for a number of names of saints are assigned to each day quite independently of any idea of liturgical cultus. On the other hand, we sometimes find true calendars in the blank spaces of which the names of saints or deceased persons have been inserted whom there was no intention of commemorating in the liturgy. They have thus been partly converted into martyrologies or necrologies. Of early lists of feasts, the most famous and the most important in the information which it preserves, the so-called "Philocalian Calendar", hardly deserves to be called by this name. It is, in fact, no more than the commonplace book of a certain Furius Dionysius Philocalus, who seems to have been a Christian interested in all kinds of chronological information and to have compiled this book in A. D. 354. There is indeed a calendar in his volume, but this is a table of purely secular and pagan celebrations containing no Christian references of any kind. The value of Philocalus' manuscript to modern scholars lies in two lists headed *Depositio Martyrum* and *Depositio Episcoporum*, together with other casual notices. We thus learn that a considerable number of martyrs, including among them Sts. Peter and Paul and several popes, were honoured in Rome on their own proper days in the middle of the fourth century, while three African martyrs, Sts. Cyprian, Perpetua, and Felicitas, also found a place on the list. The only other fixed feasts which are mentioned are the Nativity of Christ and the feast of St. Peter's Chair (22 Feb.).

Not far removed from the Philocalian document in the witness which it bears to the still present influence of paganism is the "Calendar of Polemius Sylvius" of 448. This presents a medley not unlike a modern almanac. The days are indicated when the Senate sat and when the games were celebrated in the Circus, as also the times of those pagan festivals like the Lupercalia, the Terminalia, etc., which had become in a sense national holidays throughout the empire. But side by side with these we have the mention of certain Christian feasts—Christmas Day, the Epiphany, 22 February (strangely characterized as *depositio Petri et Pauli*), and four or five other saints' days. Very curious, also, is it to notice in such company the *natales* of Virgil and of Cicero. Next to this comes a document of the North African Church which is commonly described as the "Calendar of Carthage", and which belongs to the closing years of the sixth century. It presents a considerable array of martyrs, mostly African, but including also some of the more famous of those of Rome, e. g. St. Sixtus, St. Lawrence, St. Clement, St. Agnes, etc., with Sts. Gervasius and Protasius from Milan, St. Agatha from Sicily, St. Vincent from Spain, and St. Felix from Nola in Campania. We also find days assigned to some of the Apostles and to St. John the Baptist, but as yet no feast of Our Lady. Earlier in point of time (c. 410), is a compilation preserved to us in Syriac, of Oriental and Arian origin. It was first published by the English Orientalist, William Wright, and has since been edited by Duchesne and De Rossi in their edition of the "Hieronymian Martyrologium" (Acta Sanctorum, Nov., vol. II). The Syriac document is chiefly important as witnessing to one of the main sources, direct or indirect, of that famous martyrologium, but it also shows how even in the East a calendar was being formed in the fourth century which took notice of the martyrs of Nicomedia, Antioch, and Alexandria, with even a few Western entries like Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas (7 March), and probably Xystus. Sts. Peter and Paul are commemorated on 28 December, which may be a mere error, Sts. John and James on 27 December, St. Stephen on 26 December, which is still his proper day. The month of December is partly lacking, or we should probably have found the Nativity on 25 December. The Epiphany is mentioned on 6 January.

Closely connected in certain of its aspects with this memorial of the Eastern Church is the so-called "Hieronymian Martyrologium" already mentioned. This work, which in spite of its name owes nothing directly to St. Jerome, was probably first compiled in Southern Gaul (Duchesne says Auxerre, Bruno Krusch, Autun) between the years 592 and 600, i. e. at the same period that St. Augustine was preaching the Gospel to our Anglo-Saxon forefathers. As a

martyrologium it is the type of a class. It contains long lists of obscure names for each day mingled with topographical data, but as contrasted with the later martyrologia of Bede, Ado, Usuard, etc., out of which our modern "Martyrologium Romanum" has developed, the "Hieronymian" includes few biographical details regarding the subject of its notices. The fuller discussion of this document, however, belongs to the article MARTYROLOGY (q.v.). It is sufficient here to notice that in its primitive form the "Hieronymian" includes no proper feast of Our Lady; even the Purification, on 2 February, is only indirectly alluded to.

FEASTS OF OUR LADY.—And here it may be convenient to observe that the principal festivals of the Blessed Virgin, the Assumption, Annunciation, and Nativity, were undoubtedly first celebrated in the East. There seems very good reason to believe, from certain apocryphal Syriac narratives of the "Falling asleep of Mary the Mother of the Lord", that some celebration of her Assumption into Heaven was already observed in Syria in the fifth century on a day corresponding to our 15 August (cf. Wright, in Journal of Sacred Literature, N. S., VII, 157). The Annunciation again is said to be commemorated in an authentic sermon of Proclus of Constantinople, who died in 446, while the agreement of the Armenian and Æthiopic Christians in keeping similar festivals seems to throw back the period of their first introduction to a time earlier than that at which these schismatical churches broke away from unity. In the West, however, we have no definite details as to the earliest occurrence of these Marian feasts. We only know that they were kept at Rome with solemnity in the time of Pope Sergius I (687–701). In Spain, if we may safely follow Dom G. Morin in assigning the "Lectionary of Silos" to about 650, there is definite mention of a feast of Our Lady in Advent, which may be earlier than those just referred to; and in Gaul the statutes of Bishop Sonnatius of Reims (614–631) apparently prescribe the observance of the Annunciation, Assumption, and Nativity, though the Purification, strange to say, is not mentioned.

Although the mention is a departure from the natural chronological order, a word may also be said here about the feast of the Immaculate Conception. In the East we find it known to John of Eubœa towards the close of the eighth century. It was then kept, as it still is in the Greek Church, on 9 December, but it is described by him as being only of partial observance. Nevertheless, about the year 1000, we find it included in the calendar of the Emperor Basil Porphyrogenitus, and it seems by that time to have become universally recognized in the East. The West, however, did not long lag behind. A curious trace may be found in the Irish "Calendar of Aengus" (c. 804), where the Conception of Our Lady is assigned to 3 May (see The Month, May, 1904, pp. 449–465). This probably had no liturgical significance, but Mr. Edmund Bishop has shown that in some Anglo-Saxon monasteries a real feast of the Conception was already kept upon 8 December before the year 1050 (Downside Review, 1886, pp. 107–119). At Naples, under Byzantine influence, the feast had long been known, and it appears in the famous Neapolitan marble calendar of the ninth century under the form *Conceptio S. Annæ*, being assigned, as among the Greeks, to 9 December. The general recognition of the feast in the West seems, however, to have been largely due to the influence of a certain tractate, "De Conceptione B. Mariæ", long attributed to St. Anselm, but really written by Eadmer, his disciple. At first only the Conception of Our Lady was spoken of, the question of the *Immaculate* Conception was raised somewhat later. For the feast of the Presentation of Our Lady (21 November), an early Eastern origin has also been claimed dating back to the year 700 (see Vailhé, in "Echos d'Orient", V, 193–201, etc.), but this cannot be accepted without fuller verification. For the other Marian festivals, e. g. the Visitation, the Rosary, etc., the reader must be referred to these separate articles. All are comparatively modern additions to the calendar.

THE APOSTLES AND OTHER NEW TESTAMENT SAINTS.—From the mention of Sts. Peter and Paul conjointly on 29 June in the "Depositio Martyrum" of the "Philocalian Calendar", it is probable that the two Apostles both suffered on that day. In the time of St. Leo (Sermo, lxxxiv) the feast seems to have been celebrated in Rome with an octave, while the Syriac martyrologium in the East and Polemius Silvius in Gaul equally manifest a tendency to do honour to the *Principes Apostolorum*, though in the former the commemoration is attached to 28 December, and in the latter to 22 February. This latter day was, generally, given to the celebration of the *Cathedra Petri*, also belonging to very early times, while a feast in honour of St. Paul's conversion was kept 25 January. Of the other Apostles, Sts. John and James appear together in the Syriac martyrologium on 27 December, and St. John still retains that day in the West. With regard to St. Andrew we probably have a reliable tradition as to the day on which he suffered, for apart from an explicit reference in the relatively early "Acta" (cf. Analecta Bollandiana, XIII, 373–378), his feast has been kept on 30 November, both in the East and in the West, from an early period. The other Apostles nearly all appear in some form in the "Hieronymian Martyrologium", and their festivals gradually came to be celebrated liturgically before the eighth or ninth century.

The fixing of the precise days was probably much influenced by a certain "Breviarius" which was widely circulated in somewhat varying forms, and which professed to give a brief account of the circumstances of the death of each of the Twelve. As an indication that some of these feasts must have been adopted at a more remote date than is attested in existing calendars, it may be noted that Bede has a homily upon the feast of St. Matthew, which the arrangement of the collection shows to have been kept by him in the latter part of September, as we keep it at present. St. John the Baptist, as already noted, had also more than one festival in early times. Besides the Nativity on 24 June, two of St. Augustine's sermons (nos. cccvii, cccviii) are consecrated to the celebration of his martyrdom (*Passio* or *Decollatio*). Similar honours were paid to St. Stephen, the first martyr, more particularly in the East. St. Gregory of Nyssa, in his funeral oration over St. Basil, delivered at Cæsarea in Cappadocia in 379, attests this, and lets us know that the feast was kept then as it is now, the day after Christmas. On the other hand, St. Joseph's name does not occur in the calendar until comparatively late. Curiously enough the earliest definite assignment which the writer has been able to find of a special day consecrated to his memory occurs in the "Calendar of Aengus" (c. 804) under its existing date, 19 March. There we read of "Joseph, name that is noble, Jesus' pleasant fosterer". But despite an invocation of St. Joseph in the old Irish hymn "Sen De", ascribed to St. Colman Ua Cluasaigh (c. 622), we cannot regard this entry as indicative of any proper cultus. It seems probable, from the nature of some of the apocryphal literature of the early centuries, that honour was of old paid to St. Joseph in Syria, Egypt, and the East generally, but reliable data as to his feast are at present wanting.

GROWTH OF THE CALENDAR.—During the Merovingian and Carlovingian period the number of festivals which won practical recognition gradually increased. Perhaps the safest indications of this development are to be gathered from the early service-books—sacramentaries, antiphonaries, and

lectionaries—but these are often difficult to date. Somewhat more compendious and definite are one or two other lists of feasts which have accidentally been preserved to us, and which it will be interesting to quote. A certain Perpetuus, Bishop of Tours (461–491), sets down the principal feasts celebrated in his day with a vigil as the following:—

"Natalis Domini; Epiphania; Natalis S. Ioannis (June 24th); Natalis S. Petri episcopatus (February 22d); Sext. Cal. Apr. Resurrectio Domini nostri I. Chr.; Pascha; Dies Ascensionis; Passio S. Ioannis; Natalis SS. apostolorum Petri et Pauli; Natalis S. Martini; Natalis S. Symphoriani (July 22d); Natalis S. Litorii (September 13th); Natalis S. Martini (November 11th); Natalis S. Bricii (November 13th); Natalis S. Hilarii (January 13th)." (Mon. Germ. SS. Meroving., I, 445.)

Similarly Bishop Sonnatius of Reims (614–631) makes the following list of festivals which were to be kept as holidays *absque omni opere forensi:*

Nativitas Domini, Circumcisio, Epiphania, Annuntiatio beatæ Mariæ, Resurrectio Domini cum die sequenti, Ascensio Domini, dies Pentecostes, Nativitas beati Ioannis Baptistæ, Nativitas apostolorum Petri et Pauli, Assumptio beatæ Mariæ, eiusdem Nativitas, Nativitas Andreæ apostoli, et omnes dies dominicales.

In the course of the eighth and ninth centuries various German synods drew up lists of the ecclesiastical holidays which were to be celebrated with rest from work. In an early constitution, ascribed to St. Boniface, we find nineteen such days in each year besides the ordinary Sundays, three free days after the feast itself being appointed both at Christmas and Easter. A council at Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen) in 809 fixed twenty-one holidays. This included a week at Easter and such feasts as St. Martin and St. Andrew. At Basle in 827 the list was further extended, and it now comprised all the feasts of the Apostles. In England the days honoured in this way seem not to have been quite so numerous, at any rate not at first; but before the end of the tenth century many additions were made, while the ordinances of the synods were enforced by the royal authority. The list comprised the four chief festivals of Our Lady and the commemoration of St. Gregory the Great. The observance of St. Dunstan's feast was imposed a little later during the reign of Cnut.

As regards existing documents, perhaps the oldest ecclesiastical calendar, in the proper sense of the word, which still survives, is the one which was in the possession of the Englishman St. Willibrord, Apostle of the Frisians, who has left in it an autograph note of the date of his consecration as bishop (A. D. 695). The calendar was probably written in England between 702 and 706. As it has never been printed it may be interesting to give here the entries made in the original hand, omitting the interpolations made by others at a slightly later date. The MS. which contains it is the well-known "Codex Epternacensis", now Latin MS. 10837, in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

JANUARY

1 Circumcision
3 St. Genevieve of Paris
6 Epiphany
13 St. Hilary
14 St. Felix of Nola
17 St. Anthony, Hermit
18 St. Peter's Chair at Rome and the Assumption of Holy Mary
20 St. Sebastian
21 St. Agnes V.
24 St. Babilas, Bishop and Martyr
25 Conversion of St. Paul at Damascus
29 St. Valerius, Bishop, and St. Lucy V. at Treves

FEBRUARY

1 St. Denis, St. Polycarp and St. Brigid V.
2 St. Symeon, Patriarch
5 St. Agatha
6 St. Amandus
16 St. Juliana
22 The Chair of Peter at Antioch

MARCH

1 Donatus
7 Perpetua and Felicitas
12 St. Gregory at Rome
17 St. Patrick, Bishop in Ireland
20 St. Cuthbert, Bishop
21 St. Benedict, Abbot
25 The Lord was crucified and St. James the brother of Our Lord
27 The Resurrection of Our Lord

APRIL

4 St. Ambrose
22 Philip, Apostle

MAY

1 St. Philip, Apostle
5 The Ascension of the Lord
7 The Invention of the Holy Cross
11 Pancratius, Martyr
14 Earliest date for Pentecost
31 St. Maximinius at Treves

JUNE

2 Erasmus, Martyr
8 Barnabas, Apostle
9 St. Columkill
22 James the son of Alpheus
24 Nativity of John the Baptist
29 Sts. Peter and Paul at Rome

JULY

15 St. James of Nisibis
25 St. James, Apostle, Brother of John
26 St. Symeon, Monk in Syria
29 St. Lupus

AUGUST

1 The Machabees, seven brothers with their mother
5 St. Oswald, King
6 St. Syxtus, Bishop
10 St. Laurence, Deacon
13 Hippolitus, Martyr
16 (*Sic*) [erasure] St. Mary
25 St. Bartholomew, Apostle
28 Augustine and Faustinus, Bishops
29 Martyrdom of St. John the Baptist
31 St. Paulinus, Bishop at Trier

SEPTEMBER

7 Sergius, Pope at Rome
9 (*Sic*) Nativity of St. Mary at Jerusalem
13 Cornelius and Cyprian
15 St. Euphemia, Martyr
19 Januarius, Martyr
21 Matthew, Apostle
22 Passion of St. Maurice
24 Conception of St. John the Baptist
27 Cosmas and Damian at Jerusalem
29 St. Michael, Archangel

OCTOBER

1 Remedius and Germanus
4 Sts. Heuwald and Hewald, Martyrs
14 Paulinus, Bishop in Canterbury
18 Luke, Evangelist
28 Simon and Jude, Apostles
31 St. Quintinus, Martyr

NOVEMBER

10 St. Leo, Pope
11 St. Martin, Bishop at Tours
22 St. Cecilia
23 Clement at Rome
24 Crisogonus
30 St. Andrew, Apostle

DECEMBER

10 St. Eulalia and seventy-five others
20 St. Ignatius, Bishop and Martyr
21 St. Thomas, Apostle in India
25 Nativity of Our Lord Jesus Christ
26 St. Stephen, Martyr
27 John, Apostle, and James, his brother
28 The Innocents
31 St. Silvester, Bishop

This list very well illustrates the arbitrary choice of saints to be commemorated, which is observable in most early calendars. The mention of the Nativity of our Lady on 9 September instead of 8 September, is interesting in view of the Eastern practice, attested by the Naples marble calendar, of celebrating the Conception of Our Lady on 9 December. The appearance of St. Januarius (19 Sept.) is also noteworthy. The link between England and Southern Italy in the matter of the commemoration of saints has often been noticed without ever being quite adequately explained. (See Morin, Liber Comicus, Appendix, etc.) The occurrence of the Invention of the Cross on 7 May, as in the Greek Church, is also remarkable. It is further curious to note the partial erasure of the Assumption feast on 16 August (*sic*), and its appearance upon 18 January. The later Anglo-Saxon calendars, of which a fair number have been printed by Hampson and Piper, offer fewer points of interest than the above; but a word should be said of one or two which are especially noteworthy. The metrical Latin calendar printed among the works of Bede is shown not to be his by the reference to the second Wilfrid of York, who died after his time, but it offers some useful points of comparison with Bede's genuine martyrologium, which, thanks to the patient labour of Dom Quentin, has at last been recovered for us (see Les Martyrologes Historiques, Paris, 1908, pp. 17–119). Not less interesting is the ancient English martyrology recently edited for the Early English Text Society by G. Herzfeld. This document, though not a calendar, and though including later interpolations, probably reflects the arrangement of a calendar which may be even older than the time of Bede. It is especially noteworthy for brief references to certain Capuan and South Italian saints, which it professes to derive from the "old Mass Books", probably missals of that Gelasian type for which the Gregorian Sacramentary was afterwards substituted.

Another early calendar which must possess an interest for all English-speaking students is the "Anglo-Saxon Menologium", a short but rather ornate poem of the tenth century, describing the principal feasts of each month and probably intended for popular use (see Imelmann, Das altenglische Menologium, p. 40). The writer's main purpose is indicated by his concluding words:—

Nû ge findan magon
Hâligra tiid, the man healdan sceal,
Swa bebûgeth gebod geond Brytenricu
Sexna kyninges on thâs sylfan tiid.

(Now ye may find the holy tides which men should observe as the command goeth through Britain of the king of the Saxons at this same time.) The use of metrical calendars, however, was by no means peculiar to England. The Irish "Calendar of Aengus", already referred to, was written in verse, and some of the versified Latin calendars printed by Hampson have been shown by Dr. Whitley Stokes to present clear signs of Irish influences. So on the Continent, to take but one example, we have an elaborate calendar or rather martyrologium composed about 848 in Latin hexameters by Wandelbert of Prüm.

Later Developments.—The history of the more detailed martyrologia, which has recently been worked out with such thoroughness by Dom Quentin, may serve to show how far-reaching is the principle that nature abhors a vacuum. Almost all the writers, such as Florus, Ado, and Usuard, who undertook the task of supplementing the martyrologium of Bede, worked with the avowed object of filling up the days which he had left blank. We may fairly infer that the same spirit will have affected the calendar as well. The mere sight of a vacant space, no doubt, in many cases tempted scribes and correctors to fill it up, if their erudition sufficed for the purpose; and though for a long time these entries remained mere paper-commemorations, they will certainly in the long run have reacted upon the liturgy. We may say that much the same influence was at work when Alcuin took in hand the task of supplying the lacunæ in the "Gregorian Sacramentary", more particularly when he provided a complete set of different masses for the Sundays after Pentecost. But besides this we have, of course, to consider the potent factor of new devotional interests, creating such feasts as those of All Saints, All Souls, the Blessed Trinity, the various festivals of the Angels, and notably St. Michael, and, in more modern times, Corpus Christi, the Sacred Heart, the Five Wounds, the commemoration of the various instruments of the Passion, the many different invocations under which Our Lady is honoured, and the duplications of feasts provided by translations, dedications, and miraculous events, such as the Stigmata of St. Francis of Assisi or the "Transverberation" of the heart of St. Teresa. Necessarily also, among the countless holy men who lived in the practice of heroic virtue, some in a more pronounced way caught the imagination of their contemporaries. The piety of the faithful who had been the witness of their virtues during life, or who, after their death, benefited by the power of their intercession with God, clamoured for some adequate means of manifesting devotion and gratitude.

At first this recognition of sanctity was in a measure local, informal, and popular, with the result that it was not always very discerning. Later the authority of the Holy See was invoked to pronounce after full inquiry a formal decree of canonization. But if this system, on the one hand, tended to limit the number of recognized saints, it also helped to extend more widely the fame of those whose history or whose miracles were more remarkable. Thus, in the end, we find that the cultus of such a saint as St. Thomas of Canterbury, to take an English example, was not limited to his own diocese or to his own province, but within a period of ten years after his death his name found a place in the calendars of almost every country of Europe. To these causes we must add the growth of literary culture among the people, especially after the invention of printing, and last, but by no means least, the cosmopolitan character of so many of the religious orders. Wherever the Cistercians had settled the name of St. Bernard was necessarily held in honour. If, again, there was no part of Christendom in which the friars had not laboured, so were there hardly any of the faithful who had not heard of St. Francis, St. Dominic, St. Clare, St. Catharine of Siena, and many more. It is no wonder, then, if at an early date the calendar grew crowded, and if in our own times hardly any vacant days are left in which some festival does not take precedence and exclude the ferial office. To enter into detail regarding this great variety of feasts would be impossible in an article like the present. All the more important celebrations will be found treated separately in their proper place, e. g. All Saints, All Souls, Candlemas, Corpus Christi, etc.

Various Peculiarities of Calendars.—From the ninth century onwards a calendar was a common adjunct to most of the different classes of service-books, e. g. sacramentaries, psalters, antiphonaries, and even pontificals. At a later date, and especially after such books came to be printed, it was hardly ever omitted before missals, breviaries, and horæ. In the printed liturgical calendars with which we are now more familiar, we find little but the bare catalogue of ecclesiastical feasts. In the calendars of early date there is a much greater variety of information. We have, for example, a number of astronomical data referring to the times of equinox and solstice, the sun's entry into the various signs of the Zodiac, the dog days, the beginning of the four seasons, etc., and these are often emphasized by verses written above or below the entries for each month, e. g. *Procedunt duplices in martis tempore pisces*, referring to the fact that at the beginning of March the sun is in the constellation Pisces. Sometimes, also, the verses thus prefixed bear an astrological import, e. g. *Jani prima dies et septima fine timetur*, which is meant to convey that the first day of the month of January and the seventh from the end are unlucky. It must be confessed that the traces of pagan, or at least secular, influences in many of our surviving early calendars are numerous. A very curious feature in many Anglo-Saxon documents of this class is the acquaintance which they manifest with Oriental and especially Coptic usages. For instance in the Jumièges Missal, at the head of each month we have a line giving the Oriental names for the corresponding period; e. g. in the case of April: "Hebr. Nisan; Ægypti Farmuthi; Græc. Xanthicos; Lat. Apr; Sax. Eastermonath;" and further against 26 April we find the entry "IX Ægyptior. mensis paschæ." [i. e. Pashons]. As a rule, the information given about the Coptic arrangement of months is at least approximately correct. In other specimens again the so-called *dies ægyptiaci* which were reputed to be unlucky (see Chabas, "Le Calendrier des jours fastes et néfastes de l'année égyptienne", pp. 22, 119 sq.) are carefully noted.

As regards ornament, early calendars are sometimes inserted in a sort of arcading, two pillars forming the sides of each column of writing, and an arch crowning the whole; while in the later Middle Ages we often find beautifully drawn vignettes, sometimes broadly or delicately humorous, illustrating with much play of the imagination the different seasons of the year. One feature which comes down from the earliest times, but which survives even in the printed calendars of our existing Breviary and Missal, is the insertion against each day of the "Epact" and the "Dominical Letter". These have reference to a highly artificial

method of computation and are meant to supply, ready to hand, the means for ascertaining the day of the week in any assigned year, and more particularly the age of the moon. The age of the moon, ascertained by these methods, is read out before the martyrologium every day during the public recitation of the Office of Prime. When the calendar was reformed under Gregory XIII, it was considered advisable to retain in a corrected form the old apparatus and names to which people were accustomed. As this system of computation is intricate and has little but an antiquarian interest to recommend it, we may refer the reader to the article EPACT, or to the explanations given along with the calendar in every copy of the Roman Breviary and Missal.

Besides the calendars for ecclesiastical use which were written in the service-books, a practice grew up towards the close of the Middle Ages of compiling calendars for the use of the laity. These correspond rather to what we should now call almanacs, and in them the astrological element plays a much more prominent part than in the missals or horæ. One of the most famous of these compilations was that known as the "Calendrier des Bergers", or the "Shepherds' Calendar". It was several times most sumptuously printed at Paris before the end of the fifteenth century, and it afterwards spread to England and Germany. The religious tone is very pronounced, but we find at the same time the most elaborate astrological directions as to lucky and unlucky days for certain medical operations, particularly bleeding, as well as for agricultural pursuits, such as sowing, reaping, ploughing, sheep-shearing, and the like. It is a remarkable illustration of the conservatism of the rustic mind that editions of the "Shepherds' Calendar" were published in London until past the middle of the seventeenth century, the essentially Catholic tone of the book being easily recognizable under the very thinnest of disguises (see Ecclesiastical Review, July, 1902, pp. 1–21).

THE MODERN CALENDAR IMPOSED BY AUTHORITY.— It will have been inferred from what has been said above that considerable divergence prevailed among the calendars in use at the close of the Middle Ages. This lack of uniformity degenerated into an abuse, and was a fertile source of confusion. Hence the new Roman Breviary and Missal, which in accordance with a decree of the Council of Trent eventually saw the light in 1568 and 1570 respectively, contained a new calendar. Like other portions of the new liturgical code, the observance of the new calendar was made obligatory upon all churches which could not prove a prescription of two hundred years in the enjoyment of their own distinctive customs. This law, which is still in force, has not, of course, prevented successive sovereign pontiffs from adding very many new festivals; neither does it preclude different dioceses, or even churches, from adopting various local celebrations, where the permission of the pope or of the Congregation of Rites has been sought and obtained. But though local saints may be added, the feasts prescribed in the Roman calendar must also be kept. In point of fact a considerable license is conceded in such matters. There is hardly any diocese in which the calendar, owing to these additions, does not differ considerably from those of neighbouring dioceses or provinces. Even the introduction of a single new feast, owing to the transferences thus necessitated, may effect a considerable disturbance. In the British Isles, England, Ireland, and Scotland all celebrate a number of national saints independently of each other, but these are merely additions to the general Roman calendar which all observe in common. Moreover, this universal calendar during three centuries, and especially during the last thirty years, has undergone very notable modifications, partly in consequence of new saints' days that have been introduced, partly in consequence of changes made in the grade of feasts already admitted. A tabular arrangement will help to make this clear. What the original meaning of the term *double* may have been is not entirely certain. Some think that the greater festivals were thus st led because the antiphons before and after the psalms were "duplicated", i. e. twice repeated entire on these days. Others, with more probability, point to the fact that before the ninth century in certain places, for example at Rome, it was customary on the greater feasts to recite two sets of Matins, the one of the feria or week-day, the other of the festival. Hence such days were known as "doubles". However this may be, the primitive division into doubles and simples has given place to a much more elaborate classification. At present we have six grades, to wit: doubles of the first class; doubles of the second class; greater doubles; doubles; semi-doubles; simples. Now from the various official revisions of the Breviary, made in 1568, 1662, 1631, 1882, the following data may be gleaned. For purposes of comparison we may add the figures for 1907:—

Feasts Entered in The Breviary	1568 Pius V	1602 Clement VIII	1631 Urban VIII	1882 Leo XIII	1907 Pius X
Doubles of the First Class	19	19	19	21	23
Doubles of the Second Class	17	18	18	28	27
Greater Doubles	—	16	16	24	25
Doubles	53	43	45	128	133
Semidoubles	60	68	78	74	72
Total	149	164	176	275	280

These figures (which include not merely the fixed but also the movable feasts, as well as octave days, etc.) will suffice to illustrate the crowding of the calendar which has taken place of recent years. Moreover, it must be remembered that, practically speaking, it never happens that feasts of the higher grade are "simplified", i. e. reduced to the level of bare commemorations. If a greater double chances to fall on a day already occupied, it is "transferred", and a free day has to be found for it later on in the year. On the other hand, while there has been a great increase of doubles of the first and second class, etc. (*festa chori*), the holidays of obligation (*festa chori et fori*), owing largely to the difficulties created by the civil rulers of the various European countries, have grown steadily fewer. Pre-Reformation England, with its forty or more holidays of precept, did not go beyond the rest of the world. To take almost the first example which comes to hand, in the Diocese of Liège, in 1287 (Mansi, Concilia, XXIV, 909), there were, besides the Sundays, forty-two festivals on which the people were bidden to rest from servile work. It is, therefore, hardly surprising that the excessive number of these feast-days was included in 1523 among the *Centum Gravamina*, the Hundred Grievances, of the German nation, nor that Pope Urban VIII in 1642, deprived bishops of the right to institute new ecclesiastical holidays without the permission of the Holy See, and limited the number of those of general obligation to thirty-four. In the eighteenth century, under pressure from various temporal rulers, this list in certain countries was further curtailed. Many of those festivals which had hitherto been holidays of precept were reduced to the status of feasts of devotion, i. e. the obligation of hearing Mass and resting from servile work was abolished, while at the same time their vigils ceased to be observed as fast-days. But even after the concessions which Clement XIV, in 1772, made to the Empress Maria Theresa, eighteen holidays (*festa chori et fori*) still re-

mained obligatory in the Austrian dominions. In France, under the Napoleonic regime, the pope was forced to consent to the reduction of the holidays of obligation to four only, Christmas Day, the Ascension, the Assumption, and All Saints. For the rest of Christendom other concessions were made by Leo XII, and still later by his successors. At the present day Rome numbers eighteen holidays of obligation (always, of course, exclusive of Sundays), but only nine of these are recognized as legal holidays by the Government of Italy. The French rule of four *festa præcepti* prevails also in Belgium and parts of Holland. In Spain, in Austria, and throughout the greater portion of the German Empire, some fifteen days are observed, though both the total number and the particular feasts selected vary greatly in the different provinces. In England the holidays of obligation are the Circumcision, the Epiphany, the Ascension, Corpus Christi, Sts. Peter and Paul, the Assumption, All Saints, and Christmas Day. To these two other days are added in Ireland, the Annunciation and the feast of St. Patrick, and in Scotland one day, the feast of St. Andrew. In the United States six festivals are kept as of precept—Christmas, the New Year, the Ascension, the Assumption, All Saints, and the Immaculate Conception.

For English-speaking Catholics in past centuries, while living under the penal laws, the situation must often have been a difficult one. Down to 1781, as the rare copies of the old "Laity's Directory" still bear witness, our forefathers were bound to keep every Friday of the year (except during Paschal time) as a fast-day. Besides this there was abstinence upon all Saturdays and a fair number of fasting vigils, for which last, in 1771, the Wednesdays and Fridays of Advent were substituted. The holidays of obligation amounted to thirty-four, but in 1778 these were reduced to eleven, the rest for the most part being treated as feasts of devotion. On the other hand the calendar grew by the restoration to full liturgical cultus of many of the old English saints. The first permission was given by Benedict XIV in 1749 at the request of His Royal Highness the Cardinal of York. This was limited to half a dozen saints, including St. Augustine of England and St. George, both to be kept as doubles of the first class; but in 1774 ampler concessions were made by Clement XIV. Again in 1884 the list was still further extended, and in 1887 the beatification of the English martyrs became the occasion for approving several other new offices and masses.

THE CHURCHES OF THE EAST.—With regard to the calendars of the various Eastern Churches it would be impossible here to enter into detail. For the most part they are subject, like that of the Western Church, to the complications caused by a system of feasts which are partly fixed and partly movable. Most of the more important festivals of the Roman calendar—for example the Circumcision, the Epiphany, the Purification, the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, St. Peter and Paul, the Assumption, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, St. Andrew, and the Nativity of Our Lord—are kept on the days corresponding to those observed in Western Christendom. But the correspondence, though recognizable in some few cases, is not quite exact. For example, the Greeks keep the feast of the Immaculate Conception, under the title ἡ σύλληψις τῆς θεοπρομήτορος Ἄννης (*conceptio Annæ aviæ Dei*), upon 9 December, not 8 December; and while the Invention of the Cross is celebrated by us on 3 May, the Greeks and Syrians have their corresponding feast on 7 May. Again, among Oriental Christians the octaves of festivals are not kept in the same uniform way as by the Latins. Their celebrations, indeed, in many cases continue after the day of the feast, but not for exactly a week; and it is peculiar to these rites that on the day following the feast a sort of commemoration is made of the personages who are most closely connected with it. Thus on 3 February, the day after the feast of the Purification, the Greeks pay special honour to Holy Simeon and Anna, while on 9 September, the day after Our Lady's Nativity, St. Joachim and St. Anne are more particularly mentioned. Many other exceptional features, some of them decidedly extravagant, are presented by the Syriac, Armenian, and Coptic Rites. It may be sufficient here, however, to call attention to the practice in the last-named Church of assigning a day each month for the special cultus of Our Blessed Lady.

As regards the movable feasts, the chief interest centres in the beginning of Lent. With the Greek and some of the other rites, the Lenten season may be said to begin the week before our Septuagesima, though this is only a time of preparation. Sexagesima Sunday is known as ἡ κυριακὴ τῆς ἀπόκρεω (the Sunday of abstinence from flesh), not that they are forbidden meat on that day, but because it is the last day on which meat is allowed. Similarly, the next Sunday (Quinquagesima) is known as ἡ κυριακὴ τῆς τυρινῆς (cheese Sunday), because this is the last day upon which cheese and eggs can be eaten. The movable feasts of the Greek Church, moreover, include other festivals besides those strictly belonging to the Easter cycle. The most noteworthy example is the feast of All Saints (τῶν ἁγίων πάντων), which is kept upon the Sunday which follows Pentecost, or in other words upon our Trinity Sunday.

General.—NILLES, *Kalendarium Manuale Utriusque Ecclesiæ* (2 vols., Innsbruck, 1897); KELLNER, *Heortologie* (Freiburg, 1906), and also in an It. tr., *L'Anno Ecclesiastico*, which has a better index than the original; DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship* (tr. London, 1903); WORDSWORTH, *The Ministry of Grace* (London, 1904); ASSEMANI, *Kalendaria Eccles. Univ.* (Rome, 1750); BINTERIM, *Denkwürdigkeiten* (Mainz, 1837), VI, Pt. I; BÄUMER, *L'Histoire du Bréviaire* (Fr. tr., 2 vols., Paris, 1905); BATIFFOL, *The Roman Breviary* (tr. London, 1903); SCHROD, in *Kirchenlexikon*, VII, 51; GAUDOT, *Le Bréviaire romain* (Paris, 1907, 168–181); BRADSHAW, in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. *Calendar;* THALHOFER, *Liturgik* (Freiburg, 1896); PLUNKET, *Ancient Calendars and Constellations* (London, 1903).

On Martyrologies, see DUCHESNE and DE ROSSI, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Nov., II; ACHELIS, *Die Martyrologien* (Berlin, 1900); QUENTIN, *Les martyrologes historiques* (Paris, 1908).

On English Calendars, HAMPSON, *Medii Ævi Calendarium* (2 vols., London, 1857); IMELMANN, *Das altenglische Menologium;* HERZFELD, *The Old English Martryologium* (Early Eng. Text Soc., London, 1898); PIPER, *A. S. Kalendarien* (Berlin, 1862); MORRIS, *The Calendar and Rite used by English Catholics* in *Archæologia* (London, 1892), LII, 113–128; BIRT, *An Early Catholic Almanac*, in *Downside Review* (December, 1907).

As a Part of Diplomatics:—GIRY, *Manuel de diplomatique* (Paris, 1894); GROTEFEND, *Zeitrechnung des d. M. A.* (Hanover, 1891–98), II; GROTEFEND, *Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung* (Hanover, 1905); BOND, *Handy Book of Dates* (London, 1876).

Calendar Illustrations:—RIEGL, *Die M. A. Kalender-illustration in Mitt. d. Inst. b. öster, Geschichtsforschung.* (1889), X, 1–74; FOWLER, *Mediæval Representations of the Months and Seasons*, in *Archæologia* (London), XLIV.

The editions of early calendars and the articles upon them are too numerous for special mention.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Calendar, JEWISH.—The first element to be considered with regard to the Hebrew calendar is the Jewish DAY (יוֹם, *yôm*). From the remotest time to the present the Israelites have computed the day from sunset to sunset, or rather from sunset to the appearance of the first three stars which marked the beginning of a new day [Cf. Lev., xxiii, 32; II Esd. (Nehem.), iv, 21; etc.]. Before the Babylonian Exile the time between sunrise and sunset was divided into "morning", "midday", and "evening" (Ps. liv, 18; Heb., lv, 17); but during the stay in Babylon the Hebrews adopted the division into twelve hours (Cf. John, xi, 9), whose duration varied with the length of the day. On an average, the first hour corresponded to about 6 a. m.; the third hour to 9 a. m.; the end of the sixth to noon; while at the eleventh the day was near its close. Earlier than this division of the day by hours was that of the night into three watches: the first till midnight; the second or middle watch (cock-crow)

till 3 a. m.; and the third or morning watch till about 6 a. m. Seven consecutive days form the WEEK, or second element of the Jewish calendar. As in our ecclesiastical calendar, the days of the Jewish week are numbered, not named. They are called the first day, the second day, the third day, and so on to the seventh, which last is also called "sabbath" (שבת, *shábbāth*), a name likewise used to designate the week itself. The sixth day, our Friday, is also known in the New Testament, in Josephus, and in Rabbinical writings as "the eve of the sabbath", or as "the day of the preparation", the παρασκευή, a term still employed by the Latin Church in connexion with Good Friday (Cf. Mark, xv, 42; Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, XVI, vi, 2; Talmud of Jerusalem, Treatise *Pesāhîm*, chap. iv, I).

The third and most important element in the Jewish arrangement of time is the MONTH. The two Hebrew words for month are ירח, *yéraḥ*, and חדש, *hōdésh*, whose primitive meaning, "moon", "new moon", points to the dependence of the Jewish month on the phases of the moon. As a matter of fact, the Hebrew months have always been lunar, and extended from one new moon to another. The beginning of the month with the appearance of the new moon was—as it is still—of great practical importance among the Hebrews, inasmuch as the first of every month was to be observed as New Moon's Day, and certain feasts were affixed to the 10th, 14th, or other days of the month. The earliest appearance of the new moon was long ascertained by direct observation, and authoritatively settled by a commission of the Sanhedrin, and the intelligence then made known to the Jews at large, first by means of fire-signals, and later on through special messengers. In the present day, and for many centuries, this very primitive manner of fixing the beginning of the month has given way to a systematic calculation of the latter's duration, and the Jewish calendar is now constructed on the basis of a mean lunation of 29 days, 12 hours, 44 min., and 3⅓ sec. Besides being indicated by means of numerals, the first month, the second month, etc., the Hebrew months have been designated in the course of Jewish history by two sets of names. Of the former set—going back probably to Chanaanite times—only four names have survived in the Hebrew Bible. These are: אביב, *'Ābhîbh* (A. V. Ex., xiii, 4, xxiii, 15; Deut., xvi, 1), subsequently the first month; זיו, *Ziw* (III K., vi, 1), subsequently the second month; אתנים, *'Ēthānîm* (III K., viii, 2), subsequently the seventh month; and בול, *Būl* (III K., vi, 38), subsequently the eighth month. The latter set of names, certainly of Babylonian origin, began to be used after the Exile. Of its twelve names now found in the Jewish calendar only seven occur in the Hebrew text, but the whole twelve appear as the main divisions of the *Megillath Ta' anîth* (Scroll of Fasting), which in its original form is referred to a date before the Christian Era. These twelve names are as follows: 1. *Nîṣān* (Nehem., ii, 1; Esth., iii, 7); 2. *'Iyyār* (not named in Scripture); 3. *Sîwān* (Esth., viii, 9; Baruch, i, 8); 4. *Támmûz* (Cf. A. V. Ezech., viii, 14); 5. *'Āb* (not named in Scripture); 6. *'Ĕlûl* (Nehem., vi, 15; I Mach., xiv, 27); 7. *Tíshrî* (not named in Scripture); 8. *Márḥéshwān*, or simply *Héshwān* (not named in Scripture); 9. *Kíslēw* (Zach., vii, 1; Nehem., i, 1); 10. *Tēbhēth* (Esth., ii, 16); 11. *Shebhāt* (Zach., i, 7; I Mach., xvi, 14); 12. *'Ādār* (I Esdras, vi, 15; Esth., iii, 7, viii, 12, etc.).

The twelve months thus named made up the ordinary YEAR (שנה, *shānāh*), or next important element in the Jewish calendar. As they were lunar months they formed a mean year of 354 days, a year consequently shorter than the solar year by ten or eleven days. This difference, as can be readily seen, would have, in the course of time, completely disordered the months in relation to the seasons of the year; thus the first month, or *Nîṣān* (corresponding to the end of March or the beginning of April), in the middle of which the first ripe barley was to be presented to Yahweh in connexion with the paschal feast (Ex., xii, 1 sqq., xiii,

THE JEWISH CALENDAR

Hebrew Month	Year: Sacred	Year: Civil	Year: Ordinary	Year: Leap	During 20th century first of month occurs between	Principal Feasts	Seasons
Nîṣān, ניסן	1	7	30 (days)	30	March 13–April 11	1. New Moon 14. Paschal lamb killed 15–21. Paschal Feast. (Firstfruits of barley offered)	
'Iyyār, איר	2	8	29	29	April 12–May 11	1. New Moon 14. Second Passover (Num., ix, 10, 11)	Harvest
Ṣíwān, סיון	3	9	30	30	May 11–June 9	1. New Moon 6. Pentecost. (Firstfruits of wheat harvest)	
Támmûz, תמוז	4	10	29	29	June 10–July 9	1. New Moon 7. Fast. Taking of Jerusalem by Titus	
'Ābh, אב	5	11	30	30	July 9–Aug. 7	1. New Moon 9. Fast. Destruction of the Temple	Hot Season
'Ĕlûl, אלול	6	12	29	29	Aug. 8–Sept. 6	1. New Moon	
Tíshrí, תשרי	7	1	30	30	Sept. 6–Oct. 5	1–2. New Year's Feast 10. Day of Atonement 15–21. Feast of Tabernacles. (Firstfruits of wine and oil)	Seed Time
Márḥéshwān (Héshwān), מרחשון	8	2	29+	29+	Oct. 6–Nov. 4	1. New Moon	
Kíslēw, כסלו	9	3	30–	30–	Nov. 4–Dec. 3	1. New Moon 25. Feast of the Dedication of the Temple	
Ṭēbhēth, טבת	10	4	29	29	Dec. 4–Jan. 2	1. New Moon 10. Fast. Siege of Jerusalem	Winter
Shebhāt, שבט	11	5	30	30	Jan. 2–Jan. 31	1. New Moon	
'Ādār, אדר	12	6	29	30	Feb. 1–March 2	1. New Moon 14, 15. Feast of Purim	
[We-'Ādār], ואדר	(Intercalary)	(Intercalary)	(..)	(29)	March 3–March 13	1. New Moon 14, 15. Feast of Purim	Cold Season
			354	384			

3 sqq.; Lev., xxiii, 10–12), might have fallen in the middle of winter; and some other festivals depending likewise on the products of the seasons would also have been materially interfered with. Hence it was soon felt—how soon cannot now be ascertained—that the difference between the lunar and the solar years should be equalized by the intercalation of a month. The year in which such an intercalation should be made was for a while determined by an authoritative decision of the Sanhedrin, and ultimately fixed in a permanent manner by astronomical calculation. In a cycle of nineteen years the third, sixth, eighth, eleventh, fourteenth, seventeenth, and nineteenth are made leap-years with an average length of 384 days, by the addition of a month following the twelfth (*'Ădār*), and usually called *We-'Ădār* (Second Adar). It is plain, therefore, that the Jewish year has long been, and still is, a luni-solar year. The Hebrew year thus far described is one constituted in harmony with ritual requirements, and hence it is called the sacred Jewish year. Together with it the Jews have had from time immemorial what may be called a common or civil year commencing in the month of *Tishrî* (corresponding generally to part of September and part of October), on or immediately after the new moon following the autumnal equinox. The beginning of the Hebrew civil year practically coincides with that of seed time in Palestine, while the beginning of the sacred year corresponds to that of the harvest season in the same country.

There now remains to consider the ERA, or last element of the Jewish calendar. As might well be expected in connexion with a people whose history has been so checkered, the Hebrews have adopted various points of time from which to reckon the succession of years. Their principal ancient eras have been: (1) the one which was dated from the deliverance from Egypt; (2) the regnal era, or computation of time from the year of accession of the Jewish kings to the throne; (3) the Seleucid era, introduced after the Babylonian Exile, beginning 312 B. C., and used by the Jews probably till the twelfth century. For centuries they have employed their present method of counting by *anno mundi* (A. M.). For the yearly arrangement of the principal festival days see Jewish calendar on preceding page.

According to the current Jewish reckoning the calendar is dated from the Creation of the World, which is considered to have taken place 3760 years and 3 months before the commencement of the Christian Era. To find the number of the Hebrew year, beginning in the autumn of a given year of our common era, we have to add 3761 to the number of the latter. Thus the Jewish year beginning September, 1908, is 5669 A. M.

WOOLHOUSE, *Measures, Weights, and Moneys of All Nations* (1869); SCHÜRER, *History of the Jewish People*, tr. 1st Div., vol. II (2d ed.); EDERSHEIM, *The Temple and its Services in the Time of Jesus Christ;* BARNABY, *The Jewish and Mohammedan Calendar* (1901).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Calendar, REFORM OF THE.—For the measurement of time the most important units furnished by natural phenomena are the *Day* and the *Year*. In regard of both, it is convenient and usual to speak of the apparent movements of the sun and stars as if they were real, and not occasioned by the rotation and revolution of the earth.

The *Day* is the interval between two successive passages of the sun across the meridian of any place. It is commonly computed from the midnight passage across the inferior meridian on the opposite side of the globe; but by astronomers from the passage at the noon following. The *Civil Day* is thus twelve hours in advance of the *Astronomical*.

The *Solar Day*, which is what we always mean by the term *day*, is longer by about four minutes of time than the *Sidereal*, or the successive passages of a fixed star across the same meridian; for, owing to the revolution of the earth in its orbit from west to east, the sun appears to travel annually in a path (the ecliptic), likewise from west to east, among the stars round the entire heavens. The belt of constellations through which it appears to proceed is styled the zodiac. During half the year (March to September) the ecliptic lies to the north of the celestial equator; during the other half (September to March) to the south. The points where ecliptic and equator intersect are called the equinoxes. In the northern hemisphere the March equinox (or "first point of Aries") is called the vernal equinox; the September equinox ("first point of Libra"), the autumnal.

The *Year* (*Tropical Year*) is the period in which the sun makes a complete circuit of the heavens and returns to the point in the zodiac whence it started, and the problem to be solved by those who construct calendars is to find the exact measure of this yearly period in terms of days, for the number of these occupied by the sun's annual journey is not exact. Taking the vernal equinox as a convenient starting-point, it is found that before the sun arrives there again, 365 days and something more have passed. These are, of course, solar days; of sidereal days, each shorter by four minutes, there are 366. The first attempt to find a practical solution of this problem was made by Julius Cæsar, who introduced the Julian Calendar. With the assistance of the astronomers of Alexandria, he determined the true length of the year to be 365 days and 6 hours, or a quarter of a day. From this it followed that the reckoning of the civil year began too soon, i. e. six hours before the sun had reached the point whence it started its annual cycle. In four years, therefore, the year would begin an entire day too soon. To remedy this Cæsar instituted leap-years, a 366th day being introduced in every fourth year, to cover the fractional portions of a day thus accumulated. This extra day was assigned to February, the 24th and 25th day of which were styled in leap-year the *sixth* before the calends (or first) of March. Hence the name *Bissextile* given to these years.

Cæsar's reform, which was introduced in the year 46 B.C., would have been perfect had the calculation on which it was based been accurate. In reality, however, the portion of a day to be dealt with, over and above the complete 365, is not quite six hours, but 11 minutes and 14 seconds less. To add a day every fourth year was, therefore, almost three quarters of an hour too much, the following new year commencing 44 minutes and 52 seconds after the sun had passed the equinox. At the end of a century these accumulated errors amounted to about three-quarters of a day, and at the end of four centuries to three entire days. The practical inconveniences of this defect in the system were not slow in making themselves felt, the more so as, Cæsar being murdered soon after (44 B.C.), leap-year, by a misunderstanding of his plan, occurred every third year, instead of every fourth. At the time of the Julian reform the sun passed the vernal equinox on 25 March, but by the time of the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) this had been changed for the 21st, which was then fixed upon as the proper date of the equinox—a date of great importance for the calculation of Easter, and therefore of all the moveable feasts throughout the year.

But the error, of course, continued to operate and disturb such arrangements. In the thirteenth century the year was seven days behind the Nicæan computation. By the sixteenth it was ten days in arrear, so that the vernal equinox fell on 11 March, and the autumnal on 11 September; the shortest day was 11 December, and the longest 11 June, the feast of St. Barnabas, whence the old rhyme:—

Barnaby bright, the longest day and the shortest night.

Such alterations were too obvious to be ignored, and throughout the Middle Ages many observers both pointed them out and endeavoured to devise a remedy. For this purpose it was necessary, however, not only to determine with accuracy the exact amount of the Julian error, but also to discover a practical means of correcting it. It was this latter problem that chiefly stood in the way of reform, for the amount of error was ascertained almost exactly as early as the thirteenth century. The necessity of a reform was continually urged, especially by Church authorities, who felt the need in connexion with the ecclesiastical calendar. It was accordingly strongly pressed upon the attention of the pope by the councils of Constance, Basle, Lateran (A.D. 1511), and finally by Trent, in its last session (A.D. 1563).

Nineteen years later the work was accomplished by Pope Gregory XIII (from whom the Gregorian reform takes its name) with the aid chiefly of Lilius, Clavius, and Chacon or Chaconius. There were two main objects to be attained: first, the error of ten days, already mentioned, which had crept in, had to be got rid of; second, its recurrence had to be prevented for the future. The first was attained by the omission from the calendar of the ten superfluous days, so as to bring things back to their proper position. To obviate the recurrence of the same inconvenience, it was decided to omit three leap years in every four centuries, and thus eliminate the three superfluous days, which, as we have seen, would be introduced in that period under the Julian system. To effect this, only those *Centurial* years were retained as leap years the first two figures of which are exact multiples of 4—as 1600, 2000, 2400—other centurial years—1700, 1800, 1900, 2100, etc.—becoming common years of 365 days each. By this comparatively simple device an approximation to perfect accuracy was effected, which for all practical purposes is amply sufficient; for, although the length of the Gregorian year exceeds the true astronomical measurement by twenty-six seconds, it will be about thirty-five centuries before the result will be an error of a day, and, as Lord Grimthorpe truly says, before that time arrives mankind will have abundant time to devise a mode of correction. For the actual introduction of the Gregorian Calendar or New Style, throughout Christendom, see CHRONOLOGY.

Romani Calendarii a Gregorio XIII Pont. max. instituti Explicatio (Rome, 1603——); *L'Art de vérifier les dates* (Paris, 1818–42); BOND, *Handy Book for Verifying Dates;* GROTEFEND, *Zeitrechnung des d. Mittelalters* (Hanover, 1905); WOOLHOUSE, *Measures, Weights, and Moneys;* GRIMTHORPE (SIR E. BECKETT DENISON), *Astronomy Without Mathematics*

JOHN GERARD.



PAOLO CALIARI (VERONESE), BY HIMSELF (UFFIZI GALLERY)

MYSTICAL MARRIAGE OF ST. CATHERINE (CHURCH OF S. CATARINA, VENICE)



ST. PAUL (UFFIZI GALLERY)

Calepino, AMBROGIO, an Italian lexicographer, b. about 1440 at Calepio (province of Bergamo); d. 1510 or 1511. He entered the Augustinian Order in 1458. His Latin dictionary, under the title of "Cornucopiæ", appeared first in 1502 at Reggio. It was reprinted many times during the sixteenth century, the Aldi alone giving no less than eighteen editions from 1542 to 1592. Later editions were considerably enlarged. To the Latin of the original were added equivalents in other languages. Thus we have the Basle edition (1590) which contains eleven languages: "Ambrosii Calepini dictionarium undecim linguarum: respondent autem latinis vocabulis hebraica, græca, gallica, italica, germanica, belgica, hispanica, polonica, ungarica, anglica". The edition in seven languages by Facciolati (Pavia, 1718) was reprinted many times. Calepinus became a common name, a synonym of dictionary or lexicon, and we find titles like the following: "Septem linguarum calepinus, hoc est, lexicon latinum". Calepino also wrote the life of St. John the Hermit which is found in the "Acta Sanctorum" for the 22d of October (Oct., IX, 748–767).

TIRABOSCHI, *Storia della letteratura italiana* (Florence, 1812), VII, IV, 1552–1554; *Nuova enciclopedia italiana* (Turin, 1875——), IV, 636.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Calf. See GOLDEN CALF.

Caliari, PAOLO (usually known as PAOLO VERONESE), an eminent painter of the Venetian school; b. at Verona, 1528; d. at Venice, 19 April, 1588. He was the son of a sculptor, Gabriele Caliari, and was at first educated in his father's craft, but his taste was towards painting; and he entered the studio of Antonio Badile, a Veronese painter of some repute. His first works were executed at Verona, and at Mantua, and at Castelfranco. In the last-named place he decorated the Villa Soranzo with large frescoes. He was summoned to Venice in 1555 and commissioned to decorate the ceiling of San Sebastiano, his work giving such satisfaction that he was further employed to paint an altar-piece and smaller works in the same church. In 1561 the historical paintings he executed in a castle near Vicenza were brought under the notice of Titian, who selected him to carry out part of the decoration of the great hall of the Library of Saint Mark, and his three medallions were successful in

winning for him the gold chain offered for the best painting in the library. In 1562 he painted his great picture, the "Marriage at Cana" (now in the Louvre), for the Convent of San Giorgio Maggiore, following it by several other great banqueting scenes. In the next year he was again in the church of San Sebastiano, painting two superb pieces of wall-decoration depicting the martyrdom of St. Sebastian and the execution of Saints Marcellus and Marcellinus. In this same year he decorated in masterly style the Palladiar Villa Masiera, not far from Treviso. Soon after 1566, Veronese went to Rome in the suite of the ambassador of the Republic of Venice, Guniani, and carefully studied the works of Michelangelo and of Raphael; but he was speedily back in his native districts; the remainder of his life was spent in the service of the Republic of Venice, and he was buried in the church of San Sebastiano. He married the daughter of Antonio Badile and had a large family, two of his sons, Gabriele (b. 1568) and Carletto (b. 1570), adopting their father's profession.

He is declared to have been a man of sweet character, amiable and generous, very affectionate towards his family, and greatly esteemed by all who knew him. He was a painter of prodigious facility and of untiring energy, and his paintings are exceedingly decorative, glowing with gorgeous colour, and splendidly composed. His paintings are all frankly anachronistic, and he makes no pretension to depict religious scenes in the surroundings which should belong to them. There is no trace of religious feeling about them, and no attempt to produce such an emotion. The subjects were treated by the painter purely as offering good possibilities for pictorial representation, and he introduced historical characters into his gorgeous scenes quite irrespective of historic unity, merely with a view to decorative charm. His aim was magnificence, and the church of San Sebastiano is a splendid monument of his masterly skill in decoration. It glows with his sumptuous colour. His "Vision of St. Helena", in the National Gallery, London, shows us, however, that he had deep poetic feeling, such as is not always apparent in his better-known banqueting scenes. One of the peculiarities of his great scenes is his habit of introducing irreverent details, such as dwarfs, Swiss guards, dogs, cats, monkeys, and other animals, into his Scriptural subjects, and for so doing he was twice summoned before the Inquisition and severely reprimanded. The inquisitors were particularly scandalized at the introduction of the Swiss guards, as they were presumed to be Protestants, and at the figure of a disciple who is depicted in the act of picking his teeth with a fork.

The full-length family groups which this artist painted must be alluded to. In "The Family of Darius before Alexander", every noble quality of the painter is seen to perfection. The colouring is superb, the touch sparkling and crisp, the composition unrivalled, while the stately male figures and beautiful women are worthy of all praise. He was exceedingly fond of gigantic compositions, and Tintoretto was the only painter who surpassed him in the use of huge canvases. Doubtless he was influenced by Carotto, Brusasorci, and other Veronese painters, and the effect of his early training in Verona can be seen in all his works, but in splendid pomp of colour and in the presentation of a noble race of human beings in full enjoyment of all the delights of life he is a true follower of the school of the great republic. It has been well said that the beauty of his figures is more addressed to the senses than to the soul, but it must be borne in mind that his pictures have a feeling for grace and a splendour of life which had entirely departed from the other schools of the period. Venice contains numerous works by Paolo Veronese, and there are many of his paintings in Florence, Milan, Dresden, Munich, Vienna, London, Paris, and Castelfranco, while more than a dozen works by him are to be seen in Madrid. His decorative fresco work can be studied only in the district round about Venice, in the Villas Fanzolo, Tiene, Masiera, and Magnadole.

There is a detailed description of his decoration in the Villa Masiera by BLANC in *La Gazette des Beaux-Arts*. See also SIRET; KÜGLER; BRYAN, *Dictionary*.

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

California, the largest and most important of the Pacific Coast States, is the second State of the United States in point of area, and the twenty-first in point of population. It is bounded on the north by the State of Oregon; on the east by the State of Nevada and, for a comparatively short distance, by the Territory of Arizona; on the south by the Peninsula of Lower California (Mexico); and on the west by the Pacific Ocean. It lies entirely between 42° and 32° N. lat., and between 125° and 113° W. long. It is 800 miles long, running in a northwesterly and south-easterly direction, and has an average width of 200 miles. According to the official returns of the United States Census of 1900, its total area is 158,360 square miles. Of this number 2,188 square miles constitute the water area; the total land area, therefore, is 156,172 square miles. The capital of the State is Sacramento, with a population (1900) of 29,000. San Francisco, built on San Francisco Bay, is the metropolis, with a population (1900) of 342,000. The other chief cities, with population according to the United States Census of 1900, are Los Angeles, 102,000; Oakland, 66,000; San José, 21,000; San Diego, 17,000; Stockton, 17,000; Alameda, 17,000; Berkeley and Fresno, 12,000. These figures have been enormously increased since 1900. The estimated population of the three largest cities in January, 1907, was as follows: San Francisco, 400,000; Oakland, 276,000; and Los Angeles, 245,000.

SEAL OF CALIFORNIA

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.—The State presents two systems of mountains which converge at Mount Shasta, in the north, and Tehachapi, in the south. The outer, or western, range is called the Coast Range, and is close to the sea, in some places coming down precipitately to the water's edge; the eastern range is called the Sierra Nevada. The latter is considerably higher than the former, and in several peaks reaches a height of more than 14,000 feet. The Sierra Nevadas extend along the eastern border of the State for about 450 miles; they are but a portion, physically, of the Cascade Range, which traverses also the States of Oregon and Washington. The Sierra Nevada Range is practically unbroken throughout the entire length of the State of California, the Coast Range is broken by the magnificent harbour of San Francisco. Both of these ranges follow the general contour of the coast line. Between them lies a great valley which is drained by the Sacramento River in the north and the San Joaquin River in the south. These two rivers, navigable for steamers for about 100 miles from their mouth in San Francisco Bay, constitute the great parent water-system of California, and both empty into the harbour of San Francisco, which is situated approximately midway between the northern and southern extremities of the State. The Sierra Nevada Mountains form the great watershed

from which are fed most of the rivers and streams of California. The combined valleys of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin rivers are approximately 500 miles long, and have an average width of 50 miles. This area, the surface of which is quite level, is one of the most fertile regions in the world.

In addition to those already mentioned, the divisions of the mountain ranges form numerous smaller valleys. The principal of these are Sonoma, Napa, Ukiah, Vaca, Contra Costa, and Alameda valleys in the north; and Santa Clara, Pajaro, and Salinas valleys in the south. South of the Tehachapi Range, in Southern California, is another low-lying stretch of country which has become the centre of the citrus industry and the home of a large variety of semi-tropical fruits. In the south-eastern part of the State and east of the mountains is the low-lying desert region consisting of the Mojave Desert and Death Valley. Owing to the great height of the Sierra Nevada Mountains and their comparative proximity to the sea, the numerous streams, fed from their glaciers and perpetual snows, afford abundant water-power throughout their steep descent to the sea. This power is utilized for generating light and operating mills and factories.

California has one of the finest harbours in the world, San Francisco Bay, capable of accommodating the combined navies of the world. There are five other bays forming good harbours, San Diego, San Pedro, Humboldt, Santa Barbara, and Monterey bays. The 800 miles of California's length from north to south are equal to the combined length of ten States on the Atlantic seaboard; the northern line of California is on the same latitude as Boston, and the southern line is that of Savannah, Georgia. The entire State is subject to the beneficent influence of the Japan Current. The climate is equable; except in the high mountains, snow and the extremes of cold, experienced in the same latitudes on the Atlantic Coast, are unknown. There are, in reality, but two seasons: the wet and the dry. The wet or rainy season lasts from about September to April, during which the rains are occasional, alternating with clear weather. During the entire summer the winds from the west and south-west blow over the coast, keeping the weather cool, and not infrequently bringing in cold fogs towards evening. But it is chiefly in the balminess of its winters that the climate of California excels. It is never too cold to work outdoors, and the citrus fruits, semi-tropical as they are, grow to perfection throughout the valleys of California. The records of the climate left by the early Franciscan missionaries who evangelized California are duplicated by those of the Government Weather Bureau of to-day.

Population.—The population of California, according to the United States Census of 1900, is 1,485,053, or 9.5 per square mile. This figure constitutes an increase of 22.7 per cent upon the population of 1890. The following table, taken from the United States Census of 1900, exhibits the population of California in each census year since its admission into the Federal Union, its rank among the States in point of population, and the percentage of increase in its population during the period of ten years between each census:

Year	Rank	Population	Percentage of Increase
1850	29	92,597	——
1860	26	379,994	310.4
1870	24	560,247	47.4
1880	24	864,694	54.3
1890	22	1,208,130	39.7
1900	21	1,485,053	22.7

The census of 1900 also presents the following details of population: (a) White, 1,402,727; African, 11,045; Indian, 15,377; Chinese, 45,753; Japanese, 10,151. (b) Native-born, 1,117,813; Foreign-born, 367,240; (c) Males, 820,531; Females, 664,522. The estimated population of California (January, 1907) is 2,217,897, an increase of 732,844, or 49.3 per cent since the census of 1900.

Resources.—*Agriculture.*—The soil of the State of California is rich and highly productive. It consists for the most part of alluvial deposits. This is especially true of the delta lands of the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers. Much of the so-called desert land consists of a rich subsoil covered with but a thin crust of sand. The value of irrigation in making this desert land productive, as well as in enriching the soil by bearing to it the washed-out life-principles from the uplands, is almost incalculable. The soil readily responds to the plough, and there is no hard, tough subsoil to be turned and mellowed. California has approximately 40,000,000 acres of arable land. To this must be added fully 10,000,000 acres of its so-called desert land, which needs but the touch of water from its irrigation systems to make it as productive as the valley or farm lands. The remaining 50,000,000 acres of California's domain, the mountainous and desert acreage, afford pasturage for millions of cattle and sheep. The chief products of the soil of California are hay, grain, fruits, wines, lumber, dairy produce, and live stock. It may be safely said that, in the combined value of these products, California is the richest of the United States. Ships loaded with her grain at San Francisco Bay carry their precious cargoes to every port in the world; her fruits, packed in special cars and shipped by fast freight, are the first choice in Chicago and New York, and find a ready market in London; her wines have given a standard of excellence to American wines, and "American wines" means "California wines" the world over.

The total value of all California's agricultural products, according to the census of 1900, was $131,690,606. The value of the output in 1906 reached the total of $213,000,000. The following table presents the total output of agricultural products in detail for the year 1906:

Asparagus	23,000,000 pounds	Hay	3,000,000 tons
Almonds	4,200,000 "	Lumber	900,000,000 feet
Apricots	585,000 "	Pears	54,390,000 pounds
Apples	132,455,000 "	Peaches	21,015,000 "
Beans	125,000,000 "	Plums	43,938,000 "
Barley	24,000,000 bushels	Prunes	180,000,000 "
Brandy	4,070,992 gallons	Raisins	100,000,000 "
Citrus fruits	18,220,000 boxes	Other dried fruit	41,000,000 "
Canned fruits & veg.	4,475,751 cases	Olive oil	50,000 gallons
Corn	2,000,000 bushels	Potatoes	6,500,000 bushels
Cherries	5,382,000 pounds	Walnuts	12,800,000 pounds
Figs	45,000 "	Wool	22,000,000 "
Grapes	73,224,000 "	Wheat	4,700,000 centals
Hops	73,000 bales	Wine	41,000,000 gallons

The total annual output of fruit from California farms is $40,000,000, and this is made up of all known fruits that grow in temperate and semi-tropical climates. In the year 1906 there were 30,000,000 fruit trees in California; this figure does not include nuts, figs, olives, or berries. Six million of these fruit trees belong to Santa Clara Valley alone. The principal fruit trees are as follows: apple trees, 4,000,000; apricot trees, 3,500,000; cherry trees, 1,000,000; peach trees, 4,500,000; pear trees, 2,000,000; orange trees, 6,000,000; lemon trees, 2,000,000. There are 272,500 acres of land devoted to the cultivation of grapes: 250,000 for wine, and 22,500 for table grapes.

Industries and Manufactures.—The total value of the output in manufactures in 1900, according to the census, was $302,874,761. In 1906 it amounted to $400,000,000. The chief elements contributing to California's success in manufactures are an abundance

of raw material from her soil, cheap fuel from her forests, and cheap power from her streams. The heaviest items of manufacture are sugar, lumber and timber products, flour, machinery, and leather goods. During 1906 the total output of sugar was 62,110 tons. The discovery of rich deposits of petroleum has given an impetus to manufactures that is already far-reaching in its results. In 1900 there were 12,582 manufacturing plants in California, representing a total investment of $205,395,025, and giving employment to 98,931 persons; the sum paid out for labour was $55,786,776, and for materials, $188,125,602.

Mining.—Mining is still one of the most important industries of California, notwithstanding that the flood of population first lured to her mountains by the discovery of gold has long ago been turned to agriculture and commerce. There are some forty-seven mineral substances now being mined in the State. The value of the total output in 1900 was $28,870,405. In 1906 it was over $54,000,000. Gold, petroleum, and copper are now the most valuable items of this output. In the same year there were 1,107 producing mines in the State. The value of the gold output was $19,700,000; silver, $2,460,000; copper, $3,750,000; quicksilver, $904,000; petroleum, $10,000,000. It is estimated that in the petroleum industry alone the total investment is more than $20,000,000; 35,000,000 barrels of oil were produced in 1906. There are also large and valuable deposits of brick and pottery clays, lime, asphaltum, bitumen, and iron ore.

Lumber.—Twenty-two per cent of the area of the State is forest-clad, and the importance of the lumber industry in California increases each year as the mountains of the east and the north are denuded of their trees. California is the home of the redwood (*Sequoia*). These remarkable trees attain a height of three hundred feet in the famous groves of Big Trees in Mariposa and Calaveras Counties. Redwood and pine are the two principal woods. It is estimated that, without the growth of another tree, the forests of California can not be exhausted for two hundred years. San Francisco alone sends 400,000,000 feet of lumber to the world each year. The total output of the State for 1906 was 900,000,000 feet. There are $16,000,000 invested in the industry, 250 mills, and the value of the total output, together with the by-products of the forests, is $17,000,000—the lumber itself amounting to $8,500,000.

Commerce.—Through the splendid harbour of San Francisco passes by far the greatest part of the ocean commerce of California, as well as of the entire Pacific Coast. The harbours of the State now carry on an ocean commerce of about $100,000,000 per year, the precise figure for 1906 being: imports $49,193,303; exports $45,479,422. The total foreign commerce of the State for 1900 was $119,212,911, and in 1906 San Francisco was fourth among the cities of the United States in point of customs receipts. Besides the ocean commerce of California with every port of the world which passes through her harbours, she has direct communication by rail with every quarter of the United States. Four great transcontinental railroads carry her goods and passengers to and from her cities, and a fifth is now (1907) nearing completion. In 1900 the total railroad mileage of the State was 5,532.

Educational System.—The educational system of the State commences with primary schools and continues through grammar schools and high schools, culminating in the State University. These are all public schools, being supported by the State and counties, and affording free education to all. The State Constitution creates the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction; it also provides for a superintendent of schools for each of the fifty-seven counties in the State. It makes provision for the maintenance of the public school system, and directs that the proceeds of all public lands and of all escheated estates shall be appropriated to the support of the common schools. The State University is situated at Berkeley on the Bay of San Francisco. It was created by act of the legislature on 23 March, 1868, and this act is confirmed by the present constitution (that of 1879), making the organization and government of the university perpetual. The university is designed for the education of male and female students alike, and in fact the principle of co-education is recognized and put in practice in nearly all state educational institutions.

The total number of professors, including the various officers of instruction and research, in the University of California, for the year ending 30 June, 1906, was 318, as follows: academic, 252; art, 9; Lick Astronomical Observatory, 9; law, 6; medicine, 34; pharmacy, 8. The total number of students for the same period was 3,338, of whom 2,007 were men, and 1,331 women, the women being nearly 40 per cent of the total enrolment. This percentage is far higher in the Colleges of Letters, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences, in which, as an average, the women outnumber the men more than two to one. The College of Agriculture, as well as several other technological colleges, including the College of Mechanics, the College of Mining, the College of Commerce, the College of Civil Engineering, and the College of Chemistry, are designed to afford a complete technical training in their respective branches. The Affiliated Colleges of the University, being the schools of Law, Medicine, Pharmacy, and Dentistry, are situated in San Francisco; there are several experiment stations for which the university receives $15,000 annually from the Federal Government; and there is a State University Farm of 780 acres at Davisville. The university has been the recipient of munificent endowments both from the State and from private persons. In addition to these, and to the proceeds of public land already mentioned, a direct tax of two cents on every $100 of taxable property in the State is levied, and applied to the support of the university. But four of the fifty-seven counties of the State have no high school, and some counties have several. There are also five normal schools, situated respectively at San Francisco, Los Angeles, San José, San Diego, and Chico. In addition to these there are night schools, technical schools, and commercial schools in all the large cities of the State.

The public school system of the State was founded in the constitutional convention at Monterey, in September, 1849. The 500,000 acres of land granted by Congress to new States for the purpose of internal improvement were appropriated to constitute a perpetual school fund. It was also provided that a school should be kept in each district at least three months each year to secure any share of the State school funds. In the school year ending 30 June, 1906, there were 3,227 primary and grammar schools in the State, and 117 high schools. The total number of teachers in the public schools was 9,371; the total number of pupils, 321,870. The total number of pupils in private schools was 43,080. California has been more than lavish in her provision for her public school system. The total income of her public schools during the scholastic year 1905–06 was $11,494,670.29. The total value of public school property for the same year was $23,860,341. This does not include the State University. The total income of the State University for the same period was $1,564,190. The Leland Stanford Junior University is situated at Palo Alto. It was founded by Mr. and Mrs. Leland Stanford as a memorial to their only child. The total value of the endowments given to the university by its founders reaches the astonishing figure of $26,000,000. Like the University of California, it is co-educational, but the number of women

students is limited to 500. The university was opened to students in 1891.

The work of religious education in California is confined almost exclusively to institutions under Catholic auspices. In California the Catholic Church, notwithstanding that she receives no financial aid from the State, and that the support of her schools and colleges must be derived entirely from the contributions of the faithful, has done great things in the cause of Christian education. The great pioneers of Catholic education in California were the Jesuits. In 1851 Santa Clara College was founded by the venerable Father John Nobili, S. J. This was followed, four years later, by the establishment of St. Ignatius College in San Francisco under the leadership of the Rev. Anthony Maraschi, S. J. From the days of these small beginnings the zeal of those charged with the education of Catholic youth has been untiring, progress has been steady, and the results already achieved have more than compensated for the sacrifices and expenditures which the work entailed. The following figures for the year 1907 will give some idea of the importance of Catholic education in California: 1 archdiocesan seminary, 5 seminaries of religious orders, 1 normal school, 11 colleges, academies and high schools for boys, 47 academies for girls, 73 parochial schools, 31,814 young people under Catholic care. Besides the institutions just mentioned there are numerous orphan asylums, industrial schools, infant asylums, day homes and a protectory for boys to which is attached a boys' industrial farm at Rutherford. In addition to the colleges in charge of the Jesuits already mentioned, the Christian Brothers conduct Sacred Heart College in San Francisco, and St. Mary's College in Oakland. St. Vincent's College, in Los Angeles, is under the care of the Vincentian Fathers. There are several other universities and colleges, as well as numerous grammar, primary and secondary schools and kindergartens, under private management.

HISTORY.—The origin of the name *California* has been the subject of some conjecture; but certain it is that by the end of the sixteenth century it was applied to all the territory claimed by the Spanish Crown, bordering on the Pacific Ocean and lying north of Cape San Lucas. In a much later day it came to designate, under the familiar phrase, "The Two Californias", the territory now included in the State of California, and the Peninsula of Lower California. After Florida, California is the oldest name of any of the United States. The land was discovered by the Spaniards—Lower California by Cortez, who visited the peninsula in 1533; and Alta or Upper California by Cabrillo, in 1542. Lower California had been evangelized by the Jesuits who had established eighteen missions between 1697 and 1767. Upon the expulsion of the Jesuits in the latter year, the care of the missions and the conversion of the Indians in the Spanish settlements were entrusted to the Franciscans. To them therefore belongs the honour of founding the great mission system of California proper. The leader of this gigantic work was the renowned Father Junípero Serra, and his first settlement in California was the mission of San Diego, which he established in July, 1769. San Francisco was founded in 1776. For fifteen years the saintly man laboured in California with apostolic zeal, and at the time of his death in 1784, he had established nine missions between San Diego and San Francisco. The total number of missions founded in California by the Franciscans was twenty-one, and they extended from Sonoma in the north to San Diego in the south. Prominent among them were Santa Clara, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and San Juan Capistrano. The missions were all established under the sovereignty of the King of Spain; each mission had its church, a residence for the Fathers, a *presidio*, or military guard, and shops and workrooms for the Indians, who, besides receiving instruction in the Faith, were taught the useful arts of civilization. (See CALIFORNIA MISSIONS.) Each mission was established in conjunction with a Spanish settlement under a civil governor, and during this period, the immigration was almost exclusively Spanish and Mexican. In 1822 California ceased to be a Spanish colony and became part of the territory of Mexico. From that date begins the decline of the missions; the policy of the government became one of annoyance, interference, and aggression. Finally, in 1834, began the secularization of the missions, which was in fact their downright confiscation. The Fathers were deprived of their lands and buildings; and the Indians freed from the benevolent government of the friars.

The results were disastrous. The Indians were scattered and dispersed, and many of them lapsed into barbarism. The missions themselves were destroyed. This confiscation forms one of the saddest injustices of history. The temporal wrongs done at this time were partially righted in 1902 by the award of the International Tribunal of Arbitration at The Hague, in the case of the Pious Fund, which adjudged the payment by Mexico to the United States for the Catholic Church in California, of the accrued interest of the Fund. When taken over by President Santa Anna in 1842, the total value of the Pious Fund estates was estimated at $1,700,000. In 1826 the first emigrant train of Americans entered the present territory of California. From that year onward there was a gradual influx of Americans, most of whom engaged in trading, hunting, prospecting, cattle raising, and farming. As the American population increased there were frequent misunderstandings and clashes with the Mexican authorities, some of them not altogether creditable to the Americans. Commodore Jones made an unauthorized seizure of Monterey in 1842. The United States Government subsequently disavowed his acts and made apologies to Mexico.

In 1846 a party of Americans seized Sonoma, captured the commandant, and proclaimed the independence of the Republic of California. The young republic chose the Bear Flag as its emblem. In a few weeks news was received of the outbreak of hostilities between the United States and Mexico; the Bear Flag gave place to the American Flag; and Monterey, San Francisco, Sonoma, and Sutter's Fort were soon in the hands of the Americans. California was finally ceded to the United States, on the conclusion of the war with Mexico, by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, proclaimed 4 July, 1848. In January, 1848, gold was discovered by James W. Marshall at Coloma, on the American River. The news spread like wildfire, and by the early part of 1849 a mighty tide of immigration had set in. The goldseekers came from every section of the United States, and from Europe. In that year more than 80,000 men arrived in California. These men were afterwards called the "Forty-niners". Some of them came from Australia; some, from New York and Europe by way of Cape Horn; some crossed the Isthmus of Panama; while a large number came across the plains in caravans, on horseback, and even on foot. Fortune awaited thousands of these pioneers in the rich placer mines, and California became the richest gold-producing State in the United States. But thousands of those who were unsuccessful in their quest for gold, found even greater and more lasting wealth in tilling the rich soil and engaging in commerce. After the excitement caused by the discovery of gold had subsided, a steady stream of immigration began, and continues to the present time. The foreign immigrants have been chiefly Irish, German, English, Canadian, Italian, and French, though there are also considerable numbers of Portuguese and Swedes. As shown in the tables already presented, more than

seventy-five per cent of the total population in 1900 was native-born.

So rapid was the growth of population after the discovery of gold, that in 1849 a constitution was adopted by the convention at Monterey, and California was admitted into the Union of States by Act of Congress on 9 September, 1850. That day has ever since been a legal holiday, and is generally celebrated and referred to as Admission Day. Peter H. Burnett was elected first governor of the new State and served during 1851 and 1852. All sorts of men found their way to the new El Dorado, as it was called. Most of them were hardy, industrious, and honest—these were the true pioneers. But there was a considerable admixture of the reckless and daredevil element, criminals and desperadoes, who sought fortune and adventure in the new gold diggings. In 1851 there was a veritable carnival of crime in San Francisco which the lawfully constituted authorities were unable to suppress. The citizens of the city organized themselves into a Vigilance Committee and punished crimes and criminals in summary fashion. The members of the committee were known as "Vigilantes", and were for the most part honest and reputable men, who resorted to these measures only from motives of necessity and duty, in the disturbed condition of the government. A similar condition arose again in 1856 and was met by the same remedy. It must be said that the trials of the Vigilance Committee, while informal, were in the main fair, and the punishments inflicted richly deserved.

Large numbers of Chinese coolies had emigrated to California ever since 1850; the influx was greatest during the building of the Central Pacific Railroad which was completed in 1869. A strong anti-Chinese sentiment developed, due chiefly to three principal objections made against them: they worked for wages much lower than white men; they spent little of their earnings; they rarely established homes, but lived together in large numbers and in unclean surroundings. The agitation grew to tremendous proportions, provoked serious riots, and finally resulted in the so-called Chinese exclusion acts which have been enacted periodically by Congress since 1882. There were at one time over 100,000 Chinese in California. In 1900 the number had decreased to 45,753; and it is now (1907) much smaller. In 1891 the Australian Ballot was introduced at State elections. Among other important political events of the last twenty-five years was the prohibition of hydraulic mining, which had destroyed immense areas for agriculture and had choked up river beds with the accumulation of detritus; also the passage of numerous beneficial laws for the promotion of irrigation, for the fumigation of fruit trees, and for the importation of predatory insects for the purpose of destroying insect pests. The present constitution of California was adopted in 1879. During the Spanish-American War and the subsequent American occupation of the Philippines, San Francisco has been the chief depot for the transportation of troops and supplies. On 18 April, 1906, one of the greatest earthquakes recorded in history visited the coast of California; it was most severe in San Francisco. Fire started simultaneously in a dozen quarters and burned incessantly for three days. All but the western and southern parts of the city were consumed. The city, as a city, was destroyed. The loss of life is estimated at 500, and of property at $500,000,000. More than 300,000 people left the city after the fire. Over 200,000 of these have returned, and incredible strides have been made in rehabilitating the city. Nearly $200,000,000 have been expended (December, 1907) on improvements in the 497 city blocks that were destroyed.

RELIGION.—*Dioceses.*—The territory of the State of California is divided, ecclesiastically, into the Archdiocese of San Francisco, the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles, and the Diocese of Sacramento. The first includes the city of San Francisco and the central and more westerly counties of the State. The second includes all of Southern California. The third embraces the entire northern part of the State, as well as nearly half of the State of Nevada. With the exception of the Diocese of Sacramento, their boundaries are conterminous with those of the State. The Diocese of Salt Lake, in Utah, and the Dioceses of Sacramento and of Monterey and Los Angeles are suffragan to the Archdiocese of San Francisco. The Catholic population of California is estimated at 344,000 (1906), made up as follows: Archdiocese of San Francisco, 227,000; Diocese of Sacramento, 42,000; Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles, 75,000. By far the greater portion of these are white, the total of blacks, Indians, and Chinese being less than five per cent.

Catholic Immigration.—From 1769, the year which saw the foundation of San Diego, until the second expedition of Fremont (1846), the settlers and immigrants were chiefly Catholic, being natives of Spain and Mexico. The discovery of gold in 1848 was immediately followed by an inrush of thousands of immigrants. These gold-seekers were mostly Americans, but there was also a large proportion of foreigners. From that time until the present, the immigration has been steadily on the increase, the Catholic part of it being chiefly Irish, Irish-American, Italian, French, and German.

Catholics Distinguished in Public Life.—The first Governor of California, Peter H. Burnett (q. v.), was a convert to the Catholic Faith. Stephen M. White, who represented California in the Senate of the United States, was one of the first graduates of the Jesuit college at Santa Clara. He was an astute lawyer, a brilliant orator, and a tireless worker. E. W. McKinstry, like Judge Burnett, was a convert to the Faith; and like him, also, was a member of the Supreme Bench. Judge McKinstry was a man of deep erudition, a fine constitutional lawyer, and an exemplary Catholic. W. G. Lorigan, a Catholic, was also chosen to the Supreme Bench. Joseph McKenna, another California Catholic, became a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States (1898), and James F. Smith, General in the United States Army, Member of the Philippine Commission, and Governor-General of the Philippine Islands, is another alumnus of Santa Clara College. Garret W. McEnerney, one of the leaders of the California Bar, who won international fame by his masterful presentation of the claims of the Catholic Church in California to the Pious Fund (q. v.) before the Tribunal of Arbitration at The Hague in 1902, graduated at St. Mary's College.

Principal Religious Denominations.—The following statistics of the Catholic Church in California are taken from the Catholic Directory for 1907: archbishop, 1; bishops, 2; total priests, 488; secular, 321; religious, 167; total churches, 366; churches with resident priests, 209; missions with churches, 157; stations, 119; seminary, 1; seminaries of religious orders, 5; colleges and academies for boys, 11; academies for young ladies, 47; parishes with parochial schools, 73; orphan asylums, 12; total young people under Catholic care, 31,814; Catholic population, 344,000. There are houses or monasteries of Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, Paulists, Marists, Salesians, Christian Brothers, and Brothers of Mary. The Catholic sisterhoods are almost all represented.

The following statistics of the religious denominations of California given below were presented by the United States Census of 1890, published in 1894.

The total number of churches was 1505; total value of church property, $11,961,914; total number of communicants, 280,619. Of course, these figures have been greatly increased since that time. Catholics do not recognize any such enumeration as "com-

COTTON HALL AT MONTEREY (FIRST STATE CAPITOL)
RAISIN-DRYING RACKS IN A VINEYARD, FRESNO

CALIFORNIA

LICK OBSERVATORY, MOUNT HAMILTON
ORPHAN ASYLUM, LOS ANGELES

municants"; the total for this head therefore underestimates the Catholic population.

Denomination	Organization	Churches	Value of Church property	Number of communicants
Adventist	51	32	$170,850	2,822
Baptist	165	123	763,860	11,383
Catholic	250	244	2,667,950	157,346
Congregational	182	149	1,014,975	11,907
Jewish	15	12	396,000	6,179
Lutheran	39	21	364,800	4,267
Methodist	559	438	2,575,631	36,874
Presbyterian	263	211	1,895,675	18,934
Prot. Episcopal	103	95	1,019,695	9,221

Matters Directly Affecting Religion.—The constitutional provision safeguarding religious freedom is ample and specific. It reads as follows: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall be forever guaranteed in this State; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness or juror on account of his opinions on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this State." The Constitution prohibits the appropriation of money from the State treasury for the use or benefit of any corporation, association, asylum, hospital, or any other institution not under the exclusive management and control of the State as a State institution. But there is, nevertheless, a proviso authorizing the granting of State aid to institutions conducted for the support and maintenance of "minor orphans, or half orphans, or abandoned children, or aged persons in indigent circumstances". The Constitution also expressly prohibits the appropriation of money in support of any sectarian creed, church, or school. The policy of the State is to afford the fullest measure of religious liberty to all, to discriminate in favour of, or against, no one on account of religious belief, and not to permit the power or resources of the State to be used for the propagation of any form of religion or for the benefit of any religious institution. Every Sunday is by express legislative enactment a legal holiday (Civil Code, §7); on that day all courts are closed, and business is universally suspended. Any act required by law or contract to be done or performed on a particular day which happens to fall on a Sunday, may be done or performed on the next day with full legal effect. But there is no law compelling the religious observance of Sunday, and contracts, deeds, wills, notes, etc. executed on Sunday are just as valid as if executed on any other day. But, while there is no Sunday Law, properly so-called, there is an act of the legislature passed 27 February, 1893, securing to all employees one day's rest in seven, and making it a misdemeanour to violate the provisions of the act.

The Code of Civil Procedure provides that "every court, every judge or clerk of any court, every justice and every notary public, and every officer or person authorized to take testimony in any action or proceeding, or to decide upon evidence, has power to administer oaths or affirmations". Any person who desires it may, at his option, instead of taking an oath, make his affirmation. The Bible is not used in administering oaths; in judicial proceedings the witness raises his right hand and the clerk or judge swears him "to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God". To make a wilfully false statement after having taken an oath or affirmation, before an officer authorized to administer it, to testify to the truth, is perjury, a felony punishable by imprisonment in the State's prison for from one to fourteen years. The Penal Code makes it a misdemeanour, punishable by a fine of $200 or by imprisonment for ninety days, to utter profane language in the presence or hearing of women or children (Penal Code, §415). The Supreme Court of the State, in the case of Delaney *ex parte*, California Reports, Vol. XLIII, page 478, has held it to be within the power of a municipal corporation empowered by its charter to prohibit practices which are against good morals, to prohibit and punish the utterance of profane language. The entire matter of profane language is generally left to the control of the local authorities, and most of the counties and cities have ordinances prohibiting and punishing it. It is customary to open the sessions of the legislature with prayer, though there is no provision of law either requiring or prohibiting the practice. There is no recognition of any religious holidays, by name, except Sunday. New Year's Day and Christmas are both holidays, but they are described in the Civil Code merely as "the first day of January . . . and the twenty-fifth day of December". It must be said that the same rule is observed in the Code in referring to the other legal holidays. Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, etc. are simply the twenty-second day of February, the thirtieth day of May, the fourth day of July, etc. The seal of confession has the full sanction and protection of the law. It occupies the same position in the eyes of the law as communications made to attorneys and physicians in their professional capacities. It is the policy of the law to encourage these confidential or privileged communications, as they are called, and to keep them inviolate. Section 1881 of the Code of Civil Procedure provides that a priest cannot be examined as to any confession made to him, as such, by a penitent.

Matters Affecting Religious Work.—The laws governing the incorporation of churches and religious societies and providing for the protection and management of church property are both beneficent and effective. The Civil Code (section 602) provides that any bishop, chief priest, or presiding elder, may become a sole corporation by complying with certain simple legal formalities. Thereafter, the usual attributes of corporations aggregate attach, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corporation sole. Under this statute all Catholic Church property in the Archdiocese of San Francisco is held in the name of "The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco", a corporation sole. Upon the death of the incumbent, his successor, properly appointed and qualified, takes the place of his predecessor, and no probate or other proceedings are required to vest the title to the church property which, in contemplation of law, remains always in the corporation sole, regardless of who may be, for the time being, the incumbent. In addition to the laws governing corporations sole, there are very liberal statutes authorizing the incorporation of single churches, as well as of religious, charitable, and educational associations, and the holding of property by such corporations; also authorizing the consolidation of two or more churches or parishes into one corporation. Under the law of California, therefore, the property interests of the Church are jealously safeguarded, and she is free to hold her church property in either of the methods above pointed out. Prior to the year 1900, California stood alone among the States of the Union in taxing church property in the same manner and at the same rate as business or residence property. On 6 November, 1900, the people of the State adopted an amendment to the Constitution, providing that "all buildings, and so much of the real property on which they are situated as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of said buildings, when the same are used solely and exclusively for religious worship, shall be free from taxation". The residences of the clergy, the hospitals, orphanages, refuges, asylums, and all other institutions which are devoted to

charitable or eleemosynary objects, but which are not used "solely and exclusively for religious worship", are still subject to taxation as before. The law exempts "ministers of religion" from military duty; and "a minister of the gospel, or a priest of any denomination following his profession" is exempt from jury duty.

Marriage and Divorce.—The Civil Code defines marriage as "a personal relation arising out of a civil contract, to which the consent of parties capable of making that contract is necessary. Consent alone will not constitute marriage; it must be followed by a solemnization authorized by this code" (§55). This section of the code formerly permitted "a mutual assumption of marital rights, duties or obligations" to take the place of a solemnization. In other words, the so-called common-law marriages were permitted, and their validity upheld, by the laws of the State. But the difficulty of determining just what constituted "a mutual assumption of marital rights, duties or obligations", and the numerous and scandalous cases of intrigue, temporary or illicit relations, hasty, ill-advised, and clandestine unions, with their consequent perplexing questions of legitimacy, succession, property rights, and the status of the parties themselves, convinced the leading minds of California that the position of the Catholic Church on the necessity of the public safeguards with which she protects the marriage ceremony, is the only wise and safe one. Accordingly, in 1895, the legislature amended the law, and made it necessary that the consent of the parties to the marriage be evidenced by a solemnization of the marriage. No particular form of solemnization is required, but the parties must declare in the presence of the person solemnizing the marriage that they take each other as husband and wife. Marriages may be solemnized by a priest, or minister of any denomination, or by a justice or judge of any court. A licence must first be obtained, and the person solemnizing the marriage must attach his written certificate to the licence, certifying to the fact, the time, and the place of, and the names and residences of the parties and the witnesses to, the marriage. The licence and certificate must then be recorded with the County Recorder. Under these stringent rules little or no difficulty is found in proving a marriage; and all relations between the sexes are simply meretricious unless the parties avail themselves of the legal requirements of solemnization of marriage. There is a charitable provision of the law, designed for the benefit of innocent offspring, to the effect that all children of a marriage void in law or dissolved by divorce are legitimate. The age of consent to marriage is eighteen in males, and fifteen in females; but if the male be under the age of twenty-one, or the female under the age of eighteen, the consent of parents or guardian must first be obtained. The law of the State forbids and makes absolutely void marriages (1) between whites and negroes, mongolians, or mulattoes; (2) between ancestors and descendants, brothers and sisters, uncles and nieces, aunts and nephews (marriages between cousins are permitted); (3) if either party be already married, for one year after the entry of an interlocutory decree of divorce. The annulment of marriages is provided for in certain cases: such marriages are considered voidable and may be annulled for any of the following causes: (1) if, at the time of the marriage, either party be under the age of consent, and the consent of parents or guardian be not obtained; (2) if either party be of unsound mind at the time of the marriage; (3) if consent to the marriage be obtained by fraud; or (4) by force, or (5) if either party be physically incapable of entering into the marriage state. The annulment of marriage must be carefully distinguished from divorce. The latter implies the existence of a perfectly valid marriage. The former affords relief to the injured party, who may either ratify the marriage, and thus make it valid from the beginning, or have it set aside and declared void from the beginning.

The principle of divorce is recognized by the law of California, which assigns six grounds of divorce: adultery, extreme cruelty, wilful desertion, wilful neglect (failure to provide), habitual intemperance, and conviction of a felony. Notwithstanding that a cause for divorce be proved to exist, the divorce must be denied upon proof of any of the following: connivance, collusion, condonation, recrimination (proof of a cause of divorce against the plaintiff), or lapse of time. To prevent fraudulent and secret divorces, as well as the promiscuous granting of divorces, the law requires a *bona fide* residence by the plaintiff for one year in the State, and for three months in the county, before filing suit. Upon dissolution of the marriage by divorce, the Superior Court has jurisdiction to award the care and custody of the children to the innocent party, or to make such other provision for their care and custody as the best interests of the children, both moral and material, may require; and this disposition may be altered from time to time in the discretion of the Court.

In 1903 the law on the subject of divorce was amended. Since that year, upon proof by the plaintiff of a cause of divorce, an interlocutory decree of divorce is granted. This decree entitles the successful party to a final decree of divorce upon the expiration of one year after the entry of the interlocutory decree. This change in the law prevents the remarriage of either of the parties until the expiration of one year from the entry of the interlocutory decree.

Education.—As previously explained, the Church receives no financial aid from the State towards the religious education of her children, and here, as elsewhere, Catholics are taxed for the support of public schools, as well as charged with the duty of maintaining schools of their own. Here also, as elsewhere, the effects of the public school system of non-religious education emphasize the necessity of providing for Catholic youth a complete system of education that includes, with the best profane scholarship, a sound moral and religious training. This need is especially felt in the university courses, whose systems of philosophy, if not positively anti-Christian, are certainly not calculated to foster belief in a personal God, or to strengthen faith in a Divine revelation. There are liberal statutes in force, permitting and encouraging the foundation and maintenance of private institutions of learning, and the only interference permitted the State authorities concerns the supervision of sanitary arrangements, and the prescribing of such standards of scholarship as will entitle graduates to admission to the State University without examination.

There are also liberal statutes authorizing the incorporation of religious, social, benevolent, or charitable organizations. Such corporations may make and enforce rules for the government of themselves and their institutions, and may purchase and hold such real property as may be necessary for the objects of the association, not exceeding six whole lots in any city or town, or fifty acres in the country, and the annual profit or income of such land must not exceed $50,000. Orphan asylums, however, maintaining at least 100 orphans are permitted to purchase and hold 160 acres of land, of a net annual value of not more than $50,000. These provisions, it must be remembered, do not limit the power of purely religious corporations, whether sole or aggregate, to purchase and hold such lands as may be necessary for their churches, hospitals, schools, colleges, orphan asylums, and parsonages, under statutes previously discussed. The State Constitution prohibits the appropriating of public money "for the support of any sectarian or

denominational school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools"; it also provides that no "sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught, or instruction thereon be permitted, directly or indirectly, in any of the common schools of the State". Under another constitutional provision already discussed, the legislature passed a law in 1880 appropriating annually to every institution maintaining orphans the sum of $100 for each orphan, and $75 for each half orphan. In 1903 the legislature created a State Board of Charities and Correction, consisting of six members appointed by the governor. This board has a supervisory jurisdiction over all charitable, correctional, and penal institutions, including hospitals for the insane.

Sale of Liquor.—There is no State law forbidding the sale of liquor to citizens generally. But it is forbidden: to bring intoxicating liquor to a prison, jail, or reformatory; or to sell, give, or expose it for sale within half a mile of a state prison, or within 1,900 feet of a reformatory, or within one mile of the University of California at Berkeley, or within one and one-half miles of any veterans' home, or within the State Capitol, or on the grounds adjacent thereto; or at a camp meeting; or to a common or habitual drunkard; or to an Indian; or to a minor under the age of eighteen years; or within one mile of an insane asylum. It is forbidden to permit a minor under the age of eighteen years to enter a saloon; and it is also forbidden to give or sell intoxicating liquor to anyone on an election day. Beyond these provisions, the general law leaves the control of the sale of liquor entirely to local authority. Each county, city, and town is free to regulate the liquor traffic to suit the wishes of its citizens.

Prisons and Reformatories.—There are two State prisons, situated respectively at San Quentin and Folsom. These prisons, under the Constitution, are subject to the direct control of the State Board of Prison Directors, consisting of five members appointed by the governor. The prisoners are kept at work, in the rock-crushing plant, in making grain bags, in building roads, etc. Priests and ministers are free to visit the prisoners and conduct religious services for their benefit. There are two State reformatories for juvenile offenders—the Preston School of Industry at Ione City, and the Whittier State School, at Whittier. Each is governed by its own board of trustees, and is entirely independent of the Board of Prison Directors. There is also a juvenile court charged with the control and punishment of juvenile dependents and delinquents. A large discretion is vested with the judge of this court and much good has been accomplished since its creation in keeping children of Catholic parentage under the care and influence of conscientious Catholic officers.

Wills and Testaments.—In California every person of sound mind who has reached the age of eighteen years may dispose of his entire estate by will, subject to the payment of his debts and expenses of administration. Such part of a decedent's estate as is not disposed of by will is distributed according to the statutes of succession. The estates of such persons as die without wills and without heirs escheat to the State. The phrase "expenses of administration" includes funeral expenses of the deceased, expenses of his last illness, and provision for the support of his family, including the homestead, family allowance, and setting apart property exempt from execution.

Charitable Bequests.—No person is permitted to dispose by will of more than one-third of the value of his estate to charitable uses. A will attempting to dispose of a greater proportion to charity would not be absolutely void, but all the charitable bequests and devises would be reduced proportionately so that their total value would not exceed one-third. Moreover, every charitable bequest and devise is absolutely void unless it be made at least thirty days prior to the testator's death. A bequest or devise to a church as such, or to a college, orphan asylum, missionary society, hospital, or home for the aged would be for a charitable use under this provision. But not so a devise or bequest to a priest or bishop by name, and in his individual capacity. It has also been held that a bequest to a priest for Masses to be offered for the repose of the soul of the deceased, is not a charitable bequest.

Cemeteries.—Cemeteries may be purchased, held, and owned under the liberal statutes for the ownership of church property, already explained. Or, they may be purchased, held, and owned by cemetery corporations formed under a general law, by which their land holdings are limited to 320 acres situated in the county in which their articles of incorporation are filed, or in an adjoining county. The law provides for the survey and subdivision of such lands into lots or plots, avenues or walks, and for the government of such corporations, as well as the sale and tenure of burial plots.

CLINCH, *California and Its Missions* (San Francisco, 1904); JAMES, *In and Out of the Old Missions* (Boston, 1906); JACKSON, *California and the Missions* (Boston, 1903); BURNETT, *Recollections of an Old Pioneer;* EDWORDS, *California Annual* (San Francisco, 1907); *U. S. Census of 1900* (Washington); *U. S. Census of 1890* (Washington); SWETT, *History of the Public School System of California* (San Francisco, 1876); *Catholic Directory for 1907* (Milwaukee); *Twenty-second Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction* (Sacramento, 1906); *University of California Register* (Berkeley, 1907); BABCOCK, *History of California* (Sacramento, 1907); TREADWELL, *Constitution of California* (San Francisco, 1907); *Civil Code, Code of Civil Procedure, Political Code, Penal Code* (San Francisco, 1906).

GEORGE A. CONNOLLY.

California, LOWER, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF, includes the territory of that name in Mexico (Sp. *Baja* or *Vieja California*), a peninsula 770 miles long by 30 to 120 broad. It is traversed longitudinally by mountain chains; on the gulf side the descent is abrupt, but on the western side more gradual. Running water is very scarce amid these granitic and volcanic hills, hence irrigation is dependent on showers which, though short, are often violent and flood the country. The climate is hot and dry in the north, more temperate in the south. In some places cereals and vegetables abound, also excellent grapes and many kinds of fruit. There are gold and silver mines, also deposits of copper, lead, and coal, while the seacoast abounds with many varieties of fish. This vicariate was created 20 January, 1874, and confided to the Bishop of Sonora; it is now directly subject to Propaganda, which since 8 November, 1895, has entrusted it to the Missionary College of Sts. Peter and Paul, founded by Pius IX at Rome. The boundaries of the vicariate are, on the north, the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles; on the south and west, the Pacific Ocean; on the east, the Gulf of California. It had in 1900 a Spanish-speaking population of about 47,000, nearly all Catholics. There are six churches with resident, and ten without resident, priests, twenty chapels, and as many stations. The chief town, and residence of the vicar Apostolic, is La Paz, in the south-eastern extremity of the peninsula; other centres of population are Encenada de Todos Santos, San José del Cabo, and Santa Rosalía. A number of islands (several with good ports) belong to this vicariate. Civilly this territory is dependent on the Federal Government at Mexico. (For earlier missions in the peninsula, see CALIFORNIA MISSIONS.)

Missiones Catholicæ (Rome, 1907), 657; *Lippincott's Gazetteer* (Philadelphia, 1907), 18–19; *Statesman's Year Book* (London, 1907), 1203.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

California Missions.—I. LOWER CALIFORNIA.—California became known to the world through Hernando Cortés, the conqueror of Mexico, who prob-

ably first applied the name. It is divided into Lower or Old California and Upper California. The latter part comprises the present State of California. The first missionaries were the Franciscans, who, under the leadership of Martin de la Coruña, one of the so-called "Twelve Apostles of Mexico", on the 3d of May, 1535, landed with Cortés at Santa Cruz Bay, near what is now La Paz on the lower eastern coast of the peninsula. After a year of extreme privations, due to the sterility of the soil, the undertaking, which had cost the famous conqueror $300,000, had to be abandoned. The Friars Minor made another effort to establish missions among the natives, when in 1596 Sebastian Vizcaino set out to found a colony in California. The missionaries were Diego de Perdomo, Bernardino de Zamudio, Antonio Tello, Nicolás de Arabia, and a lay brother, Cristóbal López. Hunger and the hostility of the savages, who proved to be on the lowest plane of humanity, put an end to the venture before the close of the year.

In 1683 the Jesuit Fathers, Eusebius Kuehn, better known as Kino, and Pedro Matías Goñi with Fray José Guijosa, of the Order of St. John of God, accompanying Admiral Isidro Otondo y Antillon, landed somewhat north of La Paz for the purpose of converting the natives and establishing a Spanish colony. After two years and six months as many as four hundred Indians attended the catechetical instructions. Owing to the precarious state of the whole enterprise, the missionaries administered baptism only to those neophytes who were found in danger of death. For want of supplies, and after an expenditure of $225,000 on the part of the Government, the Spaniards once more withdrew, in September, 1685, despite the protests of the religious and the sorrow of the catechumens.

Juan María Salvatierra

Anxious to secure a foothold in the territory lest a foreign power take possession, but having learned from experience that the military could not succeed, the Spanish Government, through the viceroy, invited the Society of Jesus to undertake the conquest and settlement of the country. Urged by Fathers Kino and Salvatierra the superiors of the Society at length accepted the charge. Thereupon, the Viceroy Moctezuma, on the 5th of February, 1697, formally authorized the Society of Jesus to establish missions in California on condition that the royal treasury be not expected to pay any expenses incurred without the order of the king, and that possession of the territory be taken in the name of the King of Spain. In return the Jesuits were to enjoy the privilege of enlisting soldiers to act as guards for the missions at the expense of the Society, and in time of war these soldiers were to be considered on the same footing with those of the regular army. The Jesuits were to have absolute authority on the peninsula in temporal as well as spiritual affairs, and were empowered to choose men suitable for the administration of justice. Father Juan María Salvatierra was appointed superior of the California missions. He at once began to collect funds to place the undertaking upon a firm basis. It would require ten thousand dollars, he thought, to furnish a revenue of five hundred dollars a year to maintain one priest at each mission. The Rev. Juan Caballero of Querétaro donated twenty thousand dollars for two missions, and the Confraternity of Our Lady of Sorrows in the city of Mexico supplied ten thousand dollars for the founding and maintaining of a third establishment. This was the beginning of the celebrated Pious Fund of California. Other benefactors in course of time provided the necessary capital for additional missions, until the fund, which was judiciously invested in Mexican real estate, with its accumulations amounted to half a million dollars by the year 1767. A Jesuit, the Rev. Juan de Ugarte, was appointed to manage the fund and to act as procurator for the missionaries. After collecting minor donations and goods to the value of fifteen thousand dollars, and having enlisted five trustworthy guards under the command of Captain Luis Tortolero y Torres, Father Salvatierra crossed the Gulf of California and landed at San Dionisio Bay on the 19th of October, 1697.

The first and the principal mission of Lower California was established a league from the shore and placed under the patronage of Our Lady of Loreto. The necessary buildings were hastily constructed, and the zealous Jesuit assembled the neighbouring Indians. He first endeavoured to learn their language, and meanwhile through signs tried to make them understand his object and the most necessary truths of religion. Father Francisco María Piccolo soon joined him, and assisted especially in teaching the little ones. Father Juan de Ugarte, who had resigned the procuratorship, followed in 1700. Next to Salvatierra this religious is the most noted of the early California missionaries. It was he who introduced agriculture and stock-raising at the second mission of San Francisco Xavier, for the purpose of making the missions self-supporting. He succeeded to some extent, but the barrenness of the soil and the lack of water, except at two or three other establishments, prevented the system from becoming general on the peninsula. Indeed, the scarcity of water and of arable land brought the mission establishments to the verge of abandonment several times, even before the death of Salvatierra, which occurred at Guadalajara in 1717. It was also the energetic Ugarte who built the first large ship in California, of native timber, and made a voyage of exploration to the mouth of the Colorado River in 1721. Though the missionaries devoted themselves heart and soul to their task, the work of conversion proved truly disheartening, inasmuch as polygamy, sorcery, and the vilest habits prevailed among the Lower Californians to a degree not known elsewhere. If we add to this the total indifference of the natives, who possessed no religious ideas whatever, the frequent epidemics and almost constant wars which often destroyed the labour of years and caused the desertion of several missions, it becomes plain that only the most zealous and ascetic men could have succeeded as well as these missionaries did. Pagan hatred frequently attacked the isolated religious, and in October, 1734, brought about the violent death of two priests. These were Fathers Lorenzo Carranzo of Mission Santiago and Nicolás Tamaral of Mission San José del Cabo, in the southern part of the peninsula, both of whom were killed with arrows and clubs, after which the bodies were frightfully mutilated. Two other religious, warned in time, barely escaped with their lives. Notwithstanding all these drawbacks and obstacles, to which must be added the animosity of the pearl-fishers and their friends in Mexico, besides the want of every convenience of life, the Jesuits in time established a chain of missions which extended from Cape San Lucas to the thirty-first degree of latitude. These missions and the year of their establishment, beginning from south to

north, were: San José del Cabo (1730); Santiago de las Coras (1721); San Juan de Ligní (1705); Nuestra Señora de los Dolores del Sur (1721); Nuestra Señora del Pilar (1720); Santa Rosa or Todos Santos (1733); San Luis Gonzaga (1737); San Francisco Xavier (1699); Nuestra Señora de Loreto (1697); San José de Comundú (1708); Purísima Concepción de Cadegomó (1718); Santa Rosalía de Mulegé (1705); Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe (1720); San Ignacio (1728); Santa Gertrudis (1752); San Francisco de Borja (1759); and Santa María de los Angeles (1766). Only fourteen of these missions existed in 1767; epidemics had carried off the neophytes of the other establishments so that they had to be abandoned.

No statistics exist from which the success of the Jesuit missionary labours can be estimated, because no such minute reports were required by the Government as were demanded at subsequent periods. Some of the missionaries were rather enthusiastic in describing the reception given to the Gospel by the natives in their respective localities; but owing to the unfavourable conditions, according to the Jesuit, Father John Jacob Baegert (q. v.), who had toiled for seventeen years at one of the missions, the religious and moral impression was nowhere very deep or lasting. Like other Jesuit historians he describes the Indians as indolent to the last degree, dull, cruel, treacherous, indifferent, and addicted to the lowest vices, from which it was exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to wean them, on account of the little control which the missionaries could exercise over their neophytes. Owing to the sterility of the soil and the lack of water for irrigation, it was impossible, except in a few places, to feed and clothe a large number of people at the missions and thus keep them under the watchful eye of the missionaries. After a course of instructions more or less long, during which period they were fed at the missionary establishments, the neophytes were permitted to return to their haunts in order to search for food in the mountains, as had been their custom from time immemorial. A chief and a catechist would, indeed, exercise some kind of supervision over the converts and report grievous transgressions to the missionary; but the neophytes were necessarily left to themselves, save when the turn came for each particular village to repair for a week to the mission for examination in the catechism and for further instruction, during which week the Fathers had to maintain them. Nevertheless, the missionaries succeeded in opening the gates of heaven to many thousands of souls who, but for the unselfish efforts of the religious, would not have learned even of the existence of God.

During the sixty years that the Jesuits were permitted to labour among the natives of California, as far as known, fifty-six members of the Society of Jesus came to the peninsula, of whom sixteen, two as martyrs, died at their posts. Fifteen priests and one lay brother survived the hardships only to be subjected to enforcement of the brutal decree launched against the Society of Jesus by King Carlos III of Spain. The Jesuits of Lower California were placed on board a ship in February, 1768, and brought to Mexico, whence, with the Mexican religious, those who had outlived the cruelties inflicted on the way thither were shipped to Europe. The missions meanwhile were left in charge of military officers called *comisionados*, who for a year mismanaged the temporalities regardless of the rights of the Indians.

Immediately after the decree of expulsion had been published at the capital of Mexico (July, 1767), Viceroy De Croiz requested the Franciscans of the Apostolic Missionary College of San Fernando in the city of Mexico to accept the missions of California. Their superiors acquiesced reluctantly, for they were not in a condition to furnish the requisite number of missionaries. To be able to comply with the demand, five flourishing Indian missions in the Sierra Gorda were surrendered to the Archbishop of Mexico. Fifteen volunteer friars, led by the famous Junipero Serra, finally arrived at Loreto on Good Friday, the 1st of April, 1768, and were at once assigned to deserted missions. They were given charge of the spiritual affairs only, to the amazement of the Indians who had been accustomed to receive food, clothing, and presents as well as religious instructions from their spiritual guides. When, however, the inspector-general, Don José de Galvez, arrived in July, 1768, with almost unlimited power to remedy the irregularities brought on by the sudden change, and discovered from personal observation how the *comisionados* had squandered the mission property, he at once turned it over to the Franciscans who, thereafter, could manage the missions as freely as the Jesuits had done. The friars continued the system of their predecessors and sought, though in vain at various places, to repair the damage wrought during the misrule of the secular officials. A year after their arrival another mission was founded to the north of Santa María at Velicatá under the patronage of San Fernando. The Fathers were about to establish five additional missions in obedience to the orders of the viceroy, who had already named the patron saints, when the hostility of Governor Barri frustrated the plan. From a report, the only general one we have concerning Lower California during the mission period, which Father Francisco Palou, then superior, or *presidente*, of the missions, sent to Mexico, we learn that the Franciscans, from April, 1768, to September, 1771, baptized 1731 persons, nearly all Indians. During the same period they blessed 787 marriages and buried 2165 dead.

Francisco Palou

As early as 1768 the Dominican vicar-general, Father Juan Pedro de Iriarte, sought permission from the king to found missions in Lower California, and succeeded in obtaining a royal decree to that effect on the 8th of April, 1770; but the Franciscan College of San Fernando, deeming the territory too sparsely populated for two different missionary bands, offered to cede the whole peninsula to the Dominican Order. An agreement between Father Rafael Verger, the guardian of the college, and Father Juan Pedro de Iriarte, the vicar-general of the Dominicans, was accordingly drawn up on the 7th of April, 1772, and approved by the Viceroy Bucareli on the 12th of May, 1772. Nine Dominican Fathers and one lay brother landed at Loreto on the 14th of October, 1772, but refused to accept control of the missions until their superior, Father Iriarte, should arrive. The latter sometime after suffered shipwreck and was drowned in the Gulf of California. Father Vincente Mora was then appointed superior or *presidente*, whereupon Father Francisco Palou began the formal transfer at Loreto in May, 1773, and repeated the ceremony at each mission as he travelled north on his way to Upper California. Thirty-nine Friars Minor had been active on the peninsula during the five years and five months of the Franciscan rule. Four of these died, ten were transferred to Upper California, where Father Junipero Serra had begun to open a much larger field for his brethren, and the remainder returned to the mother-house.

During their long incumbency, which lasted to about the year 1840, the Dominicans established the following new missions between San Fernando de Velicatá and San Diego: Rosario (1774); Santo Domingo (1775); San Vincente Ferrer (1780); San Miguel (1787); Santo Tomás (1791); San Pedro Mártir (1794); and Santa Catarina Mártir (1797). Little is on record about the activity of these friars. As far as known, down to the year 1800, seventy Dominicans came to the peninsula. How many died at their missions, or how many arrived after that year, it is impossible to say. The missions were finally secularized by the Mexican Government in 1834. The management of the land, stock, and other temporalities was taken from the missionaries and turned over to hired *comisionados*, with the same result that was experienced after the departure of the Jesuits. The Indians gradually disappeared and the missions decayed, so much so that a government report in 1856 declared the missions to be in ruins, and gave the Indian population of the whole peninsula as only 1938 souls.

II. Upper California.—Don José de Galvez, the inspector-general, was sent to Lower California not merely for the purpose of correcting abuses; he had been directed to secure for the Crown of Spain the whole northwest coast as far as it had been discovered and explored by Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo in 1542, and by Sebastian Vizcaino in 1602–1603. The Russians had often visited that territory with a view, Spain believed, of taking possession which would have endangered the lucrative Philippine trade. To prevent any foreign power from acquiring the country, which Spain claimed by right of discovery, the Spanish king resolved to found missions among the natives and to erect forts or *presidios* for their protection. Galvez consulted Father Junipero Serra, then superior of the peninsula missions, who enthusiastically agreed to the plan, as it gave to his insatiable zeal a wider sphere. Two ships, the San Carlos and the San Antonio, were equipped and freighted with provisions, agricultural implements, and church-goods. The San Carlos sailed for the port of San Diego from La Paz in January, 1769; the San Antonio departed from Cape San Lucas in February. The latter ship, having on board a Franciscan friar, reached the port on the 11th of April; the San Carlos, also bringing a friar, and with a crew suffering from scurvy, arrived on the 29th of April.

Statue of Junipero Serra

Meanwhile Galvez also sent out two land expeditions for the same port. The first under Captain Rivera arrived at San Diego with Father Juan Crespi on the 14th of May; the other, under Governor Portolá with Father Junipero Serra, came up 1 July, 1769. By order of the inspector-general all the missions along the route contributed church-goods, provisions, and live-stock according to their means for the benefit of the new establishments in the north. San Diego had been discovered by Cabrillo and named San Miguel for the archangel; the appellation San Diego was given by Vizcaino who also named a bay farther north Monterey. It was at this bay that the *presidio* or fort was to be located. Governor Portolá therefore set out by land to find it, but failed and instead discovered the present San Francisco Bay, 1 November, 1769. Meanwhile Father Junipero founded, 16 July, 1769, the first in the chain of missions which extended from San Diego to Sonoma, a distance of about six hundred miles.

A second expedition by land, and another by sea, at last reached the port of Monterey in May, 1770; thereafter it was the headquarters for the governor as well as the *presidente* of the missions. The conditions in Upper California were much more favourable to the system under which it was intended to convert and civilize the natives, and the latter were found less dull and brutish than those of the peninsula. The Indians about San Diego, however, stubbornly resisted the Gospel, even by force of arms, so that prior to April, 1770, a full year after the appearance of the first missionary, Father Serra and his companions, with all their kindness, persuasiveness, and presents, did not succeed in gaining a single soul, a fact which makes the historian Bancroft exclaim: "In all the missionary annals of the northwest there is no other instance where paganism remained stubborn so long."

When a sufficient number of religious had arrived, Father Serra, in compliance with the rules of his apostolic college, which forbade a friar to live alone, placed two fathers at each mission. To these the governor assigned a guard of five or six soldiers under a corporal. The latter generally acted as steward of the mission temporalities subject to the missionaries. For the erection of the temporary church and other structures at each mission, and for the purchase of agricultural implements and church-goods, the Government, out of the revenues of the Pious Fund, paid to the procurator of the Franciscan college in Mexico the sum of one thousand dollars. Each missionary was allowed an annual stipend of four hundred dollars. This money was likewise paid to the procurator who would purchase the articles designated by the missionaries. Money was never sent to the religious in California. When a site had been selected for a mission, the temporary buildings were constructed. As soon as practical, permanent structures took their place, and were built of adobe or sunburnt brick, or in a few cases of stone, generally in the form of a square. The church was located usually in one corner, and adjoining this stood the quarters of the missionaries to which women or girls had no admittance. Then followed the rooms of the attendants and cooks, who were Indian youths selected from among the converts. The sides and rear of the mission square, enclosing a courtyard called the *patio*, contained the shops, store-rooms, granary, stables, and apartments for the young women. This last-named part of the mission was called the *monjério* or nunnery, and the inmates went by the name of nuns, though of course they were not nuns in reality. The *monjério* was an important and necessary institution of the mission system and due to the carnal propensity of the Indians. According to this arrangement girls twelve years of age and more, and younger girls who had lost both parents, made their home at the mission in charge of a trustworthy matron, where they lived pretty much like the girls at an orphanage or boarding school. During the day, when not occupied at work in their shops, they were permitted to visit their parents in the neophyte village, but at night they had to rest in the mission building under the eyes of the matron. Young men, too, though not kept so strictly, had their quarters in another section of the mission buildings in charge of the mis-

sionary. When a young man wished to marry he approached the missionary, who would direct him to make the selection, and if the girl consented the pair were married with solemn ceremonies at Mass after the banns had been published. A hut in the village was then assigned where they lived, subject to the regulations of the community.

Besides this, through extreme kindness, the natives were won by means of presents in the shape of food, clothing, and trinkets of which the Indians were very fond. The principal points of the Christian Faith were explained in the simplest manner possible, through interpreters, at first, and later on in their own and the Spanish languages by the missionary. Inasmuch as the Indians of every mission had a different language, and frequently several dialects were spoken among the neophytes of a single mission, it was an exceedingly burdensome task for the missionary to make himself understood by all in the native idiom. Nevertheless, some of the Fathers became expert linguists, and several of them composed vocabularies which are still extant. To insure a regular attendance and to prevent backsliding the Indians were induced to leave their desert or mountain hovels and make their homes with the missionaries. For those that came separate huts were erected in more or less regular order. Once baptized, the neophytes were not permitted to leave the mission for the purpose of going back to their pagan homes for any length of time without permission from the missionary. The license frequently would extend over two and three weeks for the men only. In the mission village under the shadow of the church the neophyte families dwelt with their children, except the marriageable girls who had to take up their quarters at the mission proper. Morning and evening prayers were said in common at the church, and all attended Mass, after which there was breakfast, followed by a few hours of labour. The noonday meal was again taken together, whereupon in the hot season there would be a rest more or less long followed by work until the Angelus, when supper was taken. The evening was devoted to all kinds of amusements consisting of music and play; the Spanish dance was general. Every mission had its band. Thus the inventory of 1835 enumerates the following musical instruments in use at Mission Santa Barbara which was typical of all: four flutes, three clarinets, two horns or trumpets, two bass violas, one *chinesco*, one bass drum, two kettledrums, sixteen violins, four new violins, and three triangles. There were uniforms for all the members of the band. These Indians also did the singing at the high Mass and on other occasions. While the missionaries exercised independent control, which was the case to the end of 1834, the neophyte community was like one great family at the head of which stood the *padre*, under which title the missionary was universally known. To him the Indians looked for everything concerning their bodies as well as their souls. He was their guide and protector; nor would they ever have suffered had not the beneficent Spanish laws been replaced by the selfishness and cupidity of the Mexican and Californian politicians, who did away with the mission system which the well-known non-Catholic writer, Charles F. Lummis, declares "was the most just, humane, and equitable system ever devised for the treatment of an aboriginal people". Peace and contentment reigned to such a degree that the Protestant historian, Alexander Forbes, who lived in California at the time, testifies that "the best and most unequivocal proof of the good conduct of the Fathers is to be found in the unbounded affection and devotion invariably shown towards them by their Indian subjects. They venerate them not merely as friends and fathers, but with a degree of devotion approaching adoration." ("California," London, 1839.)

Each great mission family was composed of many hundreds, sometimes of two and three thousand natives, good, bad, and indifferent. Excesses were necessarily to be expected, especially in the neighbourhood of white people. To prevent disorders the missionaries, with the approval of the viceregal government, drew up what may be called police regulations, for the transgressions of which various punishments were meted out, of a kind which would impress the dull and rude nature of the Indians. The missionary dictated the punishment which was ever tempered with mercy. When simple reproof availed nothing, the whip was applied. This was the only correction, besides fasting, which affected the low-class natives of the Pacific Coast. This manner of punishing had been introduced by the Jesuit founder of the Lower California missions, Father Juan María Salvatierra, about seventy years before, as the only means to make the rude creatures grasp the wickedness of a deed. The number of lashes to be administered was governed by law, and might never exceed twenty-five for one offence, nor more than once a day. The chastisement was not applied by the missionary, but by an Indian chief or other native official, nor was it so readily inflicted as malevolent and ignorant writers would have the world believe. The stories of cruelty prevalent among closet historians were either manufactured or exaggerated out of all semblance to the truth by the enemies of the friars, because the latter stood between white cupidity and Indian helplessness. At times the culprit would be locked up, but that was a penalty he courted, as it relieved him from work, for which the Indian had an innate aversion. If the offence was of a serious nature, or a crime against the natural or the civil laws, the delinquent had to be turned over to the military authorities. Inasmuch as the missionary considered himself, as regards the neophytes, in *loco parentis*, and was so recognized by Spanish law, he acted in that capacity. It was this fatherly treatment that gained for him the veneration of the converts which "approached adoration".

THE CHIMES, SAN GABRIEL MISSION

Throughout the mission period the missionaries aimed to make their establishments self-supporting, with a view to independence of government assistance, and to wean the natives from indolence, so that they might adopt civilized ways and learn to maintain themselves by the fruit of their labour. The friars succeeded so well that from the year 1811, when all government aid ceased, as well for the missions as for the soldiers, on account of the revolutionary situation in Mexico, the California establishments maintained not only themselves, but also the whole military and civil government on the coast down to the end of 1834, when the Franciscans were deprived of control. From the beginning of a mission the Fathers insisted that all should work according to their capacity, either on the farm or at the workshops, during six or seven hours a day. The product was stored in the granaries or warerooms for the

benefit of the community. It was their endeavour to raise or manufacture everything consumed or used by the Indians. For this reason much of the meagre allowance of the friars was invested in agricultural implements and mechanical tools, and it was for that reason, too, that the missions were located where there was sufficient arable land and enough water to irrigate the soil. In this way, notwithstanding the primitiveness of the implements of those days and the frequent droughts, thousands of acres of land were brought under cultivation by the natives directed by the missionaries, who themselves, for the sake of example, never disdained to labour like the Indians. The official records show that in the twenty-one missions of Upper California from the year 1770 to the end of 1831, when the general reports cease, there were harvested in round numbers 2,200,000 bushels of wheat, 600,000 bushels of barley, 850,000 bushels of corn, 160,000 bushels of beans, and 100,000 bushels of peas and lentils, not to mention garden vegetables, grapes, olives, and various fruits, for which no reports were required. It must be remembered that before the arrival of the Franciscans the natives raised absolutely nothing, but subsisted upon whatever the earth produced spontaneously, e. g., acorns, seeds, berries in their season, fish near the coast, or, when there was nothing else, on anything that crept above the surface of the land. All the grain now raised and all the fruits, such as apples, oranges, peaches, pears, plums, prunes, lemons, grapes, pomegranates, olives, nuts, etc. were introduced by the missionaries. To irrigate the land long ditches had often to be constructed, some of which were of solid masonry. The one which brought the water down to Mission San Diego was built of stone and cement, and ran along the river side over a distance of six miles, beginning at a dam made of brick and stone.

Much live stock was raised, not only for the purpose of obtaining meat but also for wool, leather, and tallow, and for cultivating the land. Thus the missions in the height of their prosperity owned altogether 232,000 head of cattle, 268,000 sheep, 34,000 horses, 3500 mules or burros, 8300 goats, and 3400 swine. These figures are official, though quite different from those encountered in the works of writers on California. All these various kinds of animals were brought up from Mexico. It required a great many Indians to guard the herds and flocks, and this occupation created a class of horsemen scarcely surpassed anywhere. In addition, as almost everything was raised or manufactured at the missions except sugar and chocolate, which then served as the common beverage in place of coffee or tea, most of the trades were practised among the Indians under the direction of the friars. A special United States report of the year 1852 tells us, what is evident from the annual mission accounts, that the Franciscans had turned the naked savages into "masons, carpenters, plasterers, soapmakers, tanners, shoemakers, blacksmiths, millers, bakers, cooks, brickmakers, carters and cartmakers, weavers and spinners, saddlers, shepherds, agriculturists, herdsmen, vintagers, in a word, they filled all the laborious occupations known to civilized society". Nor was secular education, so called, altogether neglected; but as the Indians were averse to book-learning, and schoolbooks and writing material had to be brought from Mexico on the backs of mules, causing them to be very expensive, and inasmuch as competent schoolmasters were scarce, the missionaries had to devote their spare time to teaching reading, writing, and a little arithmetic to those boys who evinced any inclination for these branches. Some of the men who later on became most prominent in California politics acquired these necessary arts of civilization from the friars.

It was Mexican independence of Spain that put an end to the prosperity of the missions and the happiness of their inmates. With the advent of Echeandía, the first governor under the Mexican flag, began the decay of those homes of peace for nearly thirty thousand neophytes. In 1835 secularization completed the ruin. According to the intent of the Spanish laws, which always recognized the Indian's right to his land, secularization meant nothing more than the turning over of the spiritual affairs of the mission from the respective religious order to the bishop of the diocese, while the Indians retained control of the temporalities in severalty or as a whole. To this manner of secularization the friars made no objection. Secularization as practised by the Mexicans and Californians was the turning over of the mission or Indian property to the control of hired commissioners appointed by the governor without regard to the wishes of the rightful owners, the Indians, placing the missionary on a level with the secular priest, and leaving it optional to the Indians whether they would practise their religion or not. This kind of secularization, which was disguised confiscation, encountered the fearless opposition of the Franciscans, because the friars insisted that the land and all it produced, along with the live stock and buildings, belonged to the Indians and must be held sacred to the rightful owners; that the neophytes were incapable of managing their property, and therefore it should be left in charge of those who, with the aid of the natives, had accumulated its wealth without salary or compensation for the benefit of those same Indians, inasmuch as the hired officials were both incompetent and unworthy of the trust, because they were not looking to the welfare of the rightful owners, but only aimed at enriching themselves. As no court existed to which appeal could be made, the friars were powerless to secure the rights of their wards. The result was similar to that experienced in Lower California. The Indians gradually disappeared; the mission property was squandered; the mission buildings given over to destruction; the missionaries one by one died amid the few faithful who shared the poverty of the beloved *padre*, and the land once cultivated by the neophytes passed into the hands of the avaricious.

Notwithstanding the many drawbacks, the opposition, and the scandalous example of many among the military and the white settlers, the missionaries met with extraordinary spiritual success. Down to the year 1845, when but few friars and Indians survived, the Fathers had baptized, according to the records, 99,000 persons, of whom possibly nine thousand were not Indians; they had blessed 28,000 marriages, of which possibly one thousand were not Indians, and they had buried 74,000 dead, four thousand of whom were probably not Indians. The largest number of neophytes harboured, fed, clothed, and instructed at all the missions at one time was nearly thirty thousand.

One hundred and forty-six Friars Minor, all priests and mostly Spaniards by birth, laboured in California from 1769 to 1845. Sixty-seven died at their posts, two as martyrs, and the remainder retired to their mother-houses on account of illness, or at the expiration of their ten years of service. The missions from south to north, with the date of founding, were: San Diego (16 July, 1769); San Luis Rey (13 June, 1798); San Juan Capistrano (1 Nov., 1776); San Gabriel (8 Sept., 1771); San Fernando (8 Sept., 1797); San Buenaventura (31 March, 1782); Santa Barbara (4 Dec., 1786); Santa Inez (17 Sept., 1804); Purísima Concepción (8 Dec., 1787); San Luis Obispo (1 Sept., 1772); San Miguel (25 July, 1797); San Antonio de Pádua (14 July, 1771); Soledad (9 Oct., 1791); San Carlos or Carmelo (3 June, 1770); Santa Cruz (25 Sept., 1791); San Juan Bautista (24 June, 1797); Santa Clara (12 January, 1777); San José (11 June, 1797); San Francisco (9 Oct., 1776); San Rafael

CALIFORNIA MISSIONS

SANTA BARBARA
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO
SAN LUIS REY
SAN ANTONIO
SAN GABRIEL
CARMEL, NEAR MONTEREY

(14 Dec., 1817); San Francisco Solano (4 July, 1823).

For Lower California: TORQUEMADA, *Monarquía Indiana* (Madrid, 1723), 3 vols; DÍAZ, *Historia Verdadera* (Madrid, 1632); VETANCURT, *Crónica* (Mexico, 1697); MENDIETA, *Historia Ec.ca Indiana* (Mexico, 1870); TELLO, *Crónica* (Guadalajara, 1891); VENEGAS, *Noticia de la California* (Madrid, 1757), 3 vols.; CLAVIJERO, *Historia de la California* (Mexico, 1852); BAEGERT. *Nachrichten* (Mannheim, 1772); ALEGRE, *Historia* (Mexico, 1841), 3 vols.; PALOU, *Noticias de la Nueva California* (San Francisco, 1874), 4 vols.; PALOU, *Relación Histórica, Vida del P. Serra* (Mexico, 1787); *California Archives* (U. S. Land Office, San Francisco), 300 vols. In addition, *for Upper California:* cf. Santa Barbara Mission Archives, 2000 documents; Archives of the Archbishopric of San Francisco, 8 vols; H. H. BANCROFT, *History of California* (San Francisco, 1886), 7 vols.; ENGELHARDT, *The Missions and Missionaries of California* (San Francisco, 1908).

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

Calixtines. See HUSSITES.

Calixtus. See CALLISTUS.

Callières, LOUIS-HECTOR DE, thirteenth Governor of New France; b. at Cherbourg, France, 1646; d. 26 May, 1705. He was the son of Jacques de Callières and Madeleine Potier de Courcy. He ranked as captain in the regiment of Navarre. He came to Canada in 1684, and was appointed Governor of Montreal at the demand of the Sulpicians who were *Seigneurs* of the island. The situation of the colony at that time was most critical, owing to Frontenac's departure, the weakness of Governor de la Barre, and the woeful error of the French government in sending to the galleys in France some Iroquois chiefs captured at Cataracoui (Kingston). In 1689 Callières proposed to Louis XIV to invade New England by land and sea, and obtained the reappointment of Frontenac as governor. In 1690 he marched to the defence of Quebec, when it was besieged by Phipps. A valiant and experienced soldier, he aided Frontenac in saving New France from the Iroquois and in raising the prestige of the French flag. He was one of the first to receive the Cross of St. Louis (1694). Having succeeded Frontenac in 1698, he devoted all his skill and energy to the pacification of the Indians. The treaty of Montreal (1701), agreed to by representatives of all the tribes, was the crowning result of his efforts. This treaty is considered as Callières' chief title to fame. That same year he sent Lamothe-Cadillac to found Detroit. One of the most conspicuous figures in Canadian history, he left a reputation of disinterestedness, honour, and probity.

GARNEAU, *Histoire du Canada* (Montreal, 1882); FERLAND, *Cours d'histoire du Canada* (Quebec, 1882); SULTE, *La famille de Callières* (Montreal, 1890).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Calling. See VOCATION.

Callinicus, a titular see of Asia Minor. The city was founded by Alexander the Great under the name of Nicephorium, and restored by Seleucus Callinicus, King of Syria (246–225 B. C.), who gave his name to it. In the fifth century of our era it was refortified by Emperor Leo I, after which it was commonly known to Byzantine geographers as Callinicus or Leontopolis, being mentioned by Hierocles and Georgius Cyprius among others. Two famous battles were fought on the broad surrounding plain, one in 531 between Belisarius and the Persians, the other in 583 between the Persians and Emperor Mauritius. Callinicus was a suffragan of Edessa, the metropolis of Osrhoene. Four bishops are mentioned by Lequien (II, 696); Paul, deposed in 519 as a Monophysite, translated into Syriac so many Greek works that he is called by the Jacobites "the interpreter of books". The patriarch Michael the Syrian mentions twenty Jacobite bishops of Callinicus from the eighth to the thirteenth century (Revue de l'Orient chrétien, VI, 1901, 193). Eubel (I, 333, note 2) mentions a Latin titular in 1369. Callinicus is to-day Raqqah (Rakka), nine miles west of the confluence of the rivers Belik (Bilichus) and Euphrates, the centre of a caza in the vilayet of Aleppo, the population consisting chiefly of wandering tribes. It contains about 2600 houses or settled tents. On its rich plain are pastured many camels and Arab thoroughbred horses, but the vicinity is not very safe.

SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography* (London, 1878), s. v. *Nicephorium*, II, 424.

S. VAILHÉ.

Callipolis, a titular see of Thrace, now called Gallipoli (Turkish, *Gelibolou*), is a city in the southern part of the Thracian Chersonese, on the right shore, and at the entrance of the Dardanelles. Justinian fortified it and established there important military warehouses for corn and wine. In 1304 it became the centre of that strange dominion created by the Almugavares, or Catalonian routiers, who burned it in 1307, before retiring to Cassandria. It was taken by the Turks as early as 1357, being their first possession in Europe. Callipolis was a bishopric depending on Heracleia. Lequien (I, 1123) mentions only six Greek bishops, the first as being present at Ephesus in 431, when the see was united to that of Cœla (Cœlia or Cœle), the last about 1500. His list could easily be increased, for the Greek see still exists; it was raised in 1904 to the rank of a metropolis, without suffragans, after the manner of most Greek metropolitan sees. Lequien (III, 971) also gives the names of eight Latin bishops, from 1208 to 1518. (See Eubel, I, 269, note.) Gallipoli is to-day the chief town of a *Kaïmakamlik* in the vilayet of Adrianople, with about 30,000 inhabitants, Greeks, Turks, Armenians and Jews. There are numerous schools and a small museum; a large cemetery is the resting place of many French soldiers who died of disease (chiefly cholera) during the Crimean War. The port is bad and trade unimportant, for want of roads. A Catholic mission is conducted there by Assumptionist Fathers; there are also a number of Armenian and Greek Catholics, with priests of their respective rites.

DRAKOS, Θρακικά (Athens, 1892, with a list of the Greek bishops), 93–116.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Callistus I (written by most Latins, Augustine, Optatus, etc. CALLIXTUS or CALIXTUS), POPE, martyr, d. c. 223. His contemporary, Julius Africanus, gives the date of his accession as the first (or second?) year of Elagabalus, i. e., 218 or 219. Eusebius and the Liberian catalogue agree in giving him five years of episcopate. His Acts are spurious, but he is the earliest pope found in the fourth-century "Depositio Martirum", and this is good evidence that he was really a martyr, although he lived in a time of peace under Alexander Severus, whose mother was a Christian. We learn from the "Historiæ Augustæ" that a spot on which he had built an oratory was claimed by the tavern-keepers, *popinarii*, but the emperor decided that the worship of any god was better than a tavern. This is said to have been the origin of Sta. Maria in Trastevere, which was built, according to the Liberian catalogue, by Pope Julius, *juxta Callistum*. In fact the Church of St. Callistus is close by, containing a well into which legend says his body was thrown, and this is probably the church he built, rather than the more famous basilica. He was buried in the cemetery of Calepodius on the Aurelian Way, and his anniversary is given by the "Depositio Martirum" (*Callisti in viâ Aureliâ miliario III*) and by the subsequent martyrologies on 14 October, on which day his feast is still kept. His relics were translated in the ninth century to Sta. Maria in Trastevere.

Our chief knowledge of this pope is from his bitter enemies, Tertullian and the antipope who wrote the "Philosophumena", no doubt Hippolytus. Their calumnies are probably based on facts. According to

the "Philosophumena" (c. ix) Callistus was the slave of Carpophorus, a Christian of the household of Cæsar. His master entrusted large sums of money to Callistus, with which he started a bank in which brethren and widows lodged money, all of which Callistus lost. He took to flight. Carpophorus followed him to Portus, where Callistus had embarked on a ship. Seeing his master approach in a boat, the slave jumped into the sea, but was prevented from drowning himself, dragged ashore, and consigned to the punishment reserved for slaves, the *pistrinum*, or hand-mill. The brethren, believing that he still had money in his name, begged that he might be released. But he had nothing, so he again courted death by insulting the Jews at their synagogue. The Jews haled him before the prefect Fuscianus. Carpophorus declared that Callistus was not to be looked upon as a Christian, but he was thought to be trying to save his slave, and Callistus was sent to the mines in Sardinia. Some time after this, Marcia, the mistress of Commodus, sent for Pope Victor and asked if there were any martyrs in Sardinia. He gave her the list, without including Callistus. Marcia sent a eunuch who was a priest (or "old man") to release the prisoners. Callistus fell at his feet, and persuaded him to take him also. Victor was annoyed; but being a compassionate man, he kept silence. However, he sent Callistus to Antium with a monthly allowance. When Zephyrinus became pope, Callistus was recalled and set over the cemetery belonging to the Church, not a private catacomb; it has ever since borne Callistus's name. He obtained great influence over the ignorant, illiterate, and grasping Zephyrinus by bribes. We are not told how it came about that the runaway slave (now free by Roman law from his master, who had lost his rights when Callistus was condemned to penal servitude to the State) became archdeacon and then pope.

CALLISTUS I, SISTINE CHAPEL, ROME
Tuscan School (Ideal)

Döllinger and De Rossi have demolished this contemporary scandal. To begin with, Hippolytus does not say that Callistus by his own fault lost the money deposited with him. He evidently jumped from the vessel rather to escape than to commit suicide. That Carpophorus, a Christian, should commit a Christian slave to the horrible punishment of the *pistrinum* does not speak well for the master's character. The intercession of the Christians for Callistus is in his favour. It is absurd to suppose that he courted death by attacking a synagogue; it is clear that he asked the Jewish money-lenders to repay what they owed him, and at some risk to himself. The declaration of Carpophorus that Callistus was no Christian was scandalous and untrue. Hippolytus himself shows that it was as a Christian that Callistus was sent to the mines, and therefore as a confessor, and that it was as a Christian that he was released. If Pope Victor granted Callistus a monthly pension, we need not suppose that he regretted his release. It is unlikely that Zephyrinus was ignorant and base. Callistus could hardly have raised himself so high without considerable talents, and the vindictive spirit exhibited by Hippolytus and his defective theology explain why Zephyrinus placed his confidence rather in Callistus than in the learned disciple of Irenæus.

The orthodoxy of Callistus is challenged by both Hippolytus and Tertullian on the ground that in a famous edict he granted Communion after due penance to those who had committed adultery and fornication. It is clear that Callistus based his decree on the power of binding and loosing granted to Peter, to his successors, and to all in communion with them: "As to thy decision", cries the Montanist Tertullian, "I ask, whence dost thou usurp this right of the Church? If it is because the Lord said to Peter: 'Upon this rock I will build My Church, I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven', or 'whatsoever thou bindest or loosest on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven', that thou presumest that this power of binding and loosing has been handed down to thee also, that is to every Church in communion with Peter's (*ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam*, i. e. *Petri ecclesiæ propinquam*), who art thou that destroyest and alterest the manifest intention of the Lord, who conferred this on Peter personally and alone?" (De Pudicitiâ, xxi.) The edict was an order to the whole Church (ib., i): "I hear that an edict has been published, and a peremptory one; the bishop of bishops, which means the Pontifex Maximus, proclaims: I remit the crimes of adultery and fornication to those who have done penance." Doubtless Hippolytus and Tertullian were upholding a supposed custom of earlier times, and the pope in decreeing a relaxation was regarded as enacting a new law. On this point it is unnecessary to justify Callistus. Other complaints of Hippolytus are that Callistus did not put converts from heresy to public penance for sins committed outside the Church (this mildness was customary in St. Augustine's time); that he had received into his "school" (i. e. the Catholic Church) those whom Hippolytus had excommunicated from "The Church" (i. e., his own sect); that he declared that a mortal sin was not ("always", we may supply) a sufficient reason for deposing a bishop. Tertullian (De Exhort. castitatis, vii) speaks with reprobation of bishops who had been married more than once, and Hippolytus charges Callistus with being the first to allow this, against St. Paul's rule. But in the East marriages before baptism were not counted, and in any case the law is one from which the pope can dispense if necessity arise. Again Callistus allowed the lower clergy to marry, and permitted noble ladies to marry low persons and slaves, which by the Roman law was forbidden; he had thus given occasion for infanticide. Here again Callistus was rightly insisting on the distinction between the ecclesiastical law of marriage and the civil law, which later ages have always taught. Hippolytus also declared that rebaptizing (of heretics) was performed first in Callistus's day, but he does not state that Callistus was answerable for this. On the whole, then, it is clear that the Catholic Church sides with Callistus against the schismatic Hippolytus and the heretic Tertullian. Not a word is said against the character of Callistus since his promotion, nor against the validity of his election.

Hippolytus, however, regards Callistus as a heretic. Now Hippolytus's own Christology is most imperfect, and he tells us that Callistus accused him of Ditheism. It is not to be wondered at, then, if he calls Callistus the inventor of a kind of modified Sabellianism. In reality it is certain that Zephyrinus and Callistus condemned various Monarchians and Sabellius himself, as well as the opposite error of Hippolytus. This is enough to suggest that Callistus held the Catholic

Faith. And in fact it cannot be denied that the Church of Rome must have held a Trinitarian doctrine not far from that taught by Callistus's elder contemporary Tertullian and by his much younger contemporary Novatian—a doctrine which was not so explicitly taught in the greater part of the East for a long period afterwards. The accusations of Hippolytus speak for the sure tradition of the Roman Church and for its perfect orthodoxy and moderation. If we knew more of St. Callistus from Catholic sources, he would probably appear as one of the greatest of the popes.

The Acts of St. Callistus were uncritically defended in the *Acta SS.*, 14 Oct.; and by MORETTI, *De S. Callisto P. et M.* (Rome, 1752). The *Philosophumena* were first published in 1851. On the story of Callistus BUNSEN, *Hippolytus and his Age* (London, 1852), and CH. WORDSWORTH, *St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome* (London, 1853) are worthless. DÖLLINGER'S great work *Hippolytus und Kallistus* (Ratisbon, 1853), tr. PLUMMER (Edinburgh, 1876) is still the chief authority. See also DE ROSSI, *Bulletino di Arch. Crist.*, IV (1886); NORTHCOTE AND BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotteranea* (London, 1879), I, 497–505. De Rossi observes that the *Liber Pontificalis* calls Callistus the son of Domitius, and he found *Callistus Domitiorum* stamped on some tiles of the beginning of the second century. Further there is extant an inscription of a Carpophorus, a freedman of M. Aurelius. The edict of Callistus on penance has been restored with too much assurance by ROLFFS, *Das Indulgenz-Edikt des römischen Bischofs Kallist* (Leipzig, 1893), Harnack thinks that Callistus also issued a decree about fasting, and that other writings of his may have been known to Pseudo-Isidore, who attributed two letters to him (which will be found in the Councils, in HINSCHIUS, etc.); one of these seems to connect itself with the decision attributed to Callistus by Hippolytus; see HARNACK, *Chronol.*, II, 207–8. On the Catacomb of St. Callistus see DE ROSSI, *Roma Sotterranea* (Rome, 1864–77); NORTHCOTE AND BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotterranea* (London, 1879).

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Callistus II, POPE, date of birth unknown; d. 13 December, 1124. His reign, beginning 1 February, 1119, is signalized by the termination of the Investiture controversy which, begun in the time of Gregory VII, had raged with almost unabated bitterness during the last quarter of the eleventh century and the opening years of the twelfth. Guido, as he was called before his elevation to the papacy, was the son of Count William of Burgundy, and both by his father's and mother's side was closely connected with nearly all the royal houses of Europe. His brother Hugh had been appointed Archbishop of Besançon, and he himself was named Archbishop of Vienne (1088), and afterwards appointed papal legate in France by Paschal II. During Guido's tenure of this office Paschal II, yielding to the threats of Henry V, was induced to issue the "Privilegium" (1111) by which he yielded up much of what had been claimed by Gregory VII, but these concessions were received with violent opposition and nowhere more so than in France, where the opposition was led by Guido, the papal legate. The latter was present at the Lateran Synod (1112), and on his return to France convoked an assembly of the French and Burgundian bishops at Vienne (1112), where the investiture of the clergy was denounced as heretical, and sentence of excommunication pronounced against Henry V because he had dared to extort from the pope by violence an agreement opposed to the interests of the Church. These decrees were sent to Paschal II with a request for confirmation, which they received in general terms, 20 October, 1112 (Hardouin, VI, 2, 1916).

Guido was later, apparently, created cardinal by Pope Paschal, though the latter does not seem to have been quite pleased with his zeal in his attacks upon Henry V. On the death of Paschal II (21 Jan., 1118), Gelasius II was elected pope, but he was immediately seized by the Italian allies of Henry V, and on his liberation by the populace fled to Gaeta, where he was solemnly crowned. Henry V demanded the confirmation of the "Privilegium", but, receiving no satisfactory reply, set up as antipope under the name of Gregory VIII, the Archbishop of Braga, Burdinus, who had already been deposed and excommunicated for having crowned Henry at Rome with the imperial crown (1117). Gelasius promptly excommunicated both the antipope and the emperor, but was himself obliged to flee, and took refuge in the monastery of Cluny, where he died (January, 1119). On the fourth day after the death of Gelasius (1 February), owing mainly to the exertions of Cardinal Cuno, Guido was elected pope, and assumed the title of Callistus II. He was crowned at Vienne (9 February, 1119).

His election was everywhere received with approbation. On account of his close connexion with the royal families of Germany, France, England, and Denmark, it was hoped that he would be able to effect a favourable settlement of the controversy which had so long distracted the Church. Even Henry V received the papal embassy at Strasburg, and showed clearly that he was not unwilling to sue for peace, and at the same time he withdrew his support from the antipope. It was even agreed that pope and emperor should meet at Mousson. In 1119 (8 June) Callistus held a synod at Toulouse mainly to promote disciplinary reforms in the French Church, and in October of the same year he opened the council at Reims which had been contemplated in the preliminary arrangements made between the emperor and the papal ambassadors at Strasburg. Louis VI and most of the barons of France attended the council, which was composed of more than four hundred bishops and abbots. It had been arranged that during the council the pope and emperor were to have a personal conference at Mousson, and in compliance with this agreement Henry V arrived at Mousson, not alone, as had been anticipated, but with an army of over thirty thousand men. Callistus II left Reims to attend the conference at Mousson, but on learning of the warlike preparations made by the emperor, and fearing that force was likely to be used to extract from him prejudicial concessions, he hastily returned to Reims. Here the council busied itself mainly with disciplinary regulations, especially with decrees against investiture, simony, and concubinage of the clergy. In the end, as there was no hope of a favourable compromise with Henry, it was determined that the emperor and the antipope should be solemnly excommunicated in the presence of the assembled fathers and the representatives of the secular authority (30 October, 1119). Before leaving France Callistus tried to effect a settlement between Henry I of England and his brother Robert, but his efforts in this direction were without result.

Callistus determined to visit Italy and Rome. In the latter city Gregory VIII, supported by the German forces and the Italian allies of the emperor, had taken up his residence, but on the approach of Callistus, who was everywhere received with demonstrations of welcome, the antipope was obliged to flee to the fortress of Sutri, and Callistus entered Rome amid the universal rejoicings of the populace. He went south to secure the aid of the Normans of Southern Italy in his struggle against Henry V and Gregory VIII. The negotiations were entirely satisfactory. Gregory was taken prisoner and escorted to Rome (1121), where he was with difficulty saved from the wrath of the people, and lodged in a prison near Salerno and afterwards in the fortress of Fumo. By the aid of the princes of Southern Italy Callistus broke the power of the Italian allies of the emperor in Italy, notably of Cencio Frangipani, who had already given so much trouble to Gelasius II and to Callistus himself (1121).

Having thus established his power in Italy, he once more resolved to open negotiations with Henry V on the question of investiture. The latter had

already shown that he was anxious to put an end to a controversy which had alienated from him his best friends, and which threatened to endanger the peace of the empire. An embassy consisting of three cardinals was sent by Callistus to Germany, and negotiations for a permanent settlement of the investiture struggle were begun at Würzburg (October, 1121). Here it was agreed that a general truce should be proclaimed between the emperor and his rebellious subjects; that the Church should have free use of her possessions; that the lands of those in rebellion should be restored, and peace with the Church permanently established with the least possible delay. These decrees were communicated to Callistus II, who despatched Cardinal Lambert of Ostia as his legate to assist at the synod that had been convoked at Worms. The synod began at Worms, 8 September, 1222, and 23 September the concordat known as the Concordat of Worms (or *Pactum Calixtinum*) between the pope and the emperor was concluded. On his side the emperor abandoned his claim to investiture with ring and crosier and granted freedom of election to episcopal sees; on the other hand, it was conceded that the bishops should receive investiture with the sceptre, that the episcopal elections should be held in the presence of the emperor or his representatives, that in case of disputed elections the emperor should, after the decision of the metropolitan and the suffragan bishops, confirm the rightfully elected candidate, and, lastly, that the imperial investiture of the temporalities of the sees should take place in Germany before the consecration, in Burgundy and in Italy after this ceremony, while in the Papal States the pope alone had the right of investiture, without any interference on the part of the emperor. As a result of this Concordat, the emperor still retained in his hands the controlling influence in the election of the bishops in Germany, though he had abandoned much in regard to episcopal elections in Italy and Burgundy.

To secure the confirmation of this Concordat of Worms, Callistus II convoked the First Lateran Council (18 March, 1123). The council was most representative, nearly three hundred bishops and six hundred abbots from every part of Catholic Europe being present. The council solemnly confirmed the agreement that had been arrived at with Henry V with regard to episcopal elections, and passed several disciplinary decrees directed against existing abuses, such as simony and concubinage among the clergy. Decrees were also passed against violators of the Truce of God, church-robbers, and forgers of ecclesiastical documents. The indulgences already granted to the crusaders were renewed, and the jurisdiction of the bishops over the clergy, both secular and regular, was more clearly defined.

In the last few years of his life Callistus II endeavoured to secure for the Church the restoration in its entirety of the Patrimony of St. Peter, which had been greatly diminished by the constant wars and rebellions; to break the power of the nobles in the Campagna, and restore peace and order to the city of Rome itself, which had suffered much since the time of Gregory VII. He also devoted much of his time to the interests of the Church of France and to combating the errors and abuses which made their appearance in that country in his time. In the Synod of Toulouse (1119) he condemned the teaching of Peter de Bruis and his followers (Hardouin, VI, 2, 1977–84). He established the Church of Vienne as the metropolitan church of the adjoining ecclesiastical provinces (1120), thereby ending in favour of the former (that he still held as pope) the ancient controversy between Vienne and Arles. For the privileges in favour of Vienne forged during the reign of Guido, see Gundlach, "Streit der Bisthümer Arles und Vienne" (1890). Duchesne maintains ("Fastes Eccl.", I, 145 sqq.) that only the more recent of them date from the time of Guido (cf. Robert, "Calixte II", Paris, 1891). He settled several disputes between bishops and abbots in France, dispatched Gerard of Angoulême as papal legate to Brittany, and finally confirmed the primatial rights of Lyons over the Church of Sens. He demanded of Henry I of England the release of his brother, Robert of Normandy, as well as the acknowledgment of Thurstan, whom he himself had consecrated at Reims, as Archbishop of York. Henry at first refused, but on the threat of excommunication he consented to admit Thurstan as Archbishop of York, and to acknowledge the latter see's independence of Canterbury. In Spain he transferred the metropolitan rights from the old see of Merida (*Emerita*) to Santiago de Compostella, to the patron saint of which Callistus seems to have had a special devotion. He showed his attention to Germany by the canonization of Conrad of Constance at the Lateran Synod (1123) and by dispatching Otto of Bamberg as papal legate to regulate the Churches of Pomerania. In Rome he devoted much attention to beautifying and improving the city, but especially the church of St. Peter. He suppressed the suburban See of Santa Rufina by uniting this diocese with Porto, so that thenceforth there were only six cardinal-bishops instead of seven as had formerly been the case.

Callistus died in 1124, and after some dispute Honorius II was selected as his successor. As to the great influence of the reign of Callistus II on the policy of the Church there can be no dispute. Owing mainly to him the concessions so weakly made by Paschal II were recalled, and on his own accession to the papal throne, his firmness and strength of character secured a settlement of the controversy between Church and State which, though not entirely satisfactory, was at least sufficient to assure a much needed peace. Through his exertions he put an end to the wholesale bestowal of ecclesiastical offices by laymen; he re-established the freedom of canonical elections and secured recognition of the principle that ecclesiastical jurisdiction can come only from the Church, while on the other hand he conceded to the secular authorities the influence to which they were rightly entitled in the election of prelates who were at the same time the most powerful and the richest subjects of the State. On the other hand, he was blamed at the time, principally by Archbishop Conrad of Salzburg, for not insisting upon the withdrawal of the oath of homage which every bishop was required to make to the emperor or his feudal lord, but it should be remembered that Callistus II well understood that unless something were conceded peace was impossible, and that the oath of homage, however improper the ceremony might seem, was not an unnatural demand on the part of the emperor in regard to subjects who wielded such an enormous political power as did the bishops of the German Empire.

Callistus II was not very remarkable for his literary productions; yet a few works have come down to us which are ascribed to his pen. They are: "De Miraculis Sancti Jacobi Apostoli", "De obitu et Vitâ Sanctorum", "Vita Caroli Magni Imperatoris". Many letters attributed to him are preserved. These, together with his other writings, may be found in Migne, P. L., CLXIII (1073–1383). Besides this edition, thirty-six of his letters are contained in Hardouin's "Concilia" (VI, 2, 1949–1976). These same letters, with two additional, are published by Mansi (XXI, 190-218); some others are given by D'Achery [Spicilegium (Paris, 1723), II, 964; III, 478, 479]; some additional ones are to be found in "Magn. Bull. Rom. continuat.", III, ed. Luxembourg, 1730, 12. See INVESTITURES; VIENNE.

Biographies of Callistus II have been written by PANDULPHUS ALETRINUS, ARAGONIUS, and BERNARDUS GUIDONIS (MURATORI, *Script. Rer. Ital.*, III, 1, 418). Cf. WATTERICH, *Vitæ Rom. Pontif.*, II, 115; MIGNE, P. L., CLXIII, 1071; ROBERT, *Bullaire du pape Calixte II* (Paris, 1891); MAURER, *Papst Calixtus II*, in 2 parts (Munich, 1886, 1889). For the Synod of Vienne, see MANSI, XXI, 175, and HARDOUIN, VI, 2, 1752. For the Synod of Reims, MANSI, XXI, 187, and HEFELE, *Conciliengesch.*, V, 344; HALLER, *Die Verhandlungen zu Mouzon* (1119), etc. in *Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 1892. For Concordat of Worms, see MANSI, XXI, 273, 287, and JAFFÉ, *Bibl. Rer. Germ.*, V, 383, also MUNCH, *Vollständige Sammlung aller Concordate*, I (Leipzig, 1830), and NUSSI, *Conventiones de Rebus Eccles.* (Mainz, 1870); BERNHEIM, *Zur Geschichte des Wormser Konkordates* (Leipzig, 1878); BRESLAU, *Die kaiserliche Ausfertigung des Wormser Konkordates* in *Mitteil. des Instituts für Oesterreich. Gesch.*, 1885.

JAMES MACCAFFREY.

Callistus III, POPE, b. near Valencia in Spain, 31 December, 1378; d. at Rome, 6 August, 1458. Alfonso de Borja (Ital. Borgia), as he was known before he became pope, came of a noble family, and having finished his studies espoused the cause of the antipope Benedict XIII, and received from the latter the title of canon. When Alfonso V of Aragon resolved to withdraw from the Schism and place himself and his kingdom under the jurisdiction of Martin V, Alfonso Borgia acted the part of mediator with Benedict's successor, Clement VIII, and induced the latter to submit to the lawful pope. Martin V appointed Borgia Bishop of Valencia (1429), and in 1444 Eugene IV made him cardinal. In both offices he was remarkable for his mortified life, his firmness of purpose, and his prudence in face of serious difficulties. Already popular opinion had marked him as a candidate for the papacy.

CALLISTUS III. COMMEMORATION MEDAL, BRITISH MUSEUM

On the 25th of March, 1455, Nicholas V died, and Alfonso Borgia was elected (8 April) and assumed the name of Callistus III. As pope he was chiefly concerned with the organization of Christian Europe against the invasion of the Turks. Constantinople had been captured by Mohammed II (1453), and though Pope Nicholas V had made every effort nothing had been done to stay the victorious march of the forces of Islam. Already, as cardinal, Callistus had manifested a special interest in this work, and on his election he set himself to carry out the programme which he had already planned. Nuncios were dispatched to all the countries of Europe to beseech the princes to forget for a time their national jealousies and to join once more in a final effort to check the danger of a Turkish invasion. Missionaries were sent to England, France, Germany, Hungary, Portugal, and Aragon to preach the Crusade, to secure volunteers for active service in the wars, to collect the taxes necessary for the support of those in the field, and to engage the prayers of the faithful for the success of the enterprise. It was by order of Callistus III that the bells were rung at midday to remind the faithful that they should pray for the welfare of the crusaders.

But the princes of Europe were slow in responding to the call of the pope. In Germany, Frederick III, through hatred of Ladislaus of Hungary, was unwilling to join a movement from which Hungary was certain to derive an immediate advantage, while the bishops and electors were opposed to the collection of the papal tax imposed in favour of the crusaders. England and France were at war and refused to allow their forces to be weakened by participation in the plans of Callistus III. Genoa did organize a fleet and dispatch it against the Turks, but only to lay herself open to attack by Aragon, while Portugal, disheartened by lack of success, withdrew the fleet that it had already dispatched. Fortunately for Europe, the efforts of the pope were not entirely in vain. The crusading forces led by Hunyady, and inspired by the zeal and courage of the papal legate Carvajal and St. John Capistran, met the Turks at Belgrade (22 July, 1456) and inflicted upon them one of the worst defeats they underwent during their long conflict with Christian Europe. The pope had longed for such a success in the hope that it might encourage the princes of Europe to respond to his call for assistance. The news of the victory was duly announced to the courts by special messengers of the pope, but warm congratulations were the only reply. Unfortunately, too, shortly after his victory over Mohammed II at Belgrade, Hunyady himself died of a fever, and it seemed as if no Christian general could be found equal to the task of saving Europe.

In the next year of this pontificate renewed efforts were made to enlist the co-operation of Germany. The pope endeavoured to make peace between Frederick III and Ladislaus of Hungary, but during the negotiations Ladislaus died (1457), after a reign of seven years, and his death was the occasion of renewed disputes between the three great representatives of the House of Hapsburg, Frederick III, Albrecht VI, and Sigismund of Tyrol. In Albania alone was found a leader, Scanderbeg, who had steadily resisted the invasion of the Turks, and against whom all the powers of Mohammed were unavailing. Callistus III summoned (1457) another assembly of the princes of Europe to devise measures against the inroads of Mohammed. But again his efforts were unavailing. In France, the Dauphin was in favour of the proposals of Callistus, but the king refused to join in the enterprise, and the clergy were so discontented with the levy of the crusading tax that in many provinces they refused to pay, and appealed to a general council. Similar sentiments of distrust and resentment were felt by the clergy and the prince-electors of the German Empire. England, on account of the war against the allied powers, France and Scotland, was unwilling to embark in any new expedition. The war between Aragon and Genoa continued, while, as usual, Venice was more anxious to promote her own commerce than to take part in the destruction of the Turkish fleet. In Bohemia disputes raged about the succession to the throne, and even when an assembly of the nobles declared in favour of George Von Podiebrad, he was too much concerned in trying to reconcile his Catholic and Utraquist subjects, and to secure an understanding with Frederick III, to permit himself to join in the Crusade. Hungary, too, was distracted by the disputes between the rival claimants to the throne. William of Saxony and Casimir of Poland, in the names of their wives, put forward pretensions, but found little or no support from the people of Hungary. A national assembly held at Pesth chose as king Matthias Hunyady, a son of the conqueror of Belgrade, but the rival parties refused to submit to this choice. At last (1459) they proceeded to the election of Frederick III. The result of so many disputes was that the countries most closely affected by the Turkish danger were unable to do anything, and though the younger Hunyady was anxious to follow in the footsteps of his father, and to join in the papal plans for a general crusade, he was too much occupied with provisions against internal disorder and the pretensions of Frederick III to be able to lend any real assistance.

Scanderbeg was still in the field, but with the small forces at his command he could at most hope to defend his country, Albania, against attack. The pope was involved in new disputes after the death of Alfonso V of Aragon. According to the arrangements made, the latter's brother was to succeed him in Aragon and Sicily, while his son Ferdinand, previously recognized as legitimate by Callistus III, was to have Naples. But the pope refused to acknowledge Ferdinand's claim to Naples and, as feudal lord of the territory, asserted for himself the power of disposing of it as he wished. This dispute prevented him from continuing the work of organizing the Crusade and alienated from the cause the powerful family of Aragon.

Moreover, it injured the reputation of Callistus III, as it gave more colour to the charges of nepotism which were even then freely levelled against him. He had already raised to the cardinalate two of his nephews, one of whom, the youthful Rodrigo, was later to become Pope Alexander VI; he bestowed upon a third the governorship of the Castle of Sant' Angelo and the title of Duke of Spoleto. Many asserted that his opposition to Ferdinand of Aragon was due to his desire of securing Naples for the worthless Duke of Spoleto. In this way the early part of 1458 was spent, and during the last few months of his life even Callistus himself had begun to clearly realize that the work to which he had devoted his pontificate had proved a failure, and that on other shoulders must devolve the task of driving back the Turk.

His reign is also remarkable for the revision of the trial of Joan of Arc, which was carried out by direction of the pope, and according to which the sentence of the first court was quashed, and the innocence of the Maid of Orléans proclaimed. He also had the honour of placing the name of Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, on the list of canonized saints. The energies of Callistus were too much directed towards the campaign against the Turks to permit him to devote so much attention to the literary revival of the time as did some of his predecessors, especially Nicholas V, and this neglect of the Humanists made some of them his enemies; yet he seems to have spent a considerable sum of money in securing some valuable additions to the treasures of the Vatican.

Callistus III must ever be regarded as a man of lofty ideals, of boundless courage, energy, and perseverance. He realized the dangers which then confronted Europe, and made every effort to unite its Christian princes for the defence of their own countries; if he failed, the blame must fall not on the pope, but on those who refused to hearken to his counsels. It is unfortunate that a character, otherwise straightforward and unsullied, should have been damaged by contemporary charges of nepotism and avarice. He left, at his death, a rather remarkable sum of money. His letters are to be found in Raynaldus, "Annales Eccl.", from 1455 to 1458; see also Harduin, "Concilia", IX, 1375–78, D'Achéry, "Spicilegium", III (Paris ed. 796–804), and "Magn. Bullar. Rom." (Lyons, 1692), I, 279–82.

HARDUIN, *Concilia*, IX, 1375; PASTOR, tr. ANTROBUS, *History of the Popes* (London, 1894), III; CREIGHTON, *History of the Papacy during the Reformation*, III, IV; BLUME, *Iter Italicum*, III; REUMONT, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom* (Berlin, 1868), III; 126 sq.; HEFELE, *Conciliengesch.*, VIII, 74 sqq.

JAMES MACCAFFREY.

Callixtus. See CALLISTUS.

Callot, JACQUES, a French etcher, engraver, and painter, b. at Nancy, France, 1592; d. in the same city, 28 March, 1635. His father was Jean Callot, a noble, the herald-at-arms for Lorraine, who desired that his son should become a soldier or a priest. But the boy's inclinations for art were so intense, and he was so precocious that parental wishes were of no avail. His work even as a schoolboy showed a grasp of human character, and the bizarre and humorous, particularly in people of the lower orders, attracted him. Before he was twelve years old he had studied design, wherein he was so soon to become a master, and had received aid from Henriet Israel, son of the Lorraine court-painter, and from Dumange Crocq, the royal engraver.

In 1604 he ran away to Italy in the company of a band of gypsies, hoping to reach the goal of his ambition, Rome. He stopped in Florence and studied engraving under the celebrated Remigio Gallina, and copied the work of the masters, thus tempering his love for the grotesque. The young runaway was soon sent home, to the joy of his parents, but his father finally consented to his accompanying the envoy of Duke Henry II to the Papal Court. In Rome he practised engraving and etching and invented a hard varnish for grounding copper-plates. When he left Italy (1621 or 1622) his fame was already great, and it soon became world-wide. He engraved for the Infanta Eugenia in Brussels and for Louis XIII in Paris. It is said that when the French monarch in 1631 commanded Callot to engrave a plate commemorative of the fall of Nancy the artist cried that he "would rather cut off his right hand than use it on such a work".

If little is known of his intimate life and traits, his 1600 plates afford full information concerning the artistic side of his career. Callot was often ugly in his realism, but he was a master of the art of design, clear in drawing, fertile in invention, precise in line, and varied in his style. The freedom and naïveté in his small figures, the lifelike manner in which he treated them, and the certainty with which he arranged complicated groups made him the pioneer of methods followed by Rembrandt and his forerunners. The Macabresque note in medieval art is dominant in his work, and there is a piquancy and newness given to the slightest details. A peculiarity in nearly all his figures is the smallness of the heads in proportion to the bodies. His landscapes are inferior to his figure-pieces and architectural plates, though the latter are of great historical and topographical interest ("La Tour de Nesle" with "the Old Louvre"). No authentic finished painting by Callot exists among the great collections, and it is very doubtful if he ever completed a work in oil. This master of the grotesque and humorous was the father of etching in France, and his fame comes from his etchings, which are better than his engravings. He frequently spoiled his splendid point-work with the burin, and his reputation as an aquafortist depends, therefore, more on what he did than on how he did it. Notable among his works are eighteen plates entitled "The Miseries of War"; twenty-five plates of beggars; "The Holy Family"; "Cosmo III, Grand Duke of Tuscany"; "Charles III of Lorraine". His last years were spent industriously in Nancy, where he died. He was buried in the church of the Franciscans (Cordeliers). He was noted for his loyalty and courage as a subject of Lorraine, and for his generosity, probity, and kindness of heart as a citizen.

MEAUME, *Recherches sur la vie et les ouvrages de Jacques Callot* (Paris, 1860); *Dictionnaire général des artistes de l'école française*, s. v. (Paris, 1882).

LEIGH HUNT.

Cally, PIERRE, philosopher and theologian, b. at Mesnil-Hubert, department of Orne, France, date of birth uncertain; d. 31 December, 1709. In 1660 he was appointed professor of philosophy and eloquence in the University of Caen, and in 1675 president of the Collège des Arts in the same city. In 1684 he assumed charge of the parish of Saint-Martin. He wrote a course of philosophy, "Universæ philosophiæ institutiones" (Caen, 1695), in which the theories of

Descartes are explained and defended. He worked with great zeal for the conversion of Protestants, and gave conferences in which he endeavoured to solve their difficulties. For the same purpose he composed a book on the Eucharist, "Durand commenté, ou accord de la philosophie avec la théologie touchant la transsubstantiation de l'eucharistie" (Caen, 1700). In it he denies the existence of absolute accidents and, instead of a transubstantiation, admits a transformation. Before and after the consecration the matter of the bread remains the same; by the consecration the matter of the bread becomes the matter of the body of Christ. A publisher in Caen was asked to print sixty copies of the work to be sent to competent judges before making it public. In fact, eight hundred copies were printed immediately and sold. At once the book became the subject of many discussions and was bitterly denounced. On 30 March, 1701, Bishop de Nesmond of Bayeux condemned seventeen propositions taken from Cally's work as "false, rash, erroneous, scandalous, injurious to the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, c. iv and canon ii), destructive of the real presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, and leading to heresy concerning transubstantiation". Cally made a public retraction on 21 April of the same year. In addition to the works already mentioned he wrote "Doctrine hérétique et schismatique touchant la primauté du pape enseignée par les jésuites dans leur collège de Caen" (1644); "Discours en forme d'homélies sur les mystères, sur les miracles et sur les paroles de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ qui sont dans l'évangile" (Caen, 1703), and published a new edition with commentaries of Boethius's work, "De consolatione philosophicâ" (Caen, 1695).

PICOT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique pendant le 18e siècle* (3d ed., Paris, 1853), I, 229; WERNER, *Der heilige Thomas von Aquino* (Ratisbon, 1889), III, 555; MANGENOT in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, 1368.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Calmedia, DIOCESE OF. See BOSA, DIOCESE OF.

Calmet, DOM AUGUSTIN, celebrated exegetist; b. at Ménil-la-Horgne, near Commercy, Lorraine, France, 26 Feb., 1672; d. at the Abbey of Senones, near Saint-Dié, 25 Oct., 1757. He was educated at the Benedictine priory of Breuil, and in 1688 joined the same order in the Abbey of St-Mansuy at Toul, where he was admitted to profession 23 Oct. of the following year. After his ordination, 17 March, 1696, he was appointed to teach philosophy and theology at the Abbey of Moyen-Moutier. Here with the help of his brethren he began to gather the material for his commentary of the Bible, which he completed at Münster in Alsace where he was sent in 1704 as sub-prior and professor of exegesis. The first volume appeared at Paris in 1707 with the title "Commentaire littéral sur tous les livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament"; the last of the twenty-three quarto volumes, owing to various delays, was published only in 1716. To satisfy the demand for the work a second edition in twenty-six volumes quarto was issued 1714–1720, and a third, enlarged, edition in nine volumes folio 1724–1726. A Latin translation by Mansi was published at Lucca, 1730–1738, in nine folio volumes, with new editions at Augsburg (1756, eight volumes folio) and Würzburg (1789, nineteen volumes quarto); another Latin translation by F. Vecelli appeared at Venice and Frankfort (1730, six volumes folio). This shows how much the commentary was esteemed. But while it was received with high praise, even by Protestants, critics were not wanting, among whom may be mentioned the Oratorian Richard Simon. It cannot be denied that in spite of its merits and great erudition it is in some respects open to criticism. Difficult passages are often passed over lightly, and too frequently different explanations of a text are set down without a hint to the reader as to which is the right or the preferable one.

The work inaugurated a new method of Biblical exegesis, inasmuch as its author very sensibly departed from the general custom of giving an allegorical (mystical) and tropological (moral) interpretation besides the literal, and confined himself to the latter. The most valuable part of the commentary were the introductory prefaces to the several books and 114 learned dissertations on special topics. These he published separately with nineteen new ones in three volumes, under the title "Dissertations qui peuvent servir de prolégomènes à l'Ecriture Sainte" (Paris, 1720). The collection met with such success that two editions were printed at Amsterdam in 1722, the title being changed to "Trésors d'antiquités sacrées et profanes". It was translated into English (Oxford, 1726), Latin (by Mansi, Lucca, 1729), Dutch (Rotterdam, 1728), German (Bremen, 1738, 1744, and 1747) and Italian. In the meanwhile he had prepared two other works closely connected with Biblical exegesis: (1) "Histoire de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament et des Juifs" (Paris, 1718), which went through several editions, and was translated into English (London, 1740), German (Augsburg, 1759) and Latin (ib. 1788); (2) "Dictionnaire historique, critique, chronologique, géographique et littéral de la Bible" (Paris, 1720, two vols. folio), a supplement (also folio) was added in 1728. An improved and enlarged edition in four folio volumes was published in 1730, which has several times been reprinted, the last time in Migne, "Encyclopédie théologique", I–IV. It, too, was translated into Latin and the principal European languages. The English translation by D'Oyley and Colson (1732), revised and with additions by Taylor (1795), went through many editions in a larger and a compendious form. In his later years Calmet published some further Biblical dissertations in the "Bible de Vence" (1742). Among his other published works may be mentioned: (1) "Histoire universelle sacrée et profane, depuis le commencement du monde jusqu'à nos jours" (Strasburg, 1735, quarto), in which he follows the ideas enunciated in Bossuet's "Discours sur l'histoire universelle"; (2) "Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de la Lorraine" (Nancy, 1728), of great value for the history of that province; (3) "Bibliothèque Lorraine" (Nancy, 1751), containing his autobiography (pp. 209–217); (4) "Commentaire littéral, historique et moral sur la règle de S. Benoît" (Paris, 1734). Calmet was a pious religious as well as a learned man. In recognition of these qualities he was elected prior of Lay-Saint-Christophe in 1715, abbot of St-Léopold at Nancy in 1719, and of Senones in 1729; he was also twice entrusted with the office of president or superior general of the congregation. Benedict XIII wished to confer the episcopal dignity upon him, but his humility could not be brought to accept the honour.

FANGÉ, *Vie du R. P. D. Aug. Calmet* (Senones, 1762); MAGGIOLO, *Eloge historique de D. A. Calmet* (Nancy, 1839); DIGOT, *Notice biographique et littéraire sur D. Augustin Calmet* (Nancy, 1860); BAZELAIRE, *Dom Calmet et la Congr. de Saint-Vanne* in *Le Correspondant* (1845), 703–727, 846–874; HURTER, *Nomenclator;* MANGENOT in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, II, 72 sq.

F. BECHTEL.

Calne, COUNCIL OF. See DUNSTAN, SAINT.

Caloe, a titular see of Asia Minor, mentioned as Kaloe and Keloue in inscriptions of the third century, Kalose in Hierocles' "Synecdemos" (660); as Kalloe, Kaloe, and even Kolone in Parthey's "Notitiæ episcopatuum", where it figures from the sixth to the twelfth or thirteenth century. Caloe must be identified with the modern village of Kilis, Keles, or Kelas, a *nahié* in the vilayet of Smyrna, to the south-west of Ala-Shehir (ancient Philadelphia), in the upper valley of the Kutchuk-Mendérès (Caystrus). There was in Lydia a Lake Koloe, near which the

tombs of the Lydian kings and the temple of Artemis Koloene stood. According to Lequien, the titular see took its name from this locality; but Lequien's view is inconsistent with the position assigned to Caloe by the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" as a suffragan see of Ephesus.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Caltagirone (CALATA HIERONIS), DIOCESE OF (CALATAYERONENSIS). Caltagirone is a city in the province of Catania, Sicily, built on two eminences about 2000 feet above sea-level, connected by a bridge. It is supposed by some to be the ancient *Hybla Minor*, by others the ancient *Gela*. In the Middle Ages it became a Saracen stronghold. The first two syllables of its name are of Arabic origin (*kalaat*, castle). The Genoese tried unsuccessfully to expel the Arabs from Caltagirone, which later, however, with the rest of Sicily fell into the hands of the Normans. It belonged at one time to the Diocese of Syracuse, but when the latter was made the seat of a metropolitan, Caltagirone was erected into a suffragan see. The first bishop was Gaetano Maria Trigona, afterwards transferred to Palermo. The diocese contains a population of 115,500 with 25 parishes, 112 churches and chapels, 199 secular and 48 regular priests, 5 religious houses of men, and 5 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 628; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 354–55.

U. BENIGNI.

Caltanisetta (CALATHANISIUM), DIOCESE OF (CALATHANISIADENSIS). The city is situated in a fertile plain of Sicily, on the River Salso, in the vicinity of the most extensive sulphur mines in the world. The name is of Arabic origin. The immense cavern of Caltabillotta is famous on account of the legend of a great dragon, driven thence by the holy hermit Peregrinus when he chose that spot for a life of penance. This city formerly belonged to the Diocese of Girgenti, but was created an episcopal see by Gregory XVI in 1844, and is a suffragan of Monreale. The first bishop was Antonio Stromillo. The churches of the city worthy of notice are: Santa Maria Nuova, the cathedral, and Santa Maria Vecchia, whose Saracen-Norman portal is an exquisite work of art. Caltanisetta has 17 parishes, 182 churches and chapels, 225 secular priests, 145,000 Catholics, 4 religious houses for men and 16 for women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 609; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 355–56.

U. BENIGNI.

Calumny (Lat. *calvor*, to use artifice, to deceive), etymologically any form of ruse or fraud employed to deceive another, particularly in judicial proceedings. In its more commonly accepted signification it means the unjust damaging of the good name of another by imputing to him a crime or fault of which he is not guilty. The sin thus committed is in a general sense mortal, just as is detraction. It is hardly necessary, however, to observe that as in other breaches of the law the sin may be venial, either because of the trivial character of the subject-matter involved or because of insufficient deliberation in the making of the accusation. Objectively, a calumny is a mortal sin when it is calculated to do serious harm to the person so traduced. Just as in the instance of wrongful damage to person or estate, so the calumniator is bound to adequate reparation for the injury perpetrated by the blackening of another's good name. He is obliged (1) to retract his false statements, and that even though his own reputation may necessarily as a consequence suffer. (2) He must also make good whatever other losses have been sustained by the innocent party as a result of his libellous utterances, provided these same have been in some measure (*in confuso*) foreseen by him. In canon law the phrase *juramentum calumniæ* is employed to indicate the oath taken by the parties to a litigation, by which they averred that the action was brought and the defence offered in good faith.

ST. THOMAS, *Summa theol.* (Turin, 1885), II, QQ. lxviii, lxix, lxxii, lxxiii; LEHMKUHL, *Theol. moralis* (Freiburg, 1887), I, 1191 sq.; GENICOT, *Theol. moralis institutiones* (Louvain, 1898), I, 561 sq.; BERARDI, *Praxis Confessariorum* (Faenza, 1898), II, 422; DUBLANCHY in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1904), s. v.

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

Calvaert, DIONYSIUS, an eminent painter, usually known as "The Fleming" and called Denis, a native of Antwerp and a student at Bologna, b. about the year 1540; d. 1619. The Antwerp "Record of Artists" or "Liggeren" (1556–57), gives his name as Caluwaert. He first studied under Christiaen van Queecborne, but early left his own country for Bologna, becoming a pupil first with Prospero Fontana, in 1570, and afterwards with Lorenzo Sabbatini, whom he accompanied to Rome in 1572 and remained there for two years assisting his master in his paintings in the Vatican. On his return to Bologna he settled there permanently, establishing a celebrated school from which sprang, among other notable artists, Albani, Guido, and Domenichino. The rival school in Bologna was that of the Carracci, but Calvaert was so respected in the city that on his decease Ludovico Carracci attended his funeral in the Servite church and brought with him all his pupils.

Calvaert was a profound student of architecture, anatomy, and history, exceedingly accurate in perspective and graceful in design. His colouring is full and rich, his execution suave and accurate, and, although there is something of an awkward stiffness in the movements of his figures and an academic mannerism in his grouping, yet in composition he was far ahead of his rivals and in colouring undoubtedly their superior. As an instructor few excelled him. His principal works are to be seen at Bologna, Florence, St. Petersburg, Parma, and Caen, and many of his pictures have been engraved. His life was one of great devotion to his art and his faith, and he was greatly respected in Bologna.

BRYAN, *Dictionary of Painters and Engravers* (London, New York, 1903); MALVASIA, *Felsina Pittrice* (Bologna, 1678); ORLANDI, *Abbecedario Pittorico* (Bologna, 1719); ORETTI, *Unpublished Notebooks*, Arciginasio Library, Bologna.

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Calvary, CONGREGATION OF OUR LADY OF, a congregation founded at Poitiers, in 1617, by Antoinette of Orléans-Longueville, assisted by the famous Capuchin, Father Joseph Le Clerc du Tremblay. Antoinette was left a widow in 1596, and entered the convent of Feuillantines at Toulouse in 1599. After her profession she was commanded by the pope to act as coadjutrix to the Abbess of Fontevrault, and assist her in reforming her convent. Here Antoinette met Father Joseph, who became her director: he had just reformed the monastery of l'Encloître, and when Paul V ordered Antoinette to found a seminary for training religious, this convent was chosen for that purpose, and was soon filled with novices. In 1614 Antoinette founded and built a new convent at Poitiers, dedicated to Our Lady of Calvary, which became the cradle of the congregation. By permission of the pope, she left Fontevrault to enter this monastery, and took with her those nuns who wished to follow the Benedictine rule in all its strictness. The Abbess of Fontevrault at first consented to this, but afterwards objected, and it was not until after Antoinette's death that Father Joseph established the new congregation, gave them constitutions, and got Gregory XV to issue a Bull erecting them into an independent congregation under the title of Our Lady of Calvary. They were finally approved by the Holy See, 17 January, 1827. The congregation succumbed to the French Revolution, but was restored afterwards and in 1860 had

twenty houses in France, of which seven still exist. The mother-house is at Orléans, three convents are in Vendôme, Angers, and La Capelle Marival, and in 1897 an orphanage and boarding-school were opened for girls of the Greek Rite on the Mount of Olives at Jerusalem. The life is mixed. Father Joseph ordered that there should always be a nun meditating before the crucifix day and night. The nuns have boarding-schools and take charge of deaf and dumb girls, and the old and infirm. The habit is brown with a black scapular.

HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Congregationen der katholischen Kirche.* (Paderborn, 1907). BRAUNMÜLLER in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 358; HÉLYOT, *Dict. des Ordres Religieux* (Paris, 1860); DE FELLER, *Biog. Univ.* (Besançon 1848), VI.

FRANCESCA M. STEELE.

Calvary, DAUGHTERS OF. See DAUGHTERS OF CALVARY.

Calvary, MOUNT, the place of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

NAME.—*Etymology and Use.*—The word Calvary (Lat. *Calvaria*) means "a skull". *Calvaria* and the Gr. Κρανίον are equivalents for the original Golgotha (Γολγοθά or -θᾶ) from the Heb. גלגלת, Aram. גלגלתא. The ingenious conjecture that Golgotha may be a contraction for *Gol Goatha* and may accordingly have signified "mount of execution", and been related to Goatha in Jer., xxi, 39, has found scarcely any supporters. The diminutive *monticulus* (little mount) was coupled with the name A. D. 333 by the "Pilgrim of Bordeaux". Towards the beginning of the fifth century Rufinus spoke of "the rock of Golgotha". Since the sixth century the usage has been to designate Calvary as a mountain. The Gospel styles it merely a "place", (Matt. xxvii, 33; Mark xv, 22; Luke, xxiii, 33; John, xix, 17).

Origin of the Name.—The following theories have been advanced:—(1) Calvary may have been a place of public execution, and so named from the skulls strewn over it. The victims were perhaps abandoned to become a prey to birds and beasts, as Jezabel and Pharao's baker had been (IV K., ix, 35; Gen., xl, 19, 22). (2) Its name may have been derived from a cemetery that may have stood near. There is no reason for believing that Joseph's tomb, in which the body of Christ was laid, was an isolated one, especially since it was located in the district later on described by Josephus as containing the monument of the high-priest John. This hypothesis has the further advantage of explaining the thinness of the population in this quarter at so late a period as that of the siege of Jerusalem (Jos., Bell. jud., V, vi, 2). Moreover, each of the rival Calvaries of to-day is near a group of ancient Jewish tombs. (3) The name may have been occasioned by the physical contour of the place. St. Luke (loc. cit.) seems to hint at this by saying it was the place called "a skull" (κρανίον). Moreover, Golgotha (root, גלל, "to roll"), which borrows its signification from the rounded or rolling form of the skull, might also have been applied to a skull-shaped hillock. (4) There was a tradition current among the Jews that the skull of Adam, after having been confided by Noe to his son Sem, and by the latter to Melchisedech, was finally deposited at the place called, for that reason, Golgotha. The Talmudists and the Fathers of the Church were aware of this tradition, and it survives in the skulls and bones placed at the foot of the crucifix. The Evangelists are not opposed to it, inasmuch as they speak of one and not of many skulls. (Luke, Mark, John, loc. cit.)

The curious origins of many Biblical names, the twofold and sometimes disagreeing explanations offered for them by the Sacred Writers (Gen., *passim*) should make us pause before accepting any of the above theories as correct. Each of them has its weak points: The first seems to be opposed to the Jewish law, which prescribed that the crucified should be buried before sundown (Deut., xxi, 23). Josephus intimates that this enactment was scrupulously observed (Bell. jud., IV, v, 2). The executions cited in support of the opinion are too few, too remote, and too isolated to have the force of proof. Moreover, in this supposition Calvary would have been called more correctly a place "of skulls", but the Evangelists nowhere use the plural. In the first two theories no sufficient reason is assigned for selecting the skull in preference to any other member of the body, or the corpse itself, as a name-giver. The third theory is plausible and more popular. Yet it may not be urged a priori, as indicating a requisite for a Calvary otherwise unauthenticated. The Evangelists seem to have been more intent upon giving an intelligible equivalent for the obscure name, Golgotha, than upon vouching for its origin. The fourth theory has been characterized as too absurd, though it has many serious adherents. It was not absurd to the uncritical Jew. It would not seem absurd to untaught Christians. Yet it is among the untaught that names arise spontaneously. Indeed Christians embellished the legend, as we shall see.

DESCRIPTIVE DATA.—*The New Testament.*—The only explicit notices are that the Crucifixion took place outside the city (Heb., xiii, 12), but close to it; a newly-hewn tomb stood in a garden not far away (John, xix, 20, 41); the spot was probably near a frequented road, thus permitting the passers-by to revile the supposed criminal. That the Cyrenian was coming from the country when he was forced into service seems to exclude only two of the roads entering Jerusalem, the one leading from Bethlehem and the one from Siloe (Matt., xxvii, 39; Mark, xv, 21, 29; Luke, xxiii, 26). Any other road entering Jerusalem might fulfil the condition. The incidents recorded along the sorrowful journey are so few that the distance from the prætorium is left a matter of conjecture.

Early Medieval Narratives.—After the Apostolic Age no more is heard of Calvary until the fourth century. Under pagan rule an idol had been placed there, and had been later embraced within the same enclosure as the crypt of the Resurrection (Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., II, 1, 2). Eustachius, Constantine's architect, separated it from the latter by hewing away a great mass of stone. It was St. Melania the Younger who first adorned Mount Calvary with a chapel (436).

The place is described as "a knoll of scanty size" (*deficiens loci tumor*—Eucherius, 427–440), apparently natural, and in the sixth century approached by steps. It was fifteen paces from the Holy Sepulchre. It was encircled with silver railings and contained a cell in which the Cross was kept, and a great altar (Theodosius, 530). Two years after the ravages of the Persians (614), a large church replaced the ruined chapel (Arculfus, 680). From its roof a brazen wheel adorned with lamps was suspended over a silver cross that stood in the socket of Our Saviour's gibbet. This church was destroyed 1010, but was restored in 1048. The rock beneath is spoken of by Sœwulf (1102) as being "much cracked near the fosse of the Cross". In the traditions, Adam's burial and Abraham's sacrifice are repeatedly located there.

By 1149 the Calvary chapel had been united by the crusaders with the surrounding oratories into a vast basilica. The part of the rock believed to have held the Cross is said to have been removed and lost in a shipwreck on the coast of Syria while being transported to Constantinople (1809). Another fragment is shown in the chapel of Longinus, one of many in the basilica.

Contemporary Sources.—Wilson, Warren, Fraas, and other eminent topographers engaged in the interests of the English Ordnance Survey (1864–5),

declare that the lower part of this traditional Calvary is natural, and that the upper part "may very likely be so". The knoll is of soft white limestone (nummulitic) containing nodules, and occupies a position normally required for such a bed in Palestine, viz. above the Missæ and Malaki strata respectively. These last beds are seen on lower levels in the basilica. The direction taken by the rent in the rock, 96° east of north, is practically the same as that of the veining of the rocks roundabout. Other points of similarity have been observed. The fissure broadens eastwards. The rock has been cut away on the side of the Holy Sepulchre, thus bearing out the architectural datum afforded by the period of Constantine. Calvary is 140 feet south-east of the Holy Sepulchre and 13 feet above it. The early traditions mentioned at the beginning of this article still cling to it. The chapel of Adam beneath that of Calvary stands for the first. A picture in it represents the raising of Adam to life by the Precious Blood trickling down upon his skull. An altar is there dedicated to Melchisedech. A vestige of the second tradition subsists in a scraggy olive tree a few yards away, religiously guarded, which the Abyssinians still claim to have been the bush in which the ram's horns were caught when the angel stayed the hand of Abraham.

Calvary Chapel.—The small, low, poorly-lighted oratory, built upon the traditional Calvary, is divided into two sections by a pair of massive pillars. The chapel of the Exaltation of the Cross comprises the section on the north and belongs to the Orthodox Greeks. That of the Crucifixion on the south is in possession of the Latins. At the eastern end, behind a thickly-set row of sanctuary lamps kept constantly burning, there are three altars of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth stations of the Way of the Cross. That of the twelfth station is in the Greek chapel, and marks the position of Our Saviour's Cross. It is near the rent made in the rock by the earthquake. Two black marble discs at its sides indicate the presumed positions of the malefactors' crosses. Behind it, among numerous icons, stands a large painted image of the Crucified Saviour.

The altars of the Crucifixion and Mater Dolorosa (eleventh and thirteenth stations) belong to the Latins. The image on the latter, or middle, altar is screened, and incased with a profusion of votive offerings. The floor of the chapel, which is on a level with the top of the rock, is covered with coarse mosaics. A round stone in the pavement on the Latin side, near the eleventh station, marks the place of the tenth. In the roof, there is a mosaic representation of Christ. Entrance to the chapel is obtained by the stairways. The two most frequently used are at the west end. The eighteen steps in each stairway, which are narrow, steep and much worn, are mostly of pink *Santa Croce* marble commonly quarried in Palestine.

AUTHENTICITY.—It is beyond doubt that the Calvary we have been considering is the same as that of the Middle Ages, but is it correct to identify it with that of the Gospels? It has long been far within the city walls. But did the city wall which has enclosed it for so many centuries enclose it when Christ was crucified? That is, did the present city wall exist when the Saviour was put to death? If so, this could not have been the place of the crucifixion; for Christ was crucified outside of the walls (Heb., xiii, 12). St. Willibald (eighth century), Sœwulf (twelfth century), and many others asked themselves this question. But it was not until two centuries ago that an affirmative answer was ventured by Korte, a German bookseller (see below). Not, however, until the last century did the new opinion obtain supporters. Then a school sprang up which first rejected the old site and eventually set about seeking new ones. Catholics, as a class, with many leading Anglicans support the traditional claims.

The authenticity of Calvary is intimately bound up with that of the Holy Sepulchre. Relative to the authenticity of the sites of both, the ecclesiastical writers who are the first to break silence after the Evangelists seem to leave no room for doubt. Now it is not easy to see how these, the chief representatives of an apologetical age, could have overlooked the above difficulty advanced by modern writers, especially since simple pilgrims are known to have anticipated it. The spirit of investigation had awakened in the Church long years previous to them; and the accredited custodians of the tradition, the Jerusalem community, had been ruled by a continuous succession of bishops since Apostolic times. Under these circumstances, our first available witnesses tell us that a remembrance of the site had actually been transmitted. As a telling testimony to the confidence they merit herein, it need only be remarked that of sixteen modern charts of the Holy City collated by Zimmermann (Basle, 1876) only four place Golgotha within the second or outermost wall in the time of Christ. Moreover, Dr. Schick, the author of one of these, accepted the traditional view before his death. Dr. Riess, in his "Bibel-Atlas" (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1895), also agrees with the majority. (See JERUSALEM; HOLY SEPULCHRE.)

MODERN CALVARIES.—The most popular of several sites proposed is that of Otto Thenius (1849), better known as Gordon's Calvary, and styled by the latter, "Skull Hill", because of its shape. Conder is the chief supporter of this view. This site is the elevation over Jeremiah's Grotto, not far from the Damascus Gate. In default of an historic basis, and owing to the insufficiency of the Gospel data—which may be verified equally well on any side of the city—the upholders of the new theories usually take for granted one or other of the following statements, viz: that Christ should have been immolated north of the altar, like the typical victims (Lev., i, 10, 11); that Calvary was a place of public execution; that the place reserved for crucifixion, if there was one, was identical with a presumed stoning-place; that a modern Jewish tradition as to a fixed stoning-place could be substantiated in the time of Christ; and that the violent mob to which Christ was delivered would have conformed to whatever custom prescribed for the occasion. These affirmations all bear the mark of fitness; but until documents are produced to confirm them, they must inevitably fall short as proofs of facts.

For Fathers, see article, HOLY SEPULCHRE.

Pilgrims.—GEYER, *Itinera Hierosolymitana;* TOBLER, *Description Terrae Sanctae* (1874).

General Treatment.—*Dictionaries of the Bible; Quarterly statement P. E. F.* (passim, especially 1902–1903); WARREN, *Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem* in *Notes* (London, 1865); WARREN and CONDER in *Jerusalem* (1884).

Controversial (authors marked with an asterisk * oppose the traditional view):—

BREEN *, *Harm. Expos. of the Four Gospels* (Rochester, New York), IV; FERGUSSON *, *Essay on Ancient Topography of Jerusalem* (London, 1847); FINDLAY, *On the Site of the Holy Sepulchre* (London, 1847); LEWIN, *Siege of Jerusalem* (London, 1863); REILLY, *Authenticity*, etc. in *Ecclesiastical Review* (Philadelphia), XXXVI, nn. 6 sqq.; ROBINSON*, *Biblical Researches* (Boston, 1841), I; SANDAY, *Sacred Sites of the Gospels* (Oxford, 1903); THRUPP, *Ancient Jerusalem* (Cambridge, 1855); WILLIAMS, *The Holy City* (London, 1845); CHATEAUBRIAND, *Itinéraire de Paris à Jerusalem* (Paris, 1811), II; KORTE *, *Reise nach dem gelobten Lande Aeg. Syr. u. Mes.* (Halle, 1751); KRAFFT, *Die Topographie Jerusalems* (Bonn, 1846); TOBLER *, *Topographie von Jerusalem u. seinen Umgebungen* (Berlin, 1853), I.

THOMAS Á K. REILLY.

Calvert, GEORGE, first LORD BALTIMORE, statesman and colonizer, b. at Kipling, Yorkshire, England, c. 1580; d. in London, England, 15 April, 1632. He was graduated from Oxford in 1597. In 1605 he married a daughter of John Mayne, a lady of dis-

tinguished family, who died in 1622. He spent some time on the Continent where he met Robert Cecil, the secretary of state. After his return, Calvert was made private secretary to Lord Cecil. He was soon appointed by the king a Clerk of the Crown for the Province of Connaught and the County Clare in Ireland. In 1609 he was sent to Parliament from Bossiney. He was sent on a mission to the French Court in 1610, on the occasion of the accession of Louis XIII. Upon the death of Lord Cecil, in 1613, Calvert was made clerk of the Privy Council. Afterwards he was sent by the king to Ireland to report on the success of the policy of bringing the Irish people into conformity with the Church of England. There was a great deal of discontent among the Irish, and several commissions were appointed to hear and report on the grievances. Calvert served on two of these commissions. He became a great favourite of King James I. He translated into Latin the argument of the king against the Dutch theologian, Vorstius. In 1617 the order of knighthood was conferred on him and two years later he was appointed principal secretary of state. Spain and France were rivals for English favour. Calvert, believing that Spain would be the better friend or more formidable foe, favoured the proposed marriage of Prince Charles of Wales with the Infanta Maria, daughter of Philip III, although the majority in Parliament were opposed to this union. In the year 1620 the king made Calvert one of the commissioners for the office of treasurer. In 1621 he served in Parliament as a representative from Yorkshire, and in 1624 from Oxford. He was one of the minority that favoured the Spanish Court policy. He also tried to be a conciliator between the king and the country party. As a reward for faithful services the king granted him (in 1621) a manor of 2300 acres, in the County of Longford, Ireland, on condition that all settlers "should be conformable in point of religion". Calvert, becoming a Catholic, in 1624, surrendered this manor but received it again, with the religious clause omitted. On becoming a Catholic he resigned his secretaryship. The king retained him in his Privy Council, and in 1625 elevated him to the Irish Peerage as Baron Baltimore of Baltimore in County Longford. After the death of James, Charles offered to dispense with the oath of religious supremacy, if Calvert would remain in the council but Calvert declined.

Lord Baltimore purchased a plantation in Newfoundland in the year 1620, which he called Avalon. In 1622 he applied for a patent and received in 1623 a grant of the south-eastern peninsula of Newfoundland, which was erected into the Province of Avalon, and quasi-royal authority was given him. He went to Avalon in 1627 to observe conditions in the province and to establish a colony where all might enjoy freedom in worshipping God. He landed at Fairyland, the settlement of the province, in 1627 and remained till fall. When he returned the next spring he brought with him his family, including Lady Baltimore, his second wife, and about forty colonists. On his first visit to Avalon he brought two priests, and on his second visit one priest. After Lord Baltimore's second visit to Avalon, a Protestant minister, Mr. Stourton, went back to England and complained to the Privy Council that his patron was having Mass said in the province, and that he favoured the Catholics. No attention however was paid to Stourton's complaints. In the war with France French cruisers attacked the English fisheries, and Lord Baltimore's interests suffered heavily.

About 1628 Lord Baltimore requested a new grant in a better climate. In the following year, before word came from the king, he went to Virginia and being a Catholic, was received with various indignities. He returned to England and at first received from Charles a grant of land south of the James River. Meeting opposition from some of the Virginia Company, he sought another grant north and east of the Potomac, which he obtained. Before the charter was granted, however, he died. It is claimed that he dictated its provisions. Baltimore's works are "Carmen Funebre in D. Hen. Untonum", in a collection of verses on Sir Henry Unton's death, 1596; "The Answer to Tom Tell-troth; The practice of Princes and the Lamentations of the Kirk" (1642), a justification of the policy of King James in refusing to support the claim of the Elector Palatine to the crown of Bohemia; various letters and papers of value.

Cecilius, second Lord Baltimore, founder of Maryland; b. 1606; d. 1675. He was the eldest son and heir of George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore. At the age of thirteen he entered Trinity College, Oxford, where he was educated. In 1629 he married Anne Arundel, of Wardour. When his father died, in 1632, the charter of Maryland was granted to Cecilius, who was made a palatine and "Absolute Lord of Maryland and Avalon". It was Lord Baltimore's intention, at first, to come to America with the colonists, but as there were many enemies of his colonial project at home he concluded to send his brothers, Leonard and George, at the head of the expedition. The former was appointed governor. The enemies of the charter, chiefly members of the London Company, did everything in their power to defeat the objects of the proprietor. It was claimed that the charter interfered with the grant of land of the Virginia Company, and that, owing to its liberality, it would attract people from other colonies and depopulate them. The arguments of the enemies of the charter were of no avail, and finally the colonists, numbering twenty gentlemen and about three hundred labourers, embarked on the Ark and the Dove, in the harbour of Cowes, Nov., 1633. Before sailing, Leonard received instructions for the government of the colonists. Religious toleration was the keynote of Baltimore's policy throughout his long career. In spite of the fact that the Catholics were persecuted when Calvert's government was overthrown, every time his authority was restored persecution ceased and every faith had equal rights. When the Puritans were persecuted in Massachusetts, Baltimore offered them a refuge in Maryland, with freedom of worship

Cecil Calvert, Lord Baltimore

Lord Baltimore paid for the expedition, which cost him in the first two years forty thousand pounds in transportation, provisions, and stores. He provided them not only with the necessities, but also many of the conveniences adapted to a new country. So well were they equipped for the founding of a colony that it was said they made as much progress in six months as Virginia made in as many years. Unable to go with the first settlers he believed that he could soon follow them to Maryland. This

privilege was forever denied him, as the persistence of the enemies of his charter kept him at home fighting for his rights. His absence from the colony introduced a peculiar condition, the absence of laws. The charter gave the proprietor the right to make laws with the advice and consent of the freemen. The latter met in 1634–35 and passed "wholesome laws and ordinances". Feeling that this act had infringed on his rights, in his commission to the governor, April, 1637, the proprietor expressed his disapproval of all laws passed by the colonists. For the endorsement of the Assembly of 1637–38, he sent a body of laws with his secretary, John Lewger. These laws were rejected by the Assembly, as they were considered unsuited to the colony. A few laws not differing materially from those sent by Baltimore were agreed to and sent to the proprietor for his consent. At first his approval was withheld, and the colony was without laws. Later, however, his sanction was given to the laws in a commission to the governor, authorizing him to give his assent to laws made by the freemen, which would make the laws binding until they were either approved or rejected by the proprietor. With this commission the privilege of initiative in matters of legislation was conceded to the colonists, the proprietor retaining the right of absolute veto. As this power was never used by Baltimore except in extreme cases, the colonists practically enjoyed freedom in self-government.

The difficulties between Baltimore and the Jesuits were very unfortunate for the welfare of the colony. Jesuit priests went on the first expedition. From the Indians they received grants of large tracts of land. Baltimore objected to this, believing that any other grants than those coming from the proprietor were illegal. The Jesuits believed that they, their domestic servants, and half of their planting servants should be exempted from taxation and military service; that they and their adherents should not be tried by the civil authorities in temporal matters, like other settlers; and that they should have the same privileges here which were enjoyed by religious orders in Catholic countries. On each of these points their views clashed with those of the proprietor. Baltimore applied to the Propaganda in Rome "to appoint a prefect and to send secular priests to take charge of the Maryland Mission". Dom Rosetti, titular Archbishop of Tarsus, was appointed prefect, and two secular priests were sent to the colony. To this the Jesuits objected, claiming that they were the first on the ground, and had endured great hardships in the interests of the colony. Finally, an agreement was entered into between the provincial, acting for the Jesuits, and Baltimore, which, if not satisfactory to both parties, closed the matter. The whole affair seems even to this day somewhat cloudy, as good authorities take opposing points of view. Cecilius Calvert ruled over the colony nearly forty years. Although he never interfered in the administration of details, he ruled at every turn with an iron hand.

CHARLES, third Baron of Baltimore and second Proprietary Governor of Maryland, b. in London, 1629; d. at Epsom, Surrey, England, 20 Feb., 1715. He was the son of Cecilius Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, and Anne Arundel (Calvert). He was Proprietary Governor of Maryland from 1661 to 1684, and Lord Proprietor from 1675 to 1691. He married Jane, widow of Henry Sewell of Matapaney on the Patuxent, Maryland. During his administration, boundary disputes with Virginia, the Swedes of Delaware, and William Penn came up and were settled. He became proprietor upon the death of his father, 1675. At this time an effort was made by the Protestants to make the Church of England the established Church of Maryland, but he succeeded in maintaining religious freedom. In 1676 the Assembly was called together and important changes were made in the laws. At this time the colony was growing rapidly, the population having increased from 1200 to 2000 between the years 1660 and 1675. He went to England in 1676 and returned in 1680. In 1682 he, with his uncle Philip Calvert, met William Penn to settle the boundary dispute between Maryland and Pennsylvania. At this time dissensions were frequent in the colony and Protestant bigotry was rising in England. Calvert left for the mother country in 1684 to look after the interests of the colony. After the Protestant revolution of 1688, which placed William and Mary on the throne of England, Baltimore was deprived of his proprietary rights in 1691. In 1711 he petitioned the Crown to have the government of the province restored to him, but this was refused on account of his Catholicism. Although he never visited Ireland, he was outlawed there for high treason on account of his religion but this outlawry was reversed by the king in 1691.

LEONARD, Proprietary Governor of Maryland, 1634–1647, b. in England, 1607; d. in Maryland, 9 June, 1647. He was the second son of George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore. In 1629 he was sent to Newfoundland in charge of a vessel to protect the colony of Avalon against the depredations of French cruisers. In 1633 his brother, the second Lord Baltimore, appointed him Governor of Maryland and sent him in charge of an expedition to make a settlement. Two vessels, the Ark and Dove, carrying over 300 settlers sailed from the harbour of Cowes, 22 November, 1633, arriving at Point Comfort, Virginia, 24 February, 1634. On 27 March they landed at what is now St. Mary's, then the site of an Indian village, and they began the work of establishing a settlement. The Indians received them kindly and sold them the land. Clayborne of the Virginia colony had established a trading post on Kent Island, which was in the domain of Maryland. After the settlement at St. Mary's this trade was continued. Trouble arose and Clayborne went to England to lay his claims before the king, but was informed that the island belonged to Lord Baltimore. The governor at once took possession of the island and established a settlement there.

The troubles in England following 1640 were responsible for disturbances in Maryland. In 1643 Governor Calvert went to England to discuss policies with the proprietor, leaving the affairs of the colony in charge of acting Governor Brent. At the close of 1643 Captain Ingle appeared at St. Mary's with a vessel commissioned by Parliament. The ship was captured and the oath against Parliament was tendered the crew. Ingle escaped. When Governor Calvert returned he found the colony distracted by factions. Ingle returned the following year, and, with the assistance of the Protestants and Clayborne, the Catholics, including Governor Calvert, were driven into Virginia. An oath of submission was tendered but not one Catholic took it. The Jesuit priests were sent to England. A state of anarchy prevailed for two years. Calvert returned in 1646 and captured St. Mary's, and in the following year Kent Island. He favoured the right of initiative in legislation by the colonists and won for them this privilege. In the difficulties between the proprietor and the Jesuits, he sympathized with the latter and prevented a rupture between them. In 1890 the State of Maryland erected a monument to him and his wife at St. Mary's.

PHILIP, Proprietary Governor of Maryland, 1660 to 1661, son of George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore and his second wife, Arabella. He came to Maryland on the first expedition under Leonard Calvert. In 1656 he was made secretary of the province and

one of its councillors. After the treason and overthrow of Governor Fendall, Calvert became governor in 1660 and displayed clemency in pardoning Fendall. In 1661 Charles Calvert, son of the proprietor, was made governor, and Philip was appointed deputy-lieutenant and councillor of the province. After this he negotiated a treaty with the Dutch in which they agreed to abandon the disputed territory on the Delaware River. He was one of a committee which negotiated a treaty with the Indians, and of another commission which settled with the Virginia authorities a boundary line between Maryland and Virginia.

BROWNE, *George and Cecilius Calvert* (New York, 1890); IDEM, *Maryland;* HUGHES, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Federal and Colonial* (CLEVELAND, 1907); HART, *American History Told by Contemporaries;* CHALMERS, *Political Annals of the present United Colonies from their Settlement to the Peace of* 1763; BANCROFT, *History of the United States;* RUSSELL, *Maryland, the Land of the Sanctuary* (Baltimore, 1907).

J. E. HAGERTY.

Calvi and Teano, DIOCESE OF (CALVENSIS ET THEANENSIS).—The city of Calvi is the ancient *Cales* or *Calenum* in the Campagna, not far from Capua. Towards the end of the fifth century it was certainly a bishopric, since Valerius, Bishop of Calenum, was present at the Roman Council held by Pope Symmachus in 499. Destroyed in the ninth century by the Saracens, it was rebuilt by Atenulfo, Count of Capua, at which time, most probably, the see was re-established. It certainly had a bishop at the end of the eleventh century. Remarkable among the bishops were: Odoardo, who assisted at the Council of Lyons (1245) and vigorously opposed Frederick II, his sovereign, who, on his return, had him slain; Bernardo Spada (1543); the monk Gennaro Filomarino (1623). In 1818 Calvi was united with the See of Teano, a small city of the same province and a former fief of the Gaetani. Its first bishop was St. Paris, ordained by Sylvester I; according to tradition, St. Urbanus and St. Amasius were bishops of that city in the fourth century. The united dioceses are suffragans of Capua and contain 72,000 inhabitants, 103 parishes, 5 religious houses for men and 4 for women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XX; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 357–59.

U. BENIGNI.

Calvin, JOHN.—This man, undoubtedly the greatest of Protestant divines, and perhaps, after St. Augustine, the most perseveringly followed by his disciples of any Western writer on theology, was born at Noyon in Picardy, France, 10 July, 1509, and died at Geneva, 27 May, 1564. A generation divided him from Luther, whom he never met. By birth, education, and temper these two protagonists of the reforming movement were strongly contrasted. Luther was a Saxon peasant, his father a miner; Calvin sprang from the French middle-class, and his father, an advocate, had purchased the freedom of the City of Noyon, where he practised civil and canon law. Luther entered the Order of Augustinian Hermits, took a monk's vows, was made a priest, and incurred much odium by marrying a nun. Calvin never was ordained in the Catholic Church; his training was chiefly in law and the humanities; he took no vows. Luther's eloquence made him popular by its force, humour, rudeness, and vulgar style. Calvin spoke to the learned at all times, even when preaching before multitudes. His manner is classical; he reasons on system; he has little humour; instead of striking with a cudgel he uses the weapons of a deadly logic and persuades by a teacher's authority, not by a demagogue's calling of names. He writes French as well as Luther writes German, and like him has been reckoned a pioneer in the modern development of his native tongue. Lastly, if we term the doctor of Wittenberg a mystic, we may sum up Calvin as a scholastic; he gives articulate expression to the principles which Luther had stormily thrown out upon the world in his vehement pamphleteering; and the "Institutes" as they were left by their author have remained ever since the standard of orthodox Protestant belief in all the Churches known as "Reformed". His French disciples called their sect "the religion"; such it has proved to be outside the Roman world.

The family name, spelt in many ways, was Cauvin, latinized according to the custom of the age as Calvinus. For some unknown reason the Reformer is commonly called Maître Jean C. His mother, Jeanne Le Franc, born in the Diocese of Cambrai, is mentioned as "beautiful and devout"; she took her little son to various shrines and brought him up a good Catholic. On the father's side, his ancestors were seafaring men. His grandfather settled at Pont l'Evêque near Paris, and had two sons who became locksmiths; the third was Gerard, who turned procurator at Noyon, and there his four sons and two daughters saw the light. He lived in the Place au Blé (Cornmarket). Noyon, a bishop's see, had long been a fief of the powerful old family of Hangest, who treated it as their personal property. But an everlasting quarrel, in which the city took part, went on between the bishop and the chapter. Charles de Hangest, nephew of the too well-known Georges d'Amboise, Archbishop of Rouen, surrendered the bishopric in 1525 to his own nephew John, becoming his vicar-general. John kept up the battle with his canons until the Parliament of Paris intervened, upon which he went to Rome, and at last died in Paris in 1577. This prelate had Protestant kinsfolk; he is charged with having fostered heresy, which in those years was beginning to raise its head among the French. Clerical dissensions, at all events, allowed the new doctrines a promising field; and the Calvins were more or less infected by them before 1530.

Gerard's four sons were made clerics and held benefices at a tender age. The Reformer was given one when a boy of twelve; he became Curé of Saint-Martin de Marteville in the Vermandois in 1527, and of Pont l'Evêque in 1529. Three of the boys attended the local Collège des Capettes, and there John proved himself an apt scholar. But his people were intimate with greater folk, the de Montmor, a branch of the line of Hangest, which led to his accompanying some of their children to Paris in 1523, when his mother was probably dead and his father had married again. The latter died in 1531, under excommunication from the chapter for not sending in his accounts. The old man's illness, not his lack of honesty, was, we are told, the cause. Yet his son Charles, nettled by the censure, drew towards the Protestant doctrines. He was accused in 1534 of denying the Catholic dogma of the Eucharist, and died out of the Church in 1536; his body was publicly gibbeted as that of a recusant.

Meanwhile, young John was going through his own trials at the University of Paris, the dean or syndic of which, Noel Bédier, had stood up against Erasmus and bore hard upon Le Fèvre d'Etaples (Stapulensis), celebrated for his translation of the Bible into French. Calvin, a "martinet", or oppidan, in the Collège de la Marche, made this man's acquaintance (he was from Picardy) and may have glanced into his Latin commentary on St. Paul, dated 1512, which Doumergue considers the first Protestant book emanating from a French pen. Another influence tending the same way was that of Corderius, Calvin's tutor, to whom he dedicated afterwards his annotation of I Thessalonians, remarking, "if there be any good thing in what I have published, I owe it to you". Corderius had an excellent Latin style; his life was austere, and his "Colloquies" earned him enduring fame. But he fell under suspicion of heresy, and by Calvin's aid took refuge in Geneva, where he died September, 1564. A third herald of the "New Learning" was George Cop, physician to Francis I, in whose house

Calvin found a welcome and gave ear to the religious discussions which Cop favoured. And a fourth was Pierre-Robert d'Olivet of Noyon, who also translated the Scriptures, our youthful man of letters, his nephew, writing (in 1535) a Latin preface to the Old Testament and a French one—his first appearance as a native author—to the New Testament. By 1527, when no more than eighteen, Calvin's education was complete in its main lines. He had learned to be a humanist and a reformer. The "sudden conversion" to a spiritual life in 1529, of which he speaks, must not be taken quite literally. He had never been an ardent Catholic; but the stories told at one time of his ill-regulated conduct have no foundation; and by a very natural process he went over to the side on which his family were taking their stand. In 1528 he inscribed himself at Orléans as a law-student, made friends with Francis Daniel, and then went for a year to Bourges, where he began preaching in private. Margaret d'Angoulême, sister of Francis I, and Duchess of Berry, was living there with many heterodox Germans about her.

He is found again at Paris in 1531. Wolmar had taught him Greek at Bourges, from Vatable he learned Hebrew; and he entertained some relations with the erudite Budæus. About this date he printed a commentary on Seneca's "De Clementiâ". It was merely an exercise in scholarship, having no political significance. Francis I was, indeed, handling Protestants severely; and Calvin, now Doctor of Law at Orléans, composed, so the story runs, an oration on Christian philosophy which Nicholas Cop delivered on All Saints' Day, 1532, both writer and speaker having to take instant flight from pursuit by the royal inquisitors. This legend has been rejected by modern critics. Calvin spent some time, however, with Canon du Tillet at Angoulême under a feigned designation. In May, 1534, he went to Noyon, gave up his benefice, and, it is said, was imprisoned. But he got away to Nérac in Béarn, the residence of the Duchess Margaret, and there again encountered Le Fèvre, whose French Bible had been condemned by the Sorbonne to the flames. His next visit to Paris fell out during a violent campaign of the Lutherans against the Mass, which brought on reprisals; Etienne de la Forge and others were burnt in the Place de Grève; and Calvin, accompanied by du Tillet, escaped, though not without adventures, to Metz and Strasburg. In the latter city Bucer reigned supreme. The leading reformers dictated laws from the pulpit to their adherents; and this journey proved a decisive one for the French humanist, who, though by nature timid and shy, committed himself to a war on paper with his own sovereign. The famous letter to Francis I bears date 23 Aug., 1535. It served as a prologue to the "Institutes", of which the first edition came out in March, 1536, not in French but in Latin. Calvin's apology for lecturing the king was, that placards denouncing the Protestants as rebels had been posted up all over the realm. Francis I did not read these pages; but if he had done so he would have discovered in them a plea, not for toleration, which the Reformer utterly scorned, but for doing away with Catholicism in favour of the new gospel. There could be only one true Church, said the young theologian, therefore kings ought to make an utter end of popery. (For an account of the "Institutes" see CALVINISM.) The second edition belongs to 1539; the first French translation to 1541; the final Latin, as revised by its author, is of 1559; but that in common use, dated 1560, has additions by his disciples. "It was more God's work than mine", said Calvin, who took for his motto "*Omnia ad Dei gloriam*", and in allusion to the change he had undergone in 1529 assumed for his device a hand stretched out from a burning heart.

A much-disputed chapter in Calvin's biography is the visit which he was long thought to have paid at Ferrara to the Protestant Duchess Renée, daughter of Louis XII. Many stories clustered about his journey, now given up by the best-informed writers. All we know for certain is that the Reformer, after settling his family affairs and bringing over two of his brothers and sisters to the views he had adopted, undertook, in consequence of the war between Charles V and Francis I, to reach Basle by way of Geneva, in July, 1536. At Geneva the Swiss preacher Farel, then looking for help in his propaganda, besought him with such vehemence to stay and teach theology that, as Calvin himself relates, he was terrified into submission. We are not accustomed to fancy the austere prophet so easily frightened. But as a student and recluse new to public responsibilities, he may well have hesitated before plunging into the troubled waters of Geneva, then at their stormiest period. No portrait of him belonging to this time is extant. Later he is represented as of middle height, with bent shoulders, piercing eyes, and a large forehead; his hair was of an auburn tinge. Study and fasting occasioned the severe headaches from which he suffered continually. In private life he was cheerful but sensitive, not to say overbearing; his friends treated him with delicate consideration. His habits were simple; he cared nothing for wealth, and he never allowed himself a holiday. His correspondence, of which 4271 letters remain, turns chiefly on doctrinal subjects. Yet his strong, reserved character told on all with whom he came in contact; Geneva submitted to his theocratic rule, and the Reformed Churches accepted his teaching as though it were infallible.

Such was the stranger whom Farel recommended to his fellow-Protestants, "this Frenchman", chosen to lecture on the Bible in a city divided against itself. Geneva had about 15,000 inhabitants. Its bishop had long been its prince, limited, however, by popular privileges. The vidomne, or mayor, was the Count of Savoy, and to his family the bishopric seemed a property which, from 1450, they bestowed on their younger children. John of Savoy, illegitimate son of the previous bishop, sold his rights to the duke, who was head of the clan, and died in 1519 at Pignerol. Jean de la Baume, last of its ecclesiastical princes, abandoned the city, which received Protestant teachers from Berne in 1519 and from Fribourg in 1526. In 1527 the arms of Savoy were torn down; in 1530 the Catholic party underwent defeat, and Geneva became independent. It had two councils, but the final verdict on public measures rested with the people. These appointed Farel, a convert of Le Fèvre, as their preacher in 1534. A discussion between the two Churches from 30 May to 24 June, 1535 ended in victory for the Protestants. The altars were desecrated, the sacred images broken, the Mass done away with. Bernese troops entered and "the Gospel" was accepted, 21 May, 1536. This implied persecution of Catholics by the councils which acted both as Church and State. Priests were thrown into prison; citizens were fined for not attending sermons. At Zürich, Basle, and Berne the same laws were established. Toleration did not enter into the ideas of the time.

But though Calvin had not introduced this legislation, it was mainly by his influence that in Jan., 1537, the "articles" were voted which insisted on communion four times a year, set spies on delinquents, established a moral censorship, and punished the unruly with excommunication. There was to be a children's catechism, which he drew up; it ranks among his best writings. The city now broke into "jurants" and "nonjurors", for many would not swear to the "articles"; indeed, they never were completely accepted. Questions had arisen with Berne touching points that Calvin judged to be indifferent. He made a figure in the debates at Lausanne defending the freedom of Geneva. But disorders ensued at home, where recusancy was yet rife; in 1538 the council

exiled Farel, Calvin, and the blind evangelist, Couraud. The Reformer went to Strasburg, became the guest of Capito and Bucer, and in 1539 was explaining the New Testament to French refugees at fifty-two florins a year. Cardinal Sadolet had addressed an open letter to the Genevans, which their exile now answered. Sadolet urged that schism was a crime; Calvin replied that the Roman Church was corrupt. He gained applause by his keen debating powers at Hagenau, Worms, and Ratisbon. But he complains of his poverty and ill-health, which did not prevent him from marrying at this time Idelette de Bure, the widow of an Anabaptist whom he had converted. Nothing more is known of this lady, except that she brought him a son who died almost at birth in 1542, and that her own death took place in 1549.

After some negotiation Ami Perrin, commissioner for Geneva, persuaded Calvin to return. He did so, not very willingly, on 13 September, 1541. His entry was modest enough. The church constitution now recognized "pastors, doctors, elders, deacons" but supreme power was given to the magistrate. Ministers had the spiritual weapon of God's word; the consistory never, as such, wielded the secular arm. Preachers, led by Calvin, and the councils, instigated by his opponents, came frequently into collision. Yet the ordinances of 1541 were maintained; the clergy, assisted by lay elders, governed despotically and in detail the actions of every citizen. A presbyterian Sparta might be seen at Geneva; it set an example to later Puritans, who did all in their power to imitate its discipline. The pattern held up was that of the Old Testament, although Christians were supposed to enjoy Gospel liberty. In November, 1552, the Council declared that Calvin's "Institutes" were a "holy doctrine which no man might speak against." Thus the State issued dogmatic decrees, the force of which had been anticipated earlier, as when Jacques Gouet was imprisoned on charges of impiety in June, 1547, and after severe torture was beheaded in July. Some of the accusations brought against the unhappy young man were frivolous, others doubtful. What share, if any, Calvin took in this judgment is not easy to ascertain. The execution of Servetus, however, must be laid at his door; it has given greater offence by far than the banishment of Castellio or the penalties inflicted on Bolsec—moderate men opposed to extreme views in discipline and doctrine, who fell under suspicion as reactionary. The Reformer did not shrink from his self-appointed task. Within five years fifty-eight sentences of death and seventy-six of exile, besides numerous committals of the most eminent citizens to prison, took place in Geneva. The iron yoke could not be shaken off. In 1555, under Ami Perrin, a sort of revolt was attempted. No blood was shed, but Perrin lost the day, and Calvin's theocracy triumphed.

"I am more deeply scandalized", wrote Gibbon, "at the single execution of Servetus than at the hecatombs which have blazed in the autos-da-fé of Spain and Portugal". He ascribes the enmity of Calvin to personal malice and perhaps envy. The facts of the case are pretty well ascertained. Born in 1511, perhaps at Tudela, Michael Served y Reves studied at Toulouse and was present in Bologna at the coronation of Charles V. He travelled in Germany and brought out in 1531 at Hagenau his treatise "De Trinitatis Erroribus", a strong Unitarian work which made much commotion among the more orthodox Reformers. He met Calvin and disputed with him at Paris in 1534; became corrector of the press at Lyons, gave attention to medicine, discovered the lesser circulation of the blood, and entered into a fatal correspondence with the dictator of Geneva touching a new volume, "Christianismi Restitutio", which he intended to publish. In 1546 the exchange of letters ceased. The Reformer called Servetus arrogant (he had dared to criticize the "Institutes" in marginal glosses), and uttered the significant menace, "If he comes hither and I have any authority, I will never let him quit the place alive." The "Restitutio" appeared in 1553. Calvin at once had its author delated to the Dominican inquisitor Ory at Lyons, sending on to him the man's letters of 1545-46 and these glosses. Hereupon the Spaniard was imprisoned at Vienne, but he escaped by friendly connivance, and was burnt there only in effigy. Some extraordinary fascination drew him to Geneva, from which he intended to pass the Alps. He arrived on 13 Aug., 1553. Next day Calvin, who had remarked him at the sermon, got his critic arrested, the preacher's own secretary coming forward to accuse him. Calvin drew up forty articles of charge under three heads, concerning the nature of God, infant baptism, and the attack which Servetus had ventured on his own teaching. The council hesitated before taking a deadly decision, but the dictator, reinforced by Farel, drove them on. In prison the culprit suffered much and loudly complained. The Bernese and other Swiss voted for some indefinite penalty. But to Calvin his power in Geneva seemed lost, while the stigma of heresy, as he insisted, would cling to all Protestants if this innovator were not put to death. "Let the world see", Bullinger counselled him, "that Geneva wills the glory of Christ."

Accordingly, sentence was pronounced 26 Oct., 1553, of burning at the stake. "To-morrow he dies", wrote Calvin to Farel. When the deed was done, the Reformer alleged that he had been anxious to mitigate the punishment, but of this fact no record appears in the documents. He disputed with Servetus on the day of execution and saw the end. A defence and apology next year received the adhesion of the Genevan ministers. Melanchthon, who had taken deep umbrage at the blasphemies of the Spanish Unitarian, strongly approved in well-known words. But a group that included Castellio published at Basle in 1554 a pamphlet with the title, "Ought heretics to be persecuted?" It is reckoned the first plea for toleration in modern times. Beza replied by an argument for the affirmative, couched in violent terms; and Calvin, whose favorite disciple he was, translated it into French in 1559. The dialogue, "Vaticanus", written against the "Pope of Geneva" by Castellio, did not get into print until 1612. Freedom of opinion, as Gibbon remarks, "was the consequence rather than the design of the Reformation." (For a bibliography of Servetus see Erichsohn in "Opera Calvini", LIX, 533, 534.)

Another victim to his fiery zeal was Gentile, one of an Italian sect in Geneva, which also numbered among its adherents Alciati and Gribaldo. As more or less Unitarian in their views, they were required to sign a confession drawn up by Calvin in 1558. Gentile subscribed it reluctantly, but in the upshot he was condemned and imprisoned as a perjurer. He escaped only to be twice incarcerated at Berne, where, in 1566, he was beheaded. Calvin's impassioned polemic against these Italians betrays fear of the Socinianism which was to lay waste his vineyard. Politically he leaned on the French refugees, now abounding in the city, and more than equal in energy, if not in numbers, to the older native factions. Opposition died out. His continual preaching, represented by 2300 sermons extant in the MSS. and a vast correspondence, gave to the Reformer an influence without example in his closing years. He wrote to Edward VI, helped in revising the Book of Common Prayer, and intervened between the rival English parties abroad during the Marian period. In the Huguenot troubles he sided with the more moderate. His censure of the conspiracy of Amboise in 1560 does him honour. One great literary institution founded by him, the College, afterwards the University, of Geneva, flourished exceedingly. The students

were mostly French. When Beza was rector it had nearly 1500 students of various grades.

Geneva now sent out pastors to the French congregations and was looked upon as the Protestant Rome. Through Knox, "the Scottish champion of the Swiss Reformation", who had been preacher to the exiles in that city, his native land accepted the discipline of the Presbytery and the doctrine of predestination as expounded in Calvin's "Institutes". The Puritans in England were also descendants of the French theologian. His dislike of theatres, dancing and the amenities of society was fully shared by them. The town on Lake Leman was described as without crime and destitute of amusements. Calvin declaimed against the "Libertines", but there is no evidence that any such people had a footing inside its walls. The cold, hard, but upright disposition characteristic of the Reformed Churches, less genial than that derived from Luther, is due entirely to their founder himself. Its essence is a concentrated pride, a love of disputation, a scorn of opponents. The only art that it tolerates is music, and that not instrumental. It will have no Christian feasts in its calendar, and it is austere to the verge of Manichæan hatred of the body. When dogma fails the Calvinist, he becomes, as in the instance of Carlyle, almost a pure Stoic. "At Geneva, as for a time in Scotland," says J. A. Froude, "moral sins were treated as crimes to be punished by the magistrate." The Bible was a code of law, administered by the clergy. Down to his dying day Calvin preached and taught. By no means an aged man, he was worn out in these frequent controversies. On 25 April, 1564, he made his will, leaving 225 French crowns, of which he bequeathed ten to his college, ten to the poor, and the remainder to his nephews and nieces. His last letter was addressed to Farel. He was buried without pomp, in a spot which is not now ascertainable. In the year 1900 a monument of expiation was erected to Servetus in the Place Champel. Geneva has long since ceased to be the head of Calvinism. It is a rallying point for Free Thought, Socialist propaganda, and Nihilist conspiracies. But in history it stands out as the Sparta of the Reformed churches, and Calvin is its Lycurgus.

For Bibliography see article CALVINISM.

WILLIAM BARRY.

Calvinism.—No better account of this remarkable (though now largely obsolete) system has been drawn out than Möhler's in his "Symbolism or Doctrinal Differences" (tr. by J. B. Robertson). The "Institutes of the Christian Religion", in which Calvin depicted his own mind, were never superseded by creed or formulary, though the writer subscribed, in 1540, at Worms to the Confession of Augsburg, i. e. the second revised edition. To take his bearings in theology we must remember that he succeeded Luther in point of time and was committed to a struggle with Zwingli's disciples at Zurich and elsewhere, known as Sacramentarians, but who tended more and more towards a Christianity without mysteries. In 1549 he and Farel entered with Bullinger into a moderate view as regarded the Eucharist, the "Consensus Tigurinus", or compact of Zurich, which Bucer also accepted. Another compact, of the "pastors of Geneva", strengthened his hands, in 1552, on the subjects of predestination, against Jerome Bolsec, whom he refuted and cast into prison. Bolsec finally returned to the Catholic Church. In 1553 a controversy between the German Lutherans about the Lord's Supper led Calvin to declare his agreement with Melanchthon (the Philippists); but Melanchthon kept silence. Further complications ensued when Beza, softening the real doctrine of Geneva, drew nearer still to the Lutheran belief on this head. Bullinger and Peter Martyr cried down Beza's unauthorized glosses; but Calvin supported his favourite. Nevertheless, that "declaration" was dropped by Beza when, in company with Farel, he put together a "Confession of the French Church", and fell back on the creed of Augsburg issued in 1530, while not assenting to its 10th article. The Eucharist was to be more than a sign; Christ was truly present in it, and was received by Faith (compare the English Prayer Book, which reproduces his conception). Beyond these, on the whole, abortive efforts toward a common understanding, Calvin never went. His individual genius demanded its own expression; and he is always like himself, unlike any other. The many creeds fell into oblivion; but the "Institutes" were recognized more and more as the sum of Reformed Theology. Calvin, it was said after 1560, by St. Peter Canisius, the Jesuit, appeared to be taking Luther's place even among Germans. Three currents have ever since held their course in this development of Protestantism: the mystic, derived from Wittenberg; the logical-orthodox, from Geneva; and the heterodox-rationalist, from Zürich (Zwingli), this last being greatly increased, thanks to the Unitarians of Italy, Ochino, Fausto, and Lelio Socino. To the modern world, however, Calvin stands peculiarly for the Reformation; his doctrine is supposed to contain the essence of the Gospel; and multitudes who reject Christianity mean merely the creed of Geneva.

Why does this happen? Because, we answer, Calvin gave himself out as following closely in the steps of St. Paul and St. Augustine. The Catholic teaching at Trent he judged to be Semi-Pelagian, a stigma which his disciples fix especially on the Jesuit schools, above all, on Molina. Hence the curious situation arises, that, while the Catholic consent of the East and West finds little or no acknowledgement as an historical fact among assailants of religion, the views which a single Reformer enunciated are taken as though representing the New Testament. In other words, a highly refined individual system, not traceable as a whole to any previous age, supplants the public teaching of centuries. Calvin, who hated Scholasticism, comes before us, as Luther had already done, in the shape of a Scholastic. His "pure doctrine" is gained by appealing, not to tradition, the "deposit" of faith, but to argument in abstract terms exercised upon Scripture. He is neither a critic nor a historian; he takes the Bible as something given; and he manipulates the Apostles' Creed in accordance with his own ideas. The "Institutes" are not a history of dogma, but a treatise, only not to be called an essay because of its peremptory tone. Calvin annihilates the entire space, with all its developments, which lies between the death of St. John and the sixteenth century. He does, indeed, quote St. Augustine, but he leaves out all that Catholic foundation on which the Doctor of Grace built.

The "Institutes of the Christian Religion" (tr. by John Allen, London, 1844) are divided into four books and exhibit a commentary on the Apostles' Creed. Book I considers God the Creator, the Trinity, revelation, man's first estate and original righteousness. Book II describes the Fall of Adam, and treats of Christ the Redeemer. Book III enlarges on justifying faith, election, and reprobation. Book IV gives the Presbyterian idea of the Church. In form the work differs from the "Summa" of St. Thomas Aquinas by using exposition where the Angelic Doctor syllogizes; but the style is close, the language good Latin of the Renaissance, and the tone elevated, though often bitter. Arguments employed are always ostensibly grounded on Scripture, the authority of which rests not upon fallible human reasoning, but on the internal persuasion of the Holy Spirit. Yet Calvin is embarrassed at the outset by "unsteady men" who declare themselves enlightened of the same spirit and in no want of Scripture. He endeavours to refute

them by the instance of St. Paul and other "primitive believers", i. e. after all, by Catholic tradition. It will be obvious, moreover, that where the "Institutes" affirm orthodox tenets they follow the Councils and the Fathers, while professing reliance on the Bible alone. Thus we need not rehearse those chapters which deal with the Nicene and Chalcedonian formulas.

We shall best apprehend Calvin's master-thought if we liken it to modern systems of the Unconscious, or of physical predetermination, wherein all effects lie folded up, as it were, in one First Cause, and their development in time is necessitated. Effects are thus mere manifestations, not fresh acts, or in any way due to free will choosing its own course. Nature, grace, revelation, Heaven, and Hell do but show us different aspects of the eternal energy which works in all things. There is no free will outside the Supreme. Zwingli argued that, since God was infinite being, He alone existed; other being there could be none, and secondary or created causes were but instruments moved entirely by Divine power. Calvin did not go to this length. But he denies freedom to creatures, fallen or unfallen, except it be *libertas a coactione;* in other words, God does not compel man to act by brute force, yet he determines irresistibly all we do, whether good or evil. The Supreme is indeed self-conscious; not a blind Fate or Stoic destiny; it is by "decree" of the sovereign Lawgiver that events come to pass. But for such decrees no reason can be rendered. There is not any cause of the Divine will save Itself. If we ask why has the Almighty acted thus and thus, we are told, "Quia ipse voluit" —it is His good pleasure. Beyond this, an explanation would be impossible, and to demand one is impiety. From the human angle of sight, therefore, God works as though without a reason. And here we come upon the primal mystery to which in his argument Calvin recurs again and again. This Supreme Will fixes an absolute order, physical, ethical, religious, never to be modified by anything we can attempt. For we cannot act upon God, else He would cease to be the First Cause. Holding this clue, it is comparatively simple to trace Calvin's footsteps along the paths of history and revelation.

— Luther had written that man's will is enslaved either to God or to Satan, but it is never free. Melanchthon declaimed against the "impious dogma of Free Will", adding that since all things happen by necessity according to Divine predestination, no room was left for it. This was truly the article by which the Reformation should stand or fall. God is sole agent. Therefore creation, redemption, election, reprobation, are in such sense His acts that man becomes merely their vehicle and himself does nothing. Luther, contending with Erasmus, declares that "God by an unchangeable, eternal, infallible will, foresees, purposes and effects all things. By this thunderbolt, Free Will is utterly destroyed." Calvin shared Luther's doctrine of necessity to the full; but he embroiled the language by admitting in unfallen Adam a liberty of choice. He was likewise at pains to distinguish between his own teaching and the "nature bound fast in Fate" of the Stoics. He meant by liberty, however, the absence of constraint; and the Divine wisdom which he invoked could never be made intelligible to our understanding. What he rejected was the Catholic notion of the self-determining second cause. Neither would he allow the doctrine laid down by the Fathers of Trent (Sess. VI, Canon 16), that God permits evil deeds, but is not their author. The condemnation struck expressly at Melanchthon, who asserted that the betrayal by Judas was not less properly God's act than the vocation of St. Paul. But by parity of reasoning it falls upon Calvinism. For the "Institutes" affirm that "man by the righteous impulsion of God does that which is unlawful", and that "man falls, the Providence of God so ordaining" (IV, 18, 2; III, 23, 8). Yet elsewhere Calvin denied this impulse as not in accordance with the known will of the Almighty. Both he and Luther found a way of escape from the moral dilemma inflicted on them by distinguishing two wills in the Divine Nature, one public or apparent, which commanded good and forbade evil as the Scripture teaches, the other just, but secret and unsearchable, predetermining that Adam and all the reprobate should fall into sin and perish. At no time did Calvin grant that Adam's transgression was due to his own free will. Beza traces it to a spontaneous, i. e. a natural and necessary, movement of the spirit, in which evil could not fail to spring up. He justifies the means, viz. sin and its consequences, by the holy purpose of the Creator who, if there were no one to punish, would be incapable of showing that he is a righteously vindictive God. As, however, man's intent was evil, he becomes a sinner while his Creator remains holy. The Reformed confessions will not allow that God is the author of sin; and Calvin shows deep indignation when charged with "this disgraceful falsehood". He distinguishes, like Beza, the various intentions concurring to the same act on the part of different agents; but the difficulty cannot well be got over, that, in his view, the First Cause alone is a real agent, and the rest mere instruments. It was objected to him that he gave no convincing reasons for the position thus taken up, and that his followers were swayed by their master's authority rather than by the force of his logic. Even an admirer, J. A. Froude, tells us: "To represent man as sent into the world under a curse, as incurably wicked—wicked by the constitution of his nature and wicked by eternal decree—as doomed, unless exempted by special grace which he cannot merit, or by any effort of his own obtain, to live in sin while he remains on earth, and to be eternally miserable when he leaves it—to represent him as born unable to keep the commandments, yet as justly liable to everlasting punishment for breaking them, is alike repugnant to reason and conscience, and turns existence into a hideous nightmare." (Short Studies, II, 3.)

Another way to define the Reformed theology would be to contrast its view of God's eternal decrees with that taken in the Catholic Church, notably by Jesuit authors such as Molina. To Calvin the ordinances of Deity seemed absolute, i. e. not in any way regardful of the creature's acts, which they predetermined either right or wrong; and thus reprobation —the supreme issue between all parties—followed upon God's unconditioned fiat, no account being had in the decree itself of man's merits or demerits. For God chose some to glory and others to shame everlasting as He willed, not upon foreknowledge how they would act. The Jesuit school made foreknowledge of "future contingencies" or of what creatures would do in any possible juncture, the term of Divine vision "*scientia media*" which was logically antecedent (as a condition not a cause) to the scheme of salvation. Grace, said Catholic dogma, was offered to all men; none were excluded from it. Adam need not have transgressed, neither was his fall pre-ordained. Christ died for the whole human race; and every one had such help from on high that the reprobate could never charge their ruin upon their Maker, since he permitted it only, without an absolute decree. Grace, then, was given freely; but eternal life came to the saints by merit, founded on correspondence to the Holy Spirit's impulse. All these statements Calvin rejected as Pelagian, except that he would maintain, though unable to justify, the imputation of the sinner's lapse to human nature by itself.

To be consistent, this doctrine requires that no prevision of Adam's Fall should affect the eternal choice

which discriminates between the elect and the lost. A genuine Calvinist ought to be a supralapsarian; in other terms, the Fall was decreed as means to an end; it did not first appear in God's sight to be the sufficient cause why, if He chose, He might select some from the "*massa damnata*", leaving others to their decreed doom. To this subject St. Augustine frequently returns in his anti-Pelagian treatises; and he lays great emphasis on the consequences to mankind, as regards their final state, of God's dealing with them in fallen Adam. But his language, unlike that of Calvin, never implies absolute rejection divorced from foreknowledge of man's guilt. Thus even to the African Father, whose views in his latter works became increasingly severe (see "On the Predestination of the Saints" and "On Correction and Grace"), there was always an element of *scientia media*, i. e. prevision in the relation of God with His creatures. But, to the Reformer who explained Redemption and its opposite by sheer omnipotence doing as it would, the idea that man could, even as a term of knowledge, by his free acts be considered in the Everlasting Will, was not conceivable. As the Arian said, "How can the Eternal be begotten?" and straightway denied the generation of the Word, in like manner Calvin, "How can the contingent affect the First Cause on which it utterly depends?" In the old dilemma, "either God is not omnipotent or man is not self-determined", the "Institutes" accept the conclusion adverse to liberty. But it was, said Catholics, equally adverse to morals; and the system has always been criticised on that ground. In a word, it seemed to be antinomian.

With Augustine the Geneva author professed to be at one. "If they have all been taken from a corrupt mass", he argued, "no marvel that they are subject to condemnation". But, his critics replied, "were they not antecedently predestined to that corruption?" And "is not God unjust in treating His creatures with such cruel mystery?" To this Calvin answers, "I confess that all descendants of Adam fell by the Divine will", and that "we must return at last to God's sovereign determination, the cause of which is hidden" (Institutes, III, 23, 4). "Therefore," he concludes, "some men are born devoted from the womb to certain death, that His name may be glorified in their destruction". And the reason why such necessity is laid upon them?—"Because", says Calvin, "life and death are acts of God's will rather than of his foreknowledge", and "He foresees further events only in consequence of his decree that they shall happen". Finally, "it is an awful decree, I confess [*horribile decretum, fateor*], but none can deny that God foreknew the future final fate of man before He created him; and that He did foreknow it because it was appointed by His own ordinance". Calvin, then, is a supralapsarian; the Fall was necessary; and our first parents like ourselves could not have avoided sinning.

So far, the scheme presents a cast-iron logic at whatever expense to justice and morality. When it comes to consider human nature, its terms sound more uncertain, it veers to each extreme in succession of Pelagius and Luther. In St. Augustine, that nature is almost always viewed historically, not in the abstract; hence, as possessed by unfallen Adam it was endowed with supernatural gifts, while in his fallen children it bears the burden of concupiscence and sin. But the French Reformer, not conceding a possible state of pure nature, attributes to the first man, with Luther (in Gen., iii), such perfection as would render God's actual grace unnecessary, thus tending to make Adam self-sufficient, as the Pelagians held all men to be. On the other hand, when original sin took them once captive the image of God was entirely blotted out. This article of "total depravity" also came from Luther, who expressed it in language of appalling power. And so the "Institutes" announce that "in man all which bears reference to the blessed life of the soul is extinct". And if it was "natural" in Adam to love God and do justice, or a part of his very essence, then by lapsing from grace he would have been plunged into an abyss below nature, where his true moral and religious being was altogether dissolved. So, at any rate, the German Protestants believed in their earlier period, nor was Calvin reluctant to echo them.

Catholics distinguish two kinds of beatitude: one corresponding to our nature as a rational species and to be acquired by virtuous acts; the other beyond all that man may do or seek when left to his own faculties, and in such wise God's free gift that it is due only to acts performed under the influence of a strictly supernatural movement. The confusion of grace with nature in Adam's essence was common to all the Reformed schools; it is peculiarly manifest in Jansenius, who strove to deduce it from St. Augustine. And, granting the Fall, it leads by direct inference to man's utter corruption as the unregenerate child of Adam. He is evil in all that he thinks, or wills, or does. Yet Calvin allows him reason and choice, though not true liberty. The heart was poisoned by sin; but something remained of grace to hinder its worst excesses, or to justify God's vengeance on the reprobate (over and above their original fault inherited). On the whole, it must be said that the "Institutes" which now and then allow that God's image was not quite effaced in us, deny to mankind, so far as redemption has not touched them, any moral and religious powers whatsoever. With Calvin as with his predecessor of Wittenberg, heathen virtue is but apparent, and that of the non-Christian merely "political", or secular. Civilization, founded on our common nature, is in such a view external only, and its justice or benevolence may claim no intrinsic value. That it has no supernatural value Catholics have always asserted; but the Church condemns those who say, with Baius, "All the works of unbelievers are sinful and the virtues of the philosophers are vices". Propositions equivalent to these are as follows: "Free Will not aided by God's grace, avails only to commit sin", and "God could not have created man at the beginning such as he is now born" (Props. 25, 27, 55, censured by St. Pius V, Oct., 1567, and by Urban VIII, March, 1641). Catholic theology admits a twofold goodness and righteousness, the one natural, as Aristotle defines it in his "Ethics", the other supernatural inspired by the Holy Ghost. Calvin throws aside every middle term between justifying faith and corrupt desire. The integrity of Adam's nature once violated, he falls under the dominion of lust, which reigns in him without hindrance, save by the external grace now and again preventing a deeper degradation. But whatever he is or does savours of the Evil One. Accordingly the system maintained that faith (which here signifies trust in the Lutheran sense) was the first interior grace given and source of all others, as likewise that outside the Church no grace is ever bestowed.

We come on these lines to the famous distinction which separates the true Church, that of the predestined, from the seeming or visible, where all baptized persons meet. This falls in with Calvin's whole theory, but is never to be mistaken for the view held by Roman authorities, that some may pertain to the soul of the Church who are not members of its body. Always pursuing his idea, the absolute predestinarian finds among Christians, all of whom have heard the Gospel and received the sacraments, only a few entitled to life everlasting. These obtain the grace which is in words offered to every one; the rest fill up the measure of their condemnation. To the reprobate, Gospel ordinances serve as a means to compass the ruin intended for them. Hereby, also, an answer

is made possible when Catholics demand where the Reformed Church was prior to the Reformation. Calvin replies that in every age the elect constituted the flock of Christ, and all besides were strangers, though invested with dignity and offices in the visible communion. The reprobate have only apparent faith. Yet they may feel as do the elect, experience similar fervours, and to the best of their judgment be accounted saints. All that is mere delusion; they are hypocrites "into whose minds God insinuates Himself, so that, not having the adoption of sons, they may yet taste the goodness of the Spirit". Thus Calvin explained how in the Gospel many are called believers who did not persevere; and so the visible Church is made up of saints that can never lose their crown, and sinners that by no effort could attain to salvation.

—Faith, which means assurance of election, grace, and glory, is then the heritage of none but the predestined. But, since no real secondary cause exists, man remains passive throughout the temporal series of events by which he is shown to be an adopted son of God. He neither acts nor, in the Catholic sense, co-operates with his Redeemer. A difference in the method of conversion between Luther and Calvin may here be noted. The German mystic begins, as his own experience taught him, with the terrors of the law. The French divine who had never gone through that stage, gives the first place to the Gospel; and repentance, instead of preceding faith, comes after it. He argued that by so disposing of the process, faith appeared manifestly alone, unaccompanied by repentance, which, otherwise, might claim some share of merit. The Lutherans, moreover, did not allow absolute predestination. And their confidence in being themselves justified, i. e. saved, was unequal to Calvin's requirements. For he made assurance inevitable as was its object to the chosen soul. Nevertheless, he fancied that between himself and the sounder medieval scholastics no quarrel need arise touching the principle of justification, viz. that "the sinner being delivered gratuitously from his doom becomes righteous". Calvin overlooked in these statements the vital difference which accounts for his aberration from the ancient system. Catholics held that fallen man kept in some degree his moral and religious faculties, though much impaired, and did not lose his free will. But the newer doctrine affirmed man's total incompetence; he could neither freely consent nor ever resist, when grace was given, if he happened to be predestinate. If not, justification lay beyond his grasp. However, the language of the "Institutes" is not so uncompromising as Luther's had been. God first heals the corrupt will, and the will follows His guidance; or, we may say, co-operates.

The one final position of Calvin is that omnipotent grace of itself substitutes a good for an evil will in the elect, who do nothing towards their own conversion, but when converted are accounted just. In all the original theology of the Reformation righteousness is something imputed, not indwelling in the soul. It is a legal fiction when compared with what the Catholic Church believes, namely, that justice or sanctification involves a real gift, a quality bestowed on the spirit and inherent, whereby it becomes the thing it is called. Hence the Council of Trent declares (Sess. VI) that Christ died for all men; it condemns (Canon XVII) the main propositions of Geneva, that "the grace of justification comes only to the predestinate", and that "the others who are called receive an invitation but no grace, being doomed by the Divine power to evil." So Innocent X proscribed in Jansenius the statement: "It is Semipelagian to affirm that Christ died for all men, or shed His blood in their behalf." In like manner Trent rejected the definition of faith as "confidence in being justified without merit"; grace was not "the feeling of love", nor was justification the "forgiveness of sin"; and apart from a special revelation no man could be infallibly sure that he was saved. According to Calvin the saint was made such by his faith, and the sinner by want of it stood condemned; but the Fathers of Trent distinguished a dead faith, which could never justify, from faith animated by charity; and they attributed merit to all good works done through Divine inspiration. But in the Genevese doctrine faith itself is not holy. This appears very singular; and no explanation has ever been vouchsafed of the power ascribed to an act or mean, itself destitute of intrinsic qualities, neither morally good nor in any way meritorious, the presence or absence of which nevertheless fixes our eternal destiny.

But since Christ alone is our righteousness, Luther concluded that the just man is never just in himself; that concupiscence, though resisted, makes him sin damnably in all he does, and that he remains a sinner until his last breath. Thus even the "Solid Declaration" teaches, though in many respects toning down the Reformer's truculence. Such guilt, however, God overlooks where faith is found; the one unpardonable sin is want of faith. "Pecca fortiter sed crede fortius"—this Lutheran epigram, "Sin as you like provided you believe", expresses in a paradox the contrast between corrupt human nature, filthy still in the very highest saints, and the shadow of Christ, as, falling upon them, it hides their shame before God. Here again the Catholic refuses to consider man responsible except where his will consents; the Protestant regards impulse and enticement as constituting all the will that we have. These observations apply to Calvin; but he avoids extravagant speech while not differing from Luther in fact. He grants that St. Augustine would not term involuntary desires sin; then he adds, "We, on the contrary, deem it to be sin whenever a man feels any desires forbidden by Divine law; and we assert the depravity to be sin which produces them" (Institutes, III, 2, 10). On the hypothesis of determinism, held by every school of the Reformers, this logic is unimpeachable. But it leads to strange consequences. The sinner commits actions which the saint may also indulge in; but one is saved, the other is lost; and so the entire moral contents of Christianity are emptied out. Luther denominated the saint's liberty freedom from the law. And Calvin, "The question is not how we can be righteous, but how, though unworthy and unrighteous, we may be considered righteous." The law may instruct and exhort, but "it has no place in the conscience before God's tribunal". And if Christians advert to the law, "they see that every work they attempt or meditate is accursed" (Institutes, III, 19, 2, 4). Leo X had condemned Luther's thesis, "In every good work the just man sins." Baius fell under censure for asserting (Props. 74, 75) that "concupiscence in the baptized is a sin, though not imputed". And, viewing the whole theory, Catholics have asked whether a sinfulness which exists quite independent of the will is not something substantial, like the darkness of the Manichæans, or essential to us who are finite beings.

At all events Calvin seems entangled in perplexities on the subject, for he declares expressly that the regenerate are "liable every moment at God's judgment-seat to sentence of death" (Instit., III, 2, 11); yet elsewhere he tempers his language with a "so to speak", and explains it as meaning that all human virtue is imperfect. He would certainly have subscribed to the "Solid Declaration", that the good works of the pious are not necessary to salvation. With Luther, he affirms the least transgression to be a mortal sin, even involuntary concupiscence; and as this abides in every man while he lives, all that we do is worthy of punishment (Instit., II, 8, 58, 59). And again, "There never yet was any work of a relig-

ious man which, examined by God's severe standard, would not be condemnable" (Ibid., III, 14, 11). The Council of Trent had already censured these axioms by asserting that God does not command impossibilities, and that His children keep His word. Innocent X did the like when he proscribed as heretical the fifth proposition of Jansenius, "Some commandments of God are impossible to the just who will and endeavour; nor is the grace by which they should become possible given to them."

Two important practical consequences may be drawn from this entire view: first, that conversion takes place in a moment—and so all evangelical Protestants believe; and, second, that baptism ought not to be administered to infants, seeing they cannot have the faith which justifies. This latter inference produced the sect of Anabaptists against whom Calvin thunders as he does, against other "frenzied" persons, in vehement tones. Infant baptism was admitted, but its value, as that of every ordinance, varied with the predestination to life or to death of the recipient. To Calvinists the Church system was an outward life beneath which the Holy Spirit might be present or absent, not according to the dispositions brought by the faithful, but as grace was decreed. For good works could not prepare a man to receive the sacraments worthily any more than to be justified in the beginning. If so, the Quakers might well ask, what is the use of sacraments when we have the Spirit? And especially did this reasoning affect the Eucharist. Calvin employs the most painful terms in disowning the sacrifice of the Mass. No longer channels of grace, to Melanchthon the sacraments are "Memorials of the exercise of faith", or badges to be used by Christians. From this point of view, Christ's real presence was superfluous, and the acute mind of Zwingli leaped at once to that conclusion, which has ever since prevailed among ordinary Protestants. But Luther's adherence to the words of the Scripture forbade him to give up the reality, though he dealt with it in his peculiar fashion. Bucer held an obscure doctrine, which attempted the middle way between Rome and Wittenberg. To Luther the sacraments serve as tokens of God's love; Zwingli degrades them to covenants between the faithful. Calvin gives the old scholastic definition and agrees with Luther in commending their use; but he separates the visible element proffered to all from the grace which none save the elect may enjoy. He admits only two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Even these neither contain nor confer spiritual graces; they are signs, but not efficacious as regards that which is denoted by them. For inward gifts, we must remember, do not belong to the system; whereas Catholics believe in ordinances as acts of the Man-God, producing the effects within the soul which He has promised, "He that eateth Me shall live by Me."

When the Church's tradition was thrown aside, differences touching the Holy Eucharist sprang up immediately among the Reformers which have never found a reconciliation. To narrate their history would occupy a volume. It is notable, however, that Calvin succeeded where Bucer had failed, in a sort of compromise, and the agreement of Zürich which he inspired was taken up by the Swiss Protestants. Elsewhere it led to quarrels, particularly among the Lutherans, who charged him with yielding too much. He taught that the Body of Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, and that the believer partakes of it; that the elements are unchanged; and that the Catholic Mass was idolatry. Yet his precise meaning is open to question. That he did not hold a real objective presence seems clear from his arguing against Luther, as the "black rubric" of the Common Prayer Book argues; Christ's body, he says, is in heaven, therefore it cannot be on earth. The reception was a spiritual one; and this perfectly orthodox phrase might be interpreted as denying a true corporal presence. The Augsburg Confession, revised by its author Melanchthon, favoured ambiguous views; at last he declared boldly for Calvin, which amounted to an acknowledgment that Luther's more decided language overshot the mark. The "Formula of Concord" was an attempt to rescue German Churches from this concession to the so-called Sacramentarians; it pronounced, as Calvin never would have done, that the unworthy communicant receives Our Lord's Body; and it met his objection by the strange device of "ubiquity", viz., that the glorified Christ was everywhere. But these quarrels lie outside our immediate scope.

As Calvin would not grant the Mass to be a sacrifice, nor the ministers of the Lord's Supper to be priests, that conception of the Church which history traces back to the earliest Apostolic times underwent a corresponding change. The clergy were now "Ministers of the Word", and the Word was not a tradition, comprising Scripture in its treasury, but the printed Bible, declared all-sufficient to the mind which the Spirit was guiding. Justification by faith alone, the Bible, and the Bible only, as the rule of faith—such were the cardinal principles of the Reformation. They worked at first destructively, by abolishing the Mass and setting up private judgment in opposition to pope and bishops. Then the Anabaptists arose. If God's word sufficed, what need of a clergy? The Reformers felt that they must restore creeds and enforce the power of the Church over dissidents. Calvin, who possessed great constructive talent, built his presbytery on a democratic foundation; the people were to choose, but the ministers chosen were to rule. Christian freedom consisted in throwing off the yoke of the Papacy; it did not allow the individual to stand aloof from the congregation. He must sign formulas, submit to discipline, be governed by a committee of elders. A new sort of Catholic Church came into view, professing that the Bible was its teacher and judge, but never letting its members think otherwise than the articles drawn up should enjoin. None were allowed in the pulpit who were not publicly called, and ordination, which Calvin regarded almost as a sacrament, was conferred by the presbytery.

In his Fourth Book the great iconoclast, to whom in good logic only the Church invisible should have signified anything, makes the visible Church supreme over Christians, assigns to it the prerogatives claimed by Rome, enlarges on the guilt of schism, and upholds the principle, *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*. He will not allow that corrupt morals in the clergy, or a passing eclipse of doctrine by superstition, can excuse those who, on pretence of a purer Gospel, leave it. The Church is described in equivalent terms as indefectible and infallible. All are bound to hear and obey what it teaches. Luther had spoken of it with contempt almost everywhere in his first writings; to him the individual guided by the Holy Spirit was autonomous. But Calvin taught his followers so imposing a conception of the body in which they were united as to bring back a hierarchy in effect if not in name. "Where the ministry of Word and Sacraments is preserved", he concludes, "no moral delinquencies can take away the Church's title". He had, nevertheless, broken with the communion in which he was born. The Anabaptists retorted that they did not owe to his new-fashioned presbytery the allegiance he had cast away; the Quakers, who held with him by the Inward Light, more consistently refused all jurisdiction to the visible Church.

One sweeping consequence of the Reformation is yet to be noticed. As it denied the merit of good works even in the regenerate, all those Catholic beliefs and ordinances which implied a Communion of Saints actively helping each other by prayer and

self-sacrifice were flung aside. Thus Purgatory, Masses for the dead, invocation of the blessed in Heaven, and their intercession for us are scouted by Calvin as "Satan's devices". A single argument gets rid of them all: do they not make void the Cross of Christ our only Redeemer? (Instit., III, 5, 6). Beza declared that "prayer to the saints destroys the unity of God". The Dutch Calvinists affirmed of them, as the Epicureans of their deities, that they knew nothing about what passes on earth. Wherever the Reformers triumphed, a wholesale destruction of shrines and relics took place. Monasticism, being an ordered system of mortification on Catholic principles, offended all who thought such works needless or even dangerous; it fell, and great was the fall thereof, in Protestant Europe. The Calendar had been framed as a yearly ritual, commemorating Our Lord's life and sufferings, with saints' days filling it up. Calvin would tolerate the Swiss of Berne who desired to keep the Gospel festivals; but his Puritan followers left the year blank, observing only the Sabbath, in a spirit of Jewish legalism. After such a fashion the Church was divorced from the political order; the living Christian ceased to have any distinct relation with his departed friends; the saints became mere memories, or were suspected of Popery; the churches served as houses of preaching, where the pulpit had abolished the altar; and Christian art was a thing of the past.

The Reformers, including Calvin, appealed so confidently to St. Augustine's volumes that it seems only fair to note the real difference which exists between his doctrine and theirs. Cardinal Newman sums it up as follows: "The main point is whether the Moral Law can in its substance be obeyed and kept by the regenerate. Augustine says, that whereas we are by nature condemned by the Law, we are enabled by the grace of God to perform it unto our justification; Luther [and Calvin equally] that, whereas we are condemned by the law, Christ has Himself performed it unto our justification;—Augustine, that our righteousness is active; Luther, that it is passive; Augustine, that it is imparted; Luther, that it is only imputed; Augustine, that it consists in a change of heart; Luther, in a change of state. Luther maintains that God's commandments are impossible to man; Augustine adds, impossible without His grace; —Luther, that the Gospel consists of promises only; Augustine, that it is also a law; Luther, that our highest wisdom is not to know the Law; Augustine says instead, to know and keep it;—Luther says, that the Law and Christ cannot dwell together in the heart; Augustine says, that the Law is Christ;— Luther denies and Augustine maintains that obedience is a matter of conscience;—Luther says, that a man is made a Christian not by working but by hearing; Augustine excludes those works only which are done before grace is given;—Luther, that our best deeds are sins; Augustine, that they are really pleasing to God" (Lectures on Justification, ch. ii, 58).

As, unlike the Lutheran, those Churches which looked up to Calvin as their teacher did not accept one uniform standard, they fell into particular groups and had each their formulary. The three Helvetic Confessions, the Tetrapolitan, that of Basle, and that composed by Bullinger belong respectively to 1530, 1532, 1536. The Anglican 42 Articles of 1553, composed by Cranmer and Ridley, were reduced to 39 under Elizabeth in 1562. They bear evident tokens of their Calvinistic origin, but are designedly ambiguous in terms and meaning. The French Protestants, in a Synod at Paris, 1559, framed their own articles. In 1562 those of the Netherlands accepted a profession drawn up by Guy de Brès and Saravia in French, which the Synod of Dort (1574) approved. A much more celebrated meeting was held at this place, 1618–19, to adjudicate between the High Calvinists, or Supralapsarians, who held unflinchingly to the doctrine of the "Institutes" touching predestination, and the Remonstrants who opposed them. Gomar led the former party; Arminius, though he died before the synod, in 1609, had communicated his milder views to Uytenbogart and Episcopius, hence called Arminians. They objected to the doctrine of election before merit, that it made the work of Christ superfluous and inexplicable. The Five Articles which contained their theology turned on election, adoption, justification, sanctification, and sealing by the Spirit, all which Divine acts presuppose that man has been called, has obeyed, and is converted. Redemption is universal, reprobation due to the sinner's fault, and not to God's absolute decree. In these and the like particulars, we find the Arminians coming close to Tridentine formulas. The "Remonstrance" of 1610 embodied their protest against the Manichæan errors, as they said, which Calvin had taken under his patronage. But the Gomarists renewed his dogmas; and their belief met a favourable reception among the Dutch, French, and Swiss. In England the dispute underwent many vicissitudes; the Puritans, as afterwards their Nonconformist descendants, generally sided with Gomar; the High Church party became Arminian. Wesley abandoned the severe views of Calvin; Whitefield adopted them as a revelation. The Westminster Assembly (1643–47) made an attempt to unite the Churches of Great Britain on a basis of Calvinism, but in vain. Their Catechism, the Larger and the Smaller, enjoyed authority by Act of Parliament; the Smaller is binding still on Scottish Presbyterians. John Knox had, in 1560, edited the "First Book of Discipline", which follows Geneva, but includes a permissive ritual. The "Second Book of Discipline" was sent out by a congregation under Andrew Melville's influence in 1572, and in 1592 the whole system received Parliamentary sanction. But James I rejected the doctrines of Dort. In Germany the strange idea was prevalent that civil rulers ought to fix the creed of their subjects, *Cujus regio, ejus religio*. Hence an alternation and confusion of formulas ensued down to the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Frederick III, Count Palatine, put forward, in 1562, the Heidelberg Catechism, which is of Calvin's inspiration. John George of Anhalt-Dessau laid down the same doctrine in 20 Articles (1597). Maurice of Hesse-Cassel patronized the Synod of Dort; and John Sigismund of Brandenburg, exchanging the Lutheran tenets for the Genevese, imposed on his Prussians the "Confession of the Marches". In general, the reformed Protestants allowed dogmatic force to the revised Confession of Augsburg (1540) which Calvin himself had signed.

See PREDESTINATION; EUCHARIST; CHURCH; GRACE; HUGUENOTS.

The works of Calvin are found complete in J. CALVINI *Opera quæ supersunt omnia*, ed. BAUM, CUNITZ, and REUSS (Brunswick and Berlin, 1863–1900).—The last (59th) volume contains a good bibliography by ERICHSON; the same volume (pp. 461–512) gives a chronological catalogue of his writings.— BONNET, *Lettres Françaises de Jean Calvin* (Paris, 1854); HERMINJARD, *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française* (Geneva, 1866–1897). Cf. *Zürich Letters* in *Parker Society Series* (London, 1840). BEZA published a French *Life of Calvin* (Geneva, 1564), also a Latin life (Lausanne, 1575), both at once translated into English (London, 1565, 1577); the French life was re-ed. by FRANKLIN (Paris, 1869). Among the modern lives of Calvin by Protestant authors are those of HENRY (Hamburg, 1835–44, 3 vols.), tr. by STEBBING (London, 1849), HERZOG (Basle, 1843), STÄHELIN (Elberfeld, 1861), BUNGENER (Paris, 1862); MCCRIE, *Early Years of John Calvin* (London, 1880). Especially exhaustive is DOUMERGUE, *Jean Calvin* (3 vols., Paris, 1899); cf. SCHAFF, *History of the Christian Church* (New York, 1892), VII, 257 sqq. Among Catholic works on Calvin (apart from MAIMBOURG, *Hist. du Calvinisme*, Paris, 1682), see AUDIN, *Hist. de la vie des ouvrages et des doctrines de Calvin* (Paris, 1841; also 1873; tr. by GILL, London, 1843, 1850), and KAMPFSCHULTE, *Johann Calvin, seine Kirche und sein Staat*, Leipzig (I), 1869, (II) 1899, ed. by GÖTZ, an important study followed by FUNK in *Kirchenlexikon* (1883), II, 1728–44. See also SEIDER, in BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (Munich, 1906), I, 817–19, and HERGENRÖTHER-KIRSCH, *Kirchengeschichte* (4th ed., Freiburg, 1907), III, 139–47. On Calvin's stay at Ferrara,

see SANDONNINI in *Rivista Italiana* (1887), 531; on his government of Geneva, CHOISY, *La théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin;* on the *Institutes*, KÖSTLIN in *Studien und Kritiken* (1868), 7, 410, and LECOULTRE in *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie*, XIX, XXIII, XXIV; on Calvin's style, BRUNETIÈRE, *L'œuvre littéraire de Calvin* in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Oct., 1900), and SAINTSBURY, *History of Criticism* (London, 1902); see also FROUDE, *Short Studies*, II, 1893, and ZAHN, *Studien über Johann Calvin, Die Urteile katholischer und protestantischer Historiker im 19 Jahrhundert über den Reformator* (Gütersloh, 1884).

WILLIAM BARRY.

Calvinus, JUSTUS BARONIUS, convert and apologist, b. at Xanthen, Germany, c. 1570; d. after 1606. He was born of Calvinist parents and educated at Heidelberg where he took a course in theology. His study of the Fathers inclined him towards Catholicism and finally led him to Rome where he was kindly received by Cardinals Bellarmin and Baronius and by Pope Clement VIII. The writings of Bellarmin strengthened his conviction regarding the Church, and his gratitude to Baronius caused him to add that cardinal's name to his own. On his return to Germany he became a Catholic (1601) and a staunch defender of the Faith. In his "Apologia" (Mainz, 1601) he gives the reasons for his conversion, and in his "Præscriptionum adversus hæreticos . . . . Tractatus" (ibid., 1602, 1756) he appeals to the Fathers in support of the truth of Catholicism.

RÄSS, *Die Convertiten seit der Reformation* (Freiburg, 1866), III, 537; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1892), I, 166.

E. A. PACE.

Calynda, a titular see of Asia Minor. It was probably situated at the boundary of Lycia and Caria (on the river Indos?), for it is placed in the former territory by Ptolemy (xxxi, 16), in the latter by Stephanus Byzantius (s. v.). Stephanus gives also another form of the name, Karynda. Calynda must be carefully distinguished from Kalydna, Kalydnos, Karyanda, and Kadyanda. Its king, Damasithemos, was an ally of Queen Artemisia (Herod., VIII, lxxxvii; Pliny, V, xxvii, who writes its name Calydna). It is mentioned among the cities that struck coins in the Roman period. Its Christian history is very short, for it is not mentioned in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum". We know only that it was at a certain time a suffragan of Myra, the metropolis of Lycia. Bishop Leontius of Calynda is mentioned in 458 (Mansi, Concil., VII, 580) in the letter of the Lycian bishops to the Emperor Leo.

SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878), I, 485.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Calzada, DIOCESE OF. See CALAHORRA.

Camachus, a titular see of Armenia. This city does not appear in ecclesiastical history before the seventh century of our era. The true primitive name seems to have been Camacha. Camachus or Camache are later forms. When the "Pseudo-Ecthesis" of St. Epiphanius was drawn up (about 640), it was not yet a see. In 681 George, "Bishop of Daranalis or Camachus", was present at the Council of Constantinople and subscribed its acts as "bishop of the clima of Daranalis"; a third name of the see, Analibla, is given by the old Latin version. The same prelate subscribed (692) the acts of the Trullan Council. About the end of the ninth century, Camachus, until then a suffragan of Sebaste (metropolis of Armenia Prima), was made a metropolitan see by Leo the Philosopher; it had five, and at one time eight, suffragan sees. Bishop Sisinnius is mentioned in 1028 (Lequien, I, 435). The Assumptionist manuscript lists contain many other names. By the fifteenth century the see had disappeared. Three Latin titulars are mentioned by Lequien (III, 1109). Camachus is to-day Kemakh, the chief town of a caza in the vilayet of Erzeroum; the whole district has about 20,000 inhabitants (5000 Christians, mostly Armenians). It is a village on the western Euphrates (Kara-Sou), half way between Sivas and Erzeroum, about 135 miles from both towns, and carries on a trade in gloves and carpets. In the neighbourhood are many old Byzantine or Turkish castles, and *turbés* (Mussulman tombs).

SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878), I, 486.

S. VAILHÉ.

Camaldolese (CAMALDOLITES, CAMALDULENSIANS), a joint order of hermits and cenobites, founded by St. Romuald at the beginning of the eleventh century. About 1012, after having founded or reformed nearly a hundred unconnected monasteries and hermitages, St. Romuald arrived in the Diocese of Arezzo seeking place for a new hermitage. It was here, according to the legend, that he was met by a certain count called Maldolus. This man, after describing his vision of monks in white habits ascending a ladder to heaven (while he had slept in one of his fields in the mountains), offered this spot to the saint. The field, which was held by Maldolus in fief of the Bishop of Arezzo, was readily accepted by St. Romuald, who built there the famous hermitage afterwards known as *Campus Maldoli* or *Camaldoli*. In the same year he received from the count a villa at the foot of the mountains, about two miles below Camaldoli, of which he made the monastery of Fonte Buono. This latter house was intended to serve as infirmary, guest-house, and bursary to the hermitage, in order that the hermits might not be distracted by any worldly business.

Camaldoli and Fonte Buono may be considered as the beginning of the Camaldolese Order; the former foreshadowing the eremitical, the latter the cenobitical, branches. It is true that this opinion has been gravely contested. The Camaldolese writers are naturally inclined to place the date of the foundation of their order as early as possible, and their judgment is further influenced by their views on the birthdate of St. Romuald. But they differ considerably among themselves, their estimates varying from the year 940, chosen by Blessed Paolo Giustiniani, to the year 974, that commends itself to Hastiville. They point out that St. Romuald founded many monasteries and hermitages, and was many times surrounded by disciples before he came to Camaldoli; and they argue that in founding Camaldoli he did not intend to begin the order, but merely a new hermitage; that the order was called the *Romualdine* until the later years of the eleventh century, and then received the name *Camaldolese*, not from its origin at Camaldoli, but from the fact that the Holy Hermitage had always retained its first fervour and had been an exemplar to all other houses. It seems probable, however, that St. Romuald before 1012 was rather a reformer of Benedictine houses and a founder of isolated monasteries and hermitages, than the originator of a new order. Indeed it is doubtful if he had ever any intention of founding an order, in the modern sense, at all. But at Camaldoli the Rule, which later appeared in modified form as the "Constitutions of the Blessed Rudolph", is first heard of; at Camaldoli the distinctive white habit first appears; at Camaldoli are first found in combination the two cenobite and hermit branches that are afterwards so marked a feature of the order. Strictly, perhaps, the order did not come into existence till the Bull "Nulli fidelium", of Alexander II, in 1072. But, as all its distinctive features are first found together at Camaldoli in 1012, it may not be unwarranted to assign the foundation of the Camaldolese Order to that date.

THE FIVE CAMALDOLESE CONGREGATIONS.—For six centuries the order grew steadily as one body, recognizing the Holy Hermitage as its head. But in

process of time it became divided into five separate congregations, viz.: (i) The Holy Hermitage, (ii) San Michele di Murano, (iii) Monte Corona, (iv) The Congregation of Turin (San Salvatore di Torino), (v) Notre-Dame de Consolation. The history of these congregations had better be considered separately, after which something will be said of the Camaldolese Nuns.

(i) *The Congregation of the Holy Hermitage.*—Little need be said here of this great congregation, for throughout the centuries it has changed but little, and its history is mostly to be found in its relations with the congregations to which it gave birth. Before the separation of San Michele di Murano, the Holy Hermitage had given four cardinals and many bishops to the church, and was famous throughout Europe for the sanctity and austerity of its members. Gratian, the great canonist; Guido d'Arezzo, the founder of modern music; Lorenzo Monaco, the painter; Niccola Malermi, the first translator of the Bible into Italian, are all claimed as sons of this great congregation. To the present day, in spite of persecution and spoliation, the hermits of Camaldoli and the cenobites of Fonte Buono remain examples of austerity and monastic fervour.

(ii) *The Congregation of Murano.*—In the year 1212 the Venetian Republic, anxious that a hermitage should be founded within its borders, sent a request to this effect to Guido, Prior of Camaldoli. By him were sent Albert and John, hermits, and two lay brothers. To these was made over the little church of San Michele, on an island (now known as the Cemetery Island) between Venice and Murano, where tradition asserts St. Romuald to have lived with Marinus. The church was partly under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Castello, partly under that of the Bishop of Torcello. It was, however, at once released from the jurisdiction of both and handed over to Albert as representing the Prior of Camaldoli. At first a hermitage was started; but soon, on account of the rapid influx of novices, it was found necessary to adopt the cenobitical manner of life. The church was rebuilt and was consecrated by Cardinal Ugolino, and by 1227 the house is included by Gregory IX in his enumeration of the monasteries subject to Camaldoli. In 1243 another attempt to found a hermitage near Venice was made, John and Gerard, hermits of Camaldoli, being sent by Guido, the prior-general, to take possession of the house and church of San Mattia in Murano, which had formerly been a nunnery and had been given to Camaldoli by the Bishop of Torcello. This hermitage prospered greatly, and, six years after its foundation, was granted a much-mitigated form of the rule by Martin III, prior general of Camaldoli. Within twenty years this hermitage already possessed a subject house, and by the middle of the fourteenth century we find the Prior of San Mattia making a visitation of his suffragan monasteries, and the hermitage itself adopting the cenobitical life.

Meanwhile, about the end of the thirteenth century, the Priory of San Michele had developed into an abbey, and in 1407 its monks were allowed to elect their own abbot, subject only to the confirmation of the Prior of Camaldoli. Two years later Paolo Venerio, Abbot of San Michele, was appointed by the pope one of the visitors and reformers of monasteries in Venice. In 1434 Camaldoli asserted its authority, when Ambrogio Traversari, the prior general, suddenly made a visitation of San Mattia di Murano and deposed the prior for contumacy. At the same time he exempted San Michele from the jurisdiction of the vicar, and subjected it immediately to the prior-general. But in another ten years came a further impulse towards independence, when Pope Eugenius IV suggested that the Camaldolese abbeys should form a congregation similar to that of Santa Giustina di Padova. The times, however, were not opportune, and though a union of nine abbeys was attempted in 1446 (called the Union of the Nine Places) it was soon abandoned, and for twenty years the matter rested. But in 1462 Pius II granted to Mariotti, prior general, and to his successors the right of appointing all superiors under his jurisdiction *ad nutum*. At once the question of separation became again important, and twelve years later it was solved. The Abbeys of Santa Maria dei Carceri, at Padua, and of San Michele di Murano and the Priory of San Mattia di Murano formed a new congregation. To escape the danger of *commendam* it was arranged that the superiors of these houses should be elected for only three years at a time, and a semblance of connexion with Camaldoli was maintained by requiring confirmation of their election by the prior general. The new congregation was confirmed by Sixtus IV, and soon showed signs of vigour. In 1475 the two great abbeys of Sant' Apollinare and of San Severo at Classe were united to it; and in 1487 Innocent VIII confirmed and extended the privileges granted by his predecessor. By 1513, however, the life tenure of office by the prior general was found to be inconvenient by others as well as by the new congregation, and a general chapter of the whole order was held at Florence. It was decided to form a new united congregation "of the Holy Hermitage and of San Michele di Murano", with a prior general elected annually (afterwards triennially), and alternately from the hermits and the "regular" cenobites. The "conventuals" were expressly excluded from the generalship and were forbidden to take novices. This congregation was confirmed and was granted extraordinary privileges by the Bull "Etsi a summo" of Leo X. The reunion lasted, in spite of many disputes between the hermits and the cenobites, for more than a century. In 1558 the conventuals were separated from all privileges of the order, and eleven years later (1569) were finally suppressed by Pius V.

In the same year the congregation was much strengthened by the suppression of the hermit order of Fonte Avellana, which, with all its possessions, was united to the Camaldolese Order. Four years later, in 1573, the great Abbey of San Gregorio on the Cælian Hill in Rome was united to the congregation. The whole order was, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, at the summit of its fortunes. In 1513 there had been seventeen "groups of monasteries" and four nunneries in the order, and since then had been added Fonte Avellana with its dependencies, the congregations of Monte Corona and of Turin, and several great historic abbeys. But the disruptive tendencies in the order were fatal to its continued prosperity. In 1616 the differences between the hermits and the cenobites of the great Congregation of the Holy Hermitage and San Michele resulted in their separation again into two congregations, and in spite of an attempt at reunion in 1626 this separation was final. The Congregation of San Michele di Murano had its own general, styled "the general of all the Camaldolese monks and hermits". It possessed at one time about thirty-five monasteries (including Sant' Apollinare at Ravenna, San Michele and San Mattia at Murano, Santa Croce at Fonte Avellana, Santi Angeli at Florence, and San Gregorio at Rome), as well as eight nunneries. The houses subject to the congregation were divided into the four provinces of Venice, Tuscany, Romagna, and The Marches and Umbria, each with its "house of profession", whose abbot was the vicar of the province. At each of the quinquennial chapters, the four great offices of the general, the two visitors, and the procurator general were distributed in turn among the four provinces, so that each province every twenty years had possessed all these dignities. Under this organization the congregation attracted many devout and intelligent subjects, and its reputation both for learning and for strictness was widespread. Romano Merighi

(1658–1737), one of the founders of the Accademia degli Arcadi; Guido Grandi (1670–1742), historian of the order and famous mathematician, friend and correspondent of Newton; the two brothers Collina; Angelo Calogerà (1699–1768), the historian of letters; Claude Fromond (1705–65), physician and chemist; Benedetto Mittarelli (1708–77) and Anselmo Costadoni (1714–85), authors of the "Annales Camaldulenses"; Mauro Sarti (1709–66), historian; Isidoro Bianchi (1733–1807) and Clemente Biagi (1740–1804), archæologists; Ambrogio Soldani (1736–1808), naturalist—these are but a few of the illustrious names that adorn the congregation. It has also produced four cardinals: Andrea Giovannetti (1722–1800), for twenty-three years Archbishop of Bologna; Placido Zurla (1769–1834), Vicar of Rome under three popes; Mauro Cappellari (1765–1846), who in 1831 was elected pope and assumed the name of Gregory XVI; and Ambrogio Bianchi, who was also general of the order till his death in 1856. It was Mauro Cappellari to whom the Camaldolese Order is indebted for its survival. The great catastrophe of the French Revolution resulted in 1810 in the general suppression of religious orders in Italy. Fonte Avellana was spared in recognition of the scientific attainments of the titular abbot, Dom Albertino Bellenghi. But the Venetian houses were involved in the general ruin. S. Mattia was deserted and ultimately demolished. But Mauro Cappellari, who was at that time Abbot of S. Michele di Murano, succeeded in retaining both house and community, by clothing the latter in the habits of secular priests, and by turning the former into a college for noble youths. The magnificent library was confiscated, and, after its chief treasures had been placed in public libraries, the remaining 18,000 volumes were sold by public auction. In 1813, after the blockade of Venice by the Austrians, the Commune made a public cemetery of the island of San Michele, thus destroying the vineyards of the abbey. In 1829 the same body gave the monastery and island into the custody of the Friars Minor Observant, who still possess them. Meanwhile, in 1825, Cappellari had been created cardinal by Leo XII, and it was owing to the strenuous opposition of the former and of Cardinal Zurla that that pope relinquished his intention to suppress the now enfeebled order. And when Cappellari mounted the pontifical throne as Gregory XVI, he not only materially assisted the finances of the order, but in every way furthered its attempts to regain something of its former prosperity. At his death, in 1846, it had recovered several of its historic houses and had hopes of regaining all. But these hopes have not been realized.

(iii) *The Congregation of Monte Corona.*—If we except Camaldoli itself, all the houses of the order may be said to have abandoned, by the end of the fifteenth century, the eremitical mode of life so dear to St. Romuald. The establishment of hermitages in the neighbourhood of towns had rendered the solitary life of the hermit almost impossible, and the munificent benefactions which at various times had been made to the order had caused it to lose not a little of its primitive spirit and to abandon many of its stricter observances. It was reserved to Paolo Giustiniani, a member of the illustrious Venetian family of that name, to restore to the order the observance of St. Romuald's ideal of a life of silence and solitude. At an early age he left Venice, where he had been born in 1476, to study philosophy and theology in the famous schools of Padua, and at the end of a brilliant career there he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. On his return to Italy he entered religion at the age of thirty-four, becoming a hermit at Camaldoli. His promotion to high offices in the order was rapid. Shortly after his profession he was sent on an embassy to the court of Leo X to obtain papal protection against a certain abbot of S. Felice at Florence, who seems to have been lavishly spending the revenues of Camaldoli, and whom the Prior of Camaldoli, general of the order, was unable himself to deal with. The result of the embassy was a Bull from the pope ordering restitution to be made to Camaldoli and forbidding to the Abbot of S. Felice any further interference. On Giustiniani's return from Rome, the general of the order, Pietro Delphino, invited his co-operation in the difficult task of suppressing the abuses which had grown up. All authority in the order, which by right belonged to the prior of Camaldoli, was now possessed by the superiors of the regulars and conventuals. The discipline and observance of the former seem to have been strict, but the case of the conventuals left a great deal to be desired. Their superiors were perpetual, and apparently independent of one another. Recourse was had to Leo X, who, in 1513, ordered a general chapter to assemble. The results of its deliberations have been given above in the history of San Michele di Murano.

In 1516 Paolo Giustiniani was elected Prior of Camaldoli, and on the expiration of the three years of office, he again journeyed to Rome on business concerning the order. After the lapse of another three years spent in seclusion at Camaldoli, he was re-elected to the office of prior and once again approached the court of Leo X, to obtain permission from that pontiff to attempt an extension of the order. Leo, who appears to have had a great respect for Giustiniani, not only encouraged him in his project, but allowed the foundation of an entirely new congregation, exempt from the jurisdiction of the general and possessing its own peculiar constitutions. Returning from Rome to Camaldoli, he read the Brief from Leo to the assembled hermits and monks, and proceeded to resign the office of prior. Accompanied by a single companion he travelled on foot to Perugia to seek advice and spiritual direction from a solitary (of the Third Order of St. Francis) who dwelt at Monte Calvo. With this latter and a member of the Order of St. Dominic, he betook himself to a retreat in the Apennines—a dismal and solitary rock known as Pascia Lupo. A ruined chapel appears to have been the sole shelter for the three wanderers, and their right to possess even this was disputed by the priest of the neighbouring village so vigorously that it required papal authority to settle the question. Paolo was soon forsaken by his Dominican and Franciscan companions, who were aggrieved at the idea of adopting St. Romuald's rule, he himself remaining at Pascia Lupo with the companion whom he had brought from Camaldoli and two others who had joined him. He was not destined, however, to remain long in this lonely spot, for, acceding to an earnest request from the hermits of Camaldoli to live near them, he came, with his original companion, to a place near Massaccio, and was there joined by some of the religious from Camaldoli. Such were the first beginnings of the congregation founded by Paolo Giustiniani. Soon it was increased by the addition of two famous monasteries, viz. that of St. Leonard, situated on the summit of Monte Volubrio, in the Diocese of Fermo, and that of St. Benedict, near Ancona. The former was given to the order by its commendatory abbot, Gabrielli, nephew of the Cardinal of Urbino. Massaccio was given over entirely to the new congregation by Camaldoli in 1522. In the same year Giustiniani drew up his constitutions. No important additions to previous legislation seem to have been made. The rule of life was to be kept with the greatest rigour, as in St. Romuaid's time. The hermits' food was rarely to consist of anything better than dry bread, and wine was very seldom allowed. The form of the monastic habit was considerably altered: the tunic and scapular were so shortened as to come only a few inches below the knee, and in place of the cowl the new hermits were given a capuce with a hood attached

CAMALDOLI

CELLS OF HERMITS AND GENERAL VIEW OF MONASTERY

to it, and a short cloak fastened with a piece of wood at the throat.

There were now in all four hermitages belonging to the congregation, and in January of the year 1524 the first general chapter was held in the monastery of St. Benedict near Ancona. In this chapter Paolo Giustiniani was elected general of the congregation, priors were chosen for the different monasteries, and the constitutions were confirmed. In the same year Cardinal Giulio dei Medici, the friend and helper of Giustiniani, succeeded to the papacy as Clement VII. Giustiniani immediately repaired to Rome to obtain from the new pontiff confirmation of the acts of Leo X and full possession of the monasteries which Gabrielli, holding *in commendam*, had given over to the congregation when he joined it. Clement readily gave the necessary confirmation and at the same time granted the congregation certain dispensations from canon law.

This confirmation of Gabrielli's gift did not imply that the monasteries would remain in the possession of the congregation after Gabrielli's death. Giustiniani, anxious that the gift should be made perpetual, once more set out for Rome, accompanied this time by Gabrielli. It was the month of May, 1527, the very time at which the soldiers of the Emperor Charles V were occupying Rome. Giustiniani and his companion on their arrival were made prisoners, but, having nothing in their possession, were released, and travelled first to Venice and then to Massaccio. In 1528 Giustiniani went to Rome for the last time. He saw Clement in the Castle of S. Angelo and obtained the confirmation he had sought in the preceding year. Besides this he received confirmation of a gift previously made by the Abbot of St. Paul's, of the monastery of San Silvestro on Monte Soracte. On his way to this monastery, which was about twenty miles distant from Rome, he was seized by his last illness, and died at his newly acquired monastery on the 28th of June, 1528.

On the death of the founder, a new general was chosen for the congregation in the person of Agostino di Basciano, who died shortly after. His place was taken by Giustiniano di Bergamo, formerly a Benedictine monk. He summoned a general chapter to decide which of the then existing houses was to be considered as the chief of the congregation. Many preferred Massaccio, as being the first-founded, but precedence was finally given to the monastery of Monte Corona.

In 1540, reunion was effected between the Congregations of Monte Corona and Camaldoli, with the prior of Camaldoli as general. It was arranged that a general chapter was to be held yearly at Camaldoli, at which the prior was to be chosen. This state of things only lasted for a year; the congregations were again separated and remained so till the year 1634, when they were again united by Pope Urban VIII. This union lasted till 1667, when they were finally separated by a Bull of Clement IX.

(iv) *The Congregation of Turin* owes its foundation to Alessandro Ceva, a member of a noble Piedmontese family. Born in 1538, he went to Rome in 1560 to study for the priesthood, and there placed himself under the spiritual direction of St. Philip Neri. Eight years later, with the saint's advice, he determined to join the Camaldolese, and we find him becoming prior general of the order in 1587. From 1589 to 1595 he was in perpetual dispute with the order concerning the reformation of the Breviary ordered by Popes Pius V and Clement VIII. In 1596 he was sent to Turin as prior of the Camaldolese monastery of Puteo Strata, with authority to found hermitages of the order in Piedmont. Two years later a terrible plague visited Turin, during which the Camaldolese monks undertook the care of the sick, which the secular clergy, whose numbers had been terribly reduced by the pestilence, were scarcely able to perform. Alessandro Ceva, in the midst of his ministrations in the afflicted city, was called away to assume the priorship of the monastery of San Vito at Milan, and we find him writing from this place in 1599 to the Archbishop of Turin, begging him to ask Charles Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy, to make a solemn vow to God to found a Camaldolese hermitage, that the plague might be arrested. The vow was made publicly by the Duke of Savoy and the people of Turin, and the foundation of the new hermitage after much delay was laid in July, 1602, at a lonely spot between Turin and Peceto. The church of this new hermitage was finished in 1606, and endowed by the Duke of Savoy as the chapel of the Order of the Knights of the Annunciation (see MILITARY ORDERS), of which order the hermits were to be regarded as chaplains. Little is known about this congregation, which seems to have been reabsorbed into the congregation of Monte Corona in the eighteenth century

(v) *The Congregation of Notre-Dame de Consolation.*— In the year 1626 there entered the Congregation of Turin Boniface d'Antoine, a French priest belonging to the Diocese of Lyons. Almost immediately he was sent to France by the general of the congregation, to solicit from Louis XIII authorization for the founding of Camaldolese hermitages in France. His first monastery was in his native Diocese of Lyons, near a town named Bothéon. It was dedicated to Our Lady of Consolation and was founded and endowed by Balthassar de Gudaigne de Hostun, Marquis de Baume, in 1631. His second foundation was at Mont Peuchant in Le Forez, thanks to the help and munificence of the Archbishop of Lyons, Cardinal de Marque Mont. The Archbishop of Vienne, Pierre de Villars, was also friendly to the new order, authorizing the foundation of the hermitage of Notre Dame de Grâce at Sapet: and testifying at the same time to the sanctity and austerity of d'Antoine. Another foundation in the Diocese of Lyons was made in 1633, when Père Vital de Saint-Paul, an Oratorian, and his sister presented the two churches of St.-Roch and Val-Jésus, situated in the parish of Chambre, to d'Antoine. In the following year Louis XIII gave his formal consent by letters patent to the establishment of the Camaldolese in his dominions, on the condition that their general should always be French. He also prevailed upon the reigning pontiff, Urban VIII, to form the French Camaldolese into a separate congregation, with the title of "Notre-Dame de Consolation", which was effected by a Bull dated 8 October, 1634. They were to observe the constitutions of Monte Corona, to which congregation they were affiliated. The new order seems to have been popular in France. In 1642 Charles de Valois, almoner of the Duc d'Angoulême, founded a house at Gros-Bois near Paris. In 1648, Catherine le Voyer, one of the ladies of the court, founded a hermitage at La Flotte, in Vendôme, and in 1659 the order was presented with another house in Vendôme, at La Gavalerie, in the parish of Bessé. A foundation was made in 1674 by the Comte de Guénégaud and his wife, Elizabeth de Choiseul, on their estate at Rogat, in the parish of Congard, in Brittany. In 1671 the new congregation took possession of the hermitage of Mont-Valérien, near Paris, whither they had been invited two years previously by a lay religious community. This foundation, however, was abandoned two years later. In 1679 a Camaldolese community was introduced into the old Benedictine abbey at Ile Chauvet, in Lower Poitou. This abbey had been held *in commendam* by various persons, some of whom had been laymen. In 1654 Henri de Maupas, Abbot of St.-Denis at Reims and afterwards Bishop successively of Le Puy and Evreux, became commendatory abbot, and fifteen years later introduced the Camaldolese, with the consent of the Bishop of Luçon, in whose diocese the ab-

bey was situated. This was the only foundation of any importance made in France after the death of Boniface d'Antoine in 1673. Henceforth the history of this congregation is closely connected with the history of Jansenism. Throughout the congregation there were many obstinate adherents of the new heresy, and in 1728 a pamphlet, entitled "Le Témoignage", defending their position, appeared in answer to the punitive measures taken against them by the General Chapter of 1727. No amount of repression could remove all traces of this persistent heresy, and the whole Congregation was suppressed in 1770.

The first house of *Camaldolese Nuns*, San Pietro di Luco in Mugello, near Florence, was founded by Blessed Rudolph, in the year 1086. It is true that St. Romuald himself had founded houses for nuns in 1006 and 1023; but there is no evidence that they followed the Camaldolese rule, and the Camaldolese writers almost unanimously assign the beginning of the houses for women to Blessed Rudolph. By 1616, when the congregation of San Michele di Murano was finally separated, there were eight houses subject to that congregation, besides many others under the jurisdiction of the bishops in whose dioceses they were situated. The nuns follow the rule of Camaldoli. They wear a white habit, veil, scapular, and girdle, to which the choir nuns add a black veil. In choir the choir nuns wear a white cowl, but the lay sisters a white cloak.

Rule and Constitutions.—St. Romuald has left no written rule; the austere manner of life led by his hermits was transmitted by oral tradition. His great ideal was to introduce into the West the eremitical life led by the Eastern monks and the Fathers of the Desert. In the words of St. Peter Damian, his endeavour was "to turn the whole world into a hermitage, and make all the multitude of the people associates of the monastic order" (*totum mundum in eremum convertere, et monachico ordini omnem populi multitudinem sociare*). He introduced into Western monasticism a system hitherto unknown, and attempted a blending of the cenobitical life of the West with the eremitical life of the East. The rule was of the utmost severity. The brethren lived each in their separate cells, in the midst of which stood the oratory or chapel, where they met for the Hours of the Divine Office, the whole Psalter being recited daily. There were two Lents during the year, one in preparation for Christmas, the other for Easter. During both these periods every day of the week except Sunday was an abstinence day, that is to say, really a fast of the most rigorous kind on bread and water. During the remainder of the year this abstinence was to be kept on all days except Thursdays and Sundays, when fruit and vegetables might be eaten. The ideal of St. Romuald was one of absolute asceticism, and there was little room in his system for the "nothing harsh, nothing burdensome" (*nihil asperum, nihil grave*) which is so striking a feature in the Rule of St. Benedict, with its broad comprehensiveness and wise power of dispensation. This rule of life remained unrelaxed at Camaldoli till the year 1080, when the fourth prior, Blessed Rudolph I, gave the first written constitutions to the order. Besides a mitigation of austerity, there had become necessary a definite written code which everyone who joined would be bound to follow. The abstinence on bread and water, which had hitherto been observed on all days except Sundays during the two Lents, was now dispensed on Thursday as well, and also on the feasts of St. Andrew, St. Gregory, St. Benedict, the Annunciation, Palm Sunday, and Maundy Thursday. On these days fish and wine were to be allowed. On feasts of twelve lessons, if these were not days of abstinence, the hermits were allowed to take their meals together in a common refectory. The observance of silence, which was continual under St. Romuald, was slightly relaxed in Rudolph's constitutions. It was to be observed throughout both Lents and on all abstinence days. At other times it was to be observed from Vespers till after the conventual Mass. An important change in the character of the order was made by Rudolph's extension of the cenobitical life. Fonte Buono, from being merely an adjunct of Camaldoli, now became a separate monastery, and henceforth the Camaldolese Order is distinguished by this twofold character. In his legislation for cenobites Rudolph built carefully on St. Benedict's Rule. The interpretation which adhered closely to the letter and rigour of this rule, without consideration of circumstances of time, place, and national characteristics, was that which naturally appealed most strongly to the monastic reformer, and it was this aspect of the rule, if anything, intensified, which Rudolph chose for his monks, who were regarded by their contemporaries, and have ever since been regarded, as forming one of the many branches of the great Benedictine tree. In 1085 and 1188 further constitutions were given, more mitigated than those given in 1080; and as time went on the tendency was ever towards greater relaxation. In 1249 and 1253 Blessed Martin III gave his constitutions, and others again were promulgated in 1328. When the hermits of Camaldoli were united with the monks of the Congregation of San Michele di Murano, in 1513, special constitutions were drawn up, and when the first union was made between the Congregations of Camaldoli and of Monte Corona, in 1540, separate constitutions were given to the former.

With regard to the rule observed at Camaldoli to-day, it may be said with truth to retain some of its early rigour and austerity. Meat is never allowed except to the sick, and the severe abstinence on bread and water has to be observed on every Friday throughout the year. Meals are always taken in the seclusion of the cell, except on the great feasts, and even then in silence. The two Lents are still observed, and during these periods eggs, milk, butter, and cheese are strictly forbidden. All the Hours of the Divine Office are said in common in the hermitage church, a building which practically consists of one long and spacious choir. The hermits rise all the year round at half an hour after midnight for Matins, Lauds, and Meditation, which last for an hour and a half. A rest is then allowed till sunrise, when they betake themselves again to the church for the Office of Prime, and then return to their separate oratories to celebrate Mass. A slight collation is then taken, and the time between that and Tierce is spent in spiritual reading. Tierce is sung at nine, followed immediately by the conventual Mass and Sext. The remainder of the morning till the Office of None, at eleven, is passed daily in study and manual labour, each hermit having his own little garden and workshop. Dinner is taken at half-past eleven and is followed by recreation, during which the hermits are allowed in summer to take a siesta. Vespers are sung at sunset, and a slight collation is taken later on. The day is closed by Complin, Meditation, and the Rosary. Twice a week in winter, and three times a week in summer, talking is allowed during recreation time, and walks may be taken through the woods surrounding the hermitage. The monks at Fonte Buono live a life somewhat similar, though, of course, without the solitude of the hermits' life, and a walk beyond the monastic enclosure is allowed daily. Their hospice is now an hotel, and their forests have been appropriated by the Government. Speaking generally, the Camaldolese cenobites to-day may be said to follow the Benedictine rule in its ordinary interpretation.

The habit of the Camaldolese is now but little changed from that worn in the earliest days of the order. A white tunic reaching to the ankles, with scapular, girdle, and hood of the same colour. The cowl, worn only during the Divine Office, is also white, and of the same shape as the ample cowl of the Benedictines. A cloak is worn when walking abroad

in cold weather, and the hermits also have another very ample cloak in which the whole body can be wrapped when hurrying to the midnight Office from their cells in severe weather.—Camaldoli, it should be remembered, stands on a range of the Tuscan Apennines at an altitude of 3680 feet above the sea.

An aspirant to the solitary or to the cenobitical life at Camaldoli has to undergo a long and severe probation. He is at first regarded as a guest for some days, and is then summoned before the community, assembled in chapter, and formally received. Placed immediately in the novitiate, he continues to wear his secular dress for forty days, after which period he is clothed in the novice's habit and begins a novitiate of two years. If he should persevere he is admitted to simple vows, which may, if necessary, be dispensed during the three following years. During these three years the young religious does part of his ecclesiastical studies, and then, unless his superiors think a longer period necessary, he is admitted to solemn or final vows and to Holy orders. A lay brother's probation is different. He remains one year in the novitiate, and then becomes an "oblate" for seven years; another year's novitiate is then gone through, at the end of which he is called *conversus*, and his simple vows are taken for three years. If all is satisfactory, at the end of this period he is allowed to take solemn vows.

PRESENT STATE OF THE ORDER.—There are at the present date (1907) three congregations in the Camaldolese order: the Congregation of Cenobites, which possesses four monasteries, with about fifty subjects; the Congregation of Hermits of Etruria, which possesses two hermitages and three monasteries, with nearly sixty subjects; the Congregation of Hermits of Monte Corona, which possesses ten houses, with about one hundred and thirty subjects. All these houses are in Italy, except the monastery of Bielany in Poland, belonging to the Congregation of Cenobites, and the hermitage of Nuova Camaldoli, near Caxias in Brazil, belonging to the Congregation of Hermits of Etruria. This last was founded from Camaldoli in 1899, by Don Ambrogio Pierattelli and Don Michele Evangelisti, and one lay brother, Ermindo Dindelli. In 1900 these were joined by three more hermits and two more lay brothers from Camaldoli. Don Ambrogio was elected prior in 1903, and the first Camaldolese hermitage in the New World shows many signs of rapid and fruitful growth.

There are also five houses of nuns in existence, with about 150 inmates. These are all in Italy.

AUGUSTINUS FORTUNIUS, *Historia Camaldulensium* (Venice, 1575, 1579); BEAUNIER, *Recueil historique des Archevêchés, Evêchés, Abbayes et Prieurés de France* (Ligugé, 1906), introduction; *Camaldoli ed i Camaldolesi, brevi note di un sacerdote secolare ad un giovane* (Rome, 1905); CARMICHAEL, *In Tuscany* (London, 1901), 245–264; CIAMPELLI, *Guida storica illustrata di Camaldoli* (Udine, 1906); GRANDI, *Dissertationes Camaldulenses* (Lucca, 1707); HASTIVILLIUS, *Romualdina seu Eremitica Camaldulensis Ordinis Historia* (Paris, 1631); HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der catholischen Kirche* (Paderborn, 1907), I, 401–408; HELYOT, *Histoire des ordres monastiques* (Paris, 1718), V, 236–79; HERZOG AND HAUCK, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (Leipzig, 1897), III, 683–87; MABILLON, *Acta Sanctorum O. S. B.* (Venice, 1733–1740), Sæc. VI, i, 246–78; IDEM, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti* (Paris, 1707), IV, 261–3, 275, 289, 339; MITTARELLI AND COSTADONI, *Annales Camaldulenses O. S. B.* (9 vols., Venice, 1755–73); MORONI, *Diz.* (Venice, 1840–58), V, 290, 308; XCI, 519–53, 561–62; S. PETRUS DAMIANUS, *Vita Sancti Romualdi* (Florence, 1513); RAZZI, *Regola della vita eremitica data dal b. Romualdo* (Florence, 1575); RAZZI, *Vite dei santi e beati del ordine di Camaldoli* (Florence, 1600); THOMAS DE MINIS, *Catalogus Sanctorum et Beatorum totius ordinis Camaldulensis* (Florence, 1605); ZIEGELBAUER, *Centifolium Camaldulense* (Venice, 1750); *Regola di S. Benedetto e Costituzioni della Congregazione degli Eremiti Camaldolesi di Monte Corona* (Rome, 1670); *Regolamento giornaliero pei novizi degli Eremiti Camaldolesi di Monte Corona* (Frascati, 1906); *Le Messager des Fidèles, Revue Bénédictine* (Maredsous, 1887), IV, 356–63; *Rivista Storica Benedettina* (Rome, 1906–7), I, 288–9, 470–5; II, 371–383, 600–4.

R. URBAN BUTLER.
LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Camargo, DIEGO MUÑOZ (according to Beristain de Souza, Muñoz should be the surname), b. of a Spanish father and Indian mother soon after 1521; d. at a very advanced age, the exact date unknown. He acquired the knowledge of letters and rudimentary acquaintance with other branches of learning from the Franciscans at Mexico in the first half of the sixteenth century, and diligently inquired into the traditions and antiquities of the Nahuatl Indians, chiefly of the tribe of Tlaxcala, in which investigations he was encouraged and sustained by the clergy and the higher Spanish officials. For many years he acted as official interpreter. He wrote the "Historia de Tlaxcala", first published in a French translation in the "Annales des voyages" and but lately in the Spanish original. It is the only chronicle specially devoted to the past of the tribe of Tlaxcala thus far accessible in print, except one, printed 1870, and which may yet prove to be a fragment of Camargo's work. Torquemada's "Monarquia" is largely based on Camargo, and the history is of course partial, as all tribal chronicles are, extolling the Indians of Tlaxcala, and placing them above all others of Nahuatl stock. This does not, however, detract from its value. It presents a view differing from that of other Indian writers, and furnishes elements of useful criticism.

TORQUEMADA, *Monarquia Indiana* (Madrid, 1613, and 1723); BOTURINI-BENADUCCI, *Idea de una nueva Historia general de la América Setentrional* (Madrid, 1746); CLAVIGERO, *Storia del Messico* (Cesna, 1780); BERISTAIN DE SOUZA, *Biblioteca hispano-americana setentrional* (Amacameca, 1883); BRINTON, *Aboriginal Authors.*

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Cambiaso, LUCA (also known as LUCHETTO DA GENOVA, and as LUCHINO), Genoese painter, b. at Moneglia near Genoa, in 1527; d. in the Escorial, Madrid, 1585. He received his first instruction from his father, Giovanni Cambiaso, who is believed to have been the author of the method adopted in designing whereby the human body is divided into small squares in order to give correct proportions in foreshortening. Luca exhibited considerable talent, and was enabled by the assistance of a friend to visit Florence and Rome, where he carefully studied the works of Michelangelo. His early paintings are somewhat extravagant and grotesque, but later in life he checked his impetuosity, and his paintings were distinguished by exquisitely transparent colour and by grace in pose and composition. He was an exceedingly rapid painter, using both hands at once, and passionately fond of glowing colour and of sumptuous architectural backgrounds. In 1583 he was invited to visit Spain, where he was employed by Philip II in the Escorial, and painted the ceiling of the choir and several altar-pieces. His wife, to whom he was deeply attached, died at Genoa, and being unable to obtain a dispensation to marry her sister, he gave way to the severe disappointment, and allowed it to prey upon his mind until it produced melancholia, from which he died. He had one son, Orazio, who accompanied his father to Spain and who worked for Philip II after the father's decease.

Cambiaso was a man of little historical knowledge, but as an artist was distinguished by accurate drawing, clever composition, and admirable colouring. The women in his pictures are modest, the men impassioned, and he was fond of introducing horses into his scenes and painted them with beauty and spirit. His best works are in Madrid, Munich, and Florence.

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Cambrai, ARCHDIOCESE OF (CAMERACENSIS), comprises the entire Département du Nord of France. Prior to 1559 Cambrai was only a bishopric, but its jurisdiction was immense and included even Brussels and Antwerp. The creation of the new metropolitan

See of Malines in 1559 and of eleven other dioceses was at the request of Philip II of Spain in order to facilitate the struggle against the Reformation. The change greatly restricted the limits of the Diocese of Cambrai which, when thus dismembered, was made by way of compensation an archiepiscopal see with St. Omer, Tournai, and Namur as suffragans. By the Concordat of 1802 Cambrai was again reduced to a simple bishopric, suffragan to Paris, and included remnants of the former dioceses of Tournai, Ypres, and St. Omer. In 1817 both the pope and the king were eager for the erection of a see at Lille, but Bishop Belmas (1757–1841), a former constitutional bishop, vigorously opposed it. Immediately upon his death, in 1841, Cambrai once more became an archbishopric with Arras as suffragan.

For the first bishops of Arras and Cambrai, who resided at the former place, see ARRAS. On the death of St. Vedulphus (545–580) the episcopal residence was transferred from Arras to Cambrai. Among his successors were: St. Gaugericus (580–619); St. Bertholdus (about 625); St. Aubert (d. 667); St. Vindicianus (667–693), who brought King Thierri to account for the murder of St. Léger of Autun; St. Hadulfus (d. 728); Alberic and Hildoard, contemporaries of Charlemagne, and who gave to the diocese a sacramentary and important canons; Halitgarius (817–831), an ecclesiastical writer and apostle of the Danes; St. John (866–879); St. Rothadus (879–886); Wiboldus (965–966), author of the *ludus secularis* which furnished amusement to clerkly persons; Gerard the Great (1013–1051), formerly chaplain to St. Henry II, Emperor of Germany, and helpful to the latter in his negotiations with Robert the Pious, King of France; (Gerard also converted by persuasion the Gondulphian heretics, who denied the Blessed Eucharist); St. Lietbertus (1057–1076), who defended Cambrai against Robert the Frisian; Blessed Odo (1105–1113), celebrated as a professor and director of the school of Tournai, also as a writer and founder of the monastery of St. Martin near Tournai; Burchard (1115–1131), who sent St. Norbert and the Premonstratensians to Antwerp to combat the heresy of Tanquelin's disciples concerning the Blessed Eucharist; Robert II of Geneva (1368–1371), antipope in 1378 under the name of Clement VIII; Jean IV T'serclaes (1378–1389), during whose episcopate John the Fearless, son of the Duke of Burgundy, married Margaret of Bavaria at Cambrai (1385); the illustrious Pierre d'Ailly (1396–1411); the celebrated Fénelon (1695–1715); and Cardinal Dubois (1720–1723), minister to Louis XV.



ALLEGORY OF THE PEACE OF CAMBRAI, BY PALMA (PALACE OF THE DOGE, VENICE)

In the Middle Ages the Diocese of Cambrai was included in that part of Lorraine which, after various vicissitudes, passed under German rule in 940, and in 941 the Emperor Otto the Great ratified all the privileges that had been accorded the Bishop of Cambrai by the Frankish kings. Later, in 1007, St. Henry II invested him with authority over the countship of Cambrésis; the Bishop of Cambrai was thus the overlord of the twelve "peers of Cambrésis". Under Louis XIV (1678) the Bishopric of Cambrai once more became French. The councils of Leptines, at which St. Boniface played an important rôle, were held in what was then the Belgian part of the former Diocese of Cambrai. Under the old regime the Archdiocese of Cambrai had forty-one abbeys, eighteen of which belonged to the Benedictines. Chief among them were the Abbey of St. Géry, founded near Cambrai about the year 600 in honour of St. Médard by St. Géry (580–619), deacon of the church of Treves, and who built a chapel on the bank of the Senne, on the site of the future city of Brussels; the Abbey of Hautmont, founded in the seventh century by St. Vincent, the husband of St. Wandru, who was foundress of the chapter at Mons; the Abbey of Soignies, founded by the same St. Vincent, and having for abbots his son Landri and, in the eleventh century, St. Richard; the Abbey of Maubeuge, founded in 661 by St. Aldegonde the sister of St. Wandru and a descendant of Clovis and the kings of Thuringia, among whose successors as abbesses were her niece, St. Aldetrude (d. 696) and another niece, St. Amalberte (d. 705), herself the mother of two saints, one of whom, St. Gudule, was a nun at Nivennes and became patroness of Brussels, and the other, St. Raynalde, a martyr; the Abbey of Lobbes which, in the seventh and eighth centuries, had as abbots St. Landelin, St. Ursmar, St. Ermin, and St. Theodulph, and in the tenth century, Hériger, the ecclesiastical writer; the Abbey of Crespin, founded in the seventh century by St. Landelin, who was succeeded by St. Adelin; the Abbey of Maroilles (seventh century), of which St. Humbert I, who died in 682, was abbot; the Abbey of Elnon, founded in the seventh century by St. Amandus and endowed by Dagobert; the Abbey of St. Ghislain, founded in the seventh century by the Athenian philosopher, St. Ghislain, and having as abbots St. Gerard (tenth century) and St. Poppo (eleventh century); the Abbey of Marchiennes, founded by St. Rictrudes (end of the seventh century); the Abbey of Liessies (eighth century) which, in the sixteenth century, had for abbot Ven. Louis de Blois (1506–1566), author of numerous spiritual writings (see BLOSIUS); the Abbey of St. Sauve de Valenciennes (ninth century), founded in honour of the itinerant bishop St. Sauve (Salvius), martyred in Hainault at the end of the eighth century; and the Abbey of Cysoing, founded about 854 by St. Evrard, Count of Flanders and son-in-law of Louis the Debonair.

The list of the saints of the Diocese of Cambrai is very extensive, and their biographies, although short, take up no less than four volumes of the work by Canon Destombes. Exclusive of those saints whose

history would be of interest only in connexion with the Belgian territory formerly belonging to the diocese, mention may be made of St. Eubertus, an itinerant bishop, martyred at Lille (third century); St. Chrysole, martyr, patron of Comines, and St. Piat, martyr, patron of Tournai and Seclin (end of third century); St. Pharailde, patron of Bruay near Valenciennes (eighth century); the Irish missionaries Fursy, Caidac, Fricor, and Ultan (seventh and eighth centuries); St. Winnoc, Abbot of Bergues (end of seventh century); Blessed Evermore, disciple of St. Norbert and Bishop of Ratzburg in Germany (twelfth century); Blessed Charles le Bon, Count of Flanders, son of King Canute of Denmark and assassinated at Bruges in 1127; and Blessed Beatrice of Lens, a recluse (thirteenth century). The Jesuits Cortyl and du Béron, first apostles of the Pelew (Caroline) Islands, were martyred in 1701, and Chomé (1696–1767), who was prominent in the Missions of Paraguay, and the Oratorian Gratry (1805–1872), philosopher and member of the French Academy, were natives of the Diocese of Cambrai. The English college of Douai, founded by William Allen in 1568, gave in subsequent centuries a certain number of apostles and martyrs to Catholic England. Since the promulgation of the law of 1875 on higher education, Lille has been the seat of important Catholic faculties. (See BAUNARD; LILLE.)

The principal places of pilgrimage are: Notre-Dame de la Treille at Lille, a church dedicated in 1066 by Baldwin V, Count of Flanders, visited by St. Thomas of Canterbury, St. Bernard, and Pope Innocent III, and where, on 14 June, 1254, fifty-three cripples were suddenly cured; Notre-Dame de Grâce at Cambrai, containing a picture ascribed to St. Luke; Notre-Dame des Dunes at Dunkerque, where the special object of interest is a statue which, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, was discovered near the castle of Dunkerque; the feast associated with this, 8 September, 1793, coincided with the raising of the siege of this city by the Duke of York; Notre-Dame des Miracles at Bourbourg, made famous by a miracle wrought in 1383, an account of which was given by the chronicler Froissart, who was an eyewitness. A Benedictine abbey formerly extant here was converted by Marie Antoinette into a house of noble canonesses. Until a comparatively recent date, the great religious solemnities in the diocese often gave rise to *ducasses*, sumptuous processions in which giants, huge fishes, devils, and representations of heaven and hell figured prominently. Before the law of 1901 was enforced there were in the diocese Augustinians, English Benedictines, Jesuits, Marists, Dominicans, Franciscans, Lazarists, Redemptorists, Camillians, Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul, and Trappists; the last-named still remain. Numerous local congregations of women are engaged in the schools and among the sick, as, for instance: the Augustinian Nuns (founded in the sixth century, mother-house at Cambrai); the Bernardines of Our Lady of Flines (founded in the thirteenth century); the Daughters of the Infant Jesus (founded in 1824, mother-house at Lille); the Bernardines of Esquernes (founded in 1827); the Sisters of Providence, or of St. Thérèse (mother-house at Avesnes); the Sisters of Our Lady of Treille (mother-house at Lille), and the Religious of the Holy Union of the Sacred Hearts (mother-house at Douai).

In 1900 the religious institutions of the archdiocese included 7 foundling asylums, 260 infant schools, 4 infirmaries for sick children, 2 schools for the blind, 2 schools for deaf-mutes, 19 boys' orphanages, 57 girls' orphanages, 20 industrial schools, 1 trades' school, 3 schools of domestic economy, 5 reformatories, 89 hospitals and hospices, 32 houses of religious nurses, 7 houses of retreat, 2 insane asylums, and 177 conferences of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. This development of charitable establishments, to which should be added many institutions founded by Catholic employers for their workmen, may be accounted for by the immense labouring class in the Archdiocese of Cambrai. The retreats of Notre-Dame de Hautmont are well patronized by the working Catholics of the district. Statistics for the end of 1905 (close of the Concordat period) show a population of 1,866,994 with 67 pastorates, 599 succursales, or second-class parishes, and 157 curacies then remunerated by the State.

Gallia Christiana, ed. nova (1725), III, 1–7 and 206, and *instrumenta*, 1–44; FISQUET, *Métropole de Cambrai* (Paris, 1869); BLIN, *Histoire des évêques et archevêques de Cambrai* (Tournai, 1876); DESTOMBES, *Les vies des Saints et des personnes d'une éminente piété de Cambrai et d'Arras* (Lille, 1890); CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibliographie*, 554–558.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Cambridge, UNIVERSITY OF.—I. ORIGIN AND HISTORY.—The obscurity which surrounds the ancient history of Cambridge makes it impossible to fix with any certainty the date of the foundation of the great seat of learning now known as the university. In the days of Queen Elizabeth the most extraordinary legends were current, propounded by learned men at Oxford and Cambridge, regarding the respective antiquity of these two universities. The Oxford schools, it was claimed, had been founded by certain Greek professors who came to England with Brutus of Troy, "about the time when Eli was judge in Israel"; while Cambridge traced her origin to "Cantaber a Spanish prince", who arrived in Britain in the year of the world 3588. No more trustworthy is the statement of the chronicler known as Peter de Blois, who assigns 1110 as the date of certain learned monks coming to Cambridge from the great Abbey of Croyland, in the fen country, lecturing there, and assembling round them a nucleus of scholars. All that is certain is that long (though how long is not known) before the establishment of the first college in Cambridge, a body of students was in residence in the town, lodging at first in the houses of the townspeople, but gathered later into "hostels", houses licensed by the university authorities, who appointed principals to each, responsible for the order, good discipline, and comfort of the inmates. These hostels, of which Fuller enumerates thirty-four, continued to exist up to, and after, the foundation of the first colleges, which were originally composed only of the master, fellows, and poor scholars, or sizars, who paid for their education by performing menial work. To the Benedictine Order belongs the honour of having established the first college within the university, St. Peter's, better known as Peterhouse. It was founded in 1284 by Hugh de Balsham, monk and sometime prior of the Abbey of Ely, and Bishop of Ely from 1257 to 1286; and its constitution and statutes were modelled on those of Merton College, Oxford, founded twelve years previously by Walter de Merton, Bishop of Rochester.

Bishop de Balsham obtained leave from Edward I to place his scholars in the buildings of St. John's Hospital, in the place of the religious brethren of that foundation, and a few years later acquired possession of a neighbouring monastery belonging to a suppressed order of friars. He and his successor at Ely, Bishop Simon Montacute, drew up an admirable code of statutes providing for the maintenance of a master and fourteen fellows, who were to be "studiously engaged in literature", and withal "honourable, chaste, peaceable, humble and modest". The scholars who attended the college lectures (prototypes of the "pensioner" of to-day) were still accommodated in the hostels, but the statutes provided for the maintenance of a few "indigent scholars well grounded in Latin", who came later to be known as sizars. Monks and friars were explicitly excluded from the benefits of the foundation, but clerical students were evidently expected to be in the majority, and indeed the clerical

dress and tonsure is specially enjoined on the master and all the scholars of Peterhouse. In the statutes of the second college founded, that of Michaelhouse (afterwards absorbed in Trinity), the religious provisions are particularly prominent. All the fellows were to be in Holy orders and students of theology, and the provisions for Divine service are elaborate and minute. In Cambridge, as at Oxford, the earliest colleges made use of the nearest parish church as their place of worship, and Pembroke, which dates from 1347, was the first which had from the beginning a chapel for its members within its own precincts. Thirteen of the existing colleges are pre-Reformation foundations, and three more were established in the sixteenth century. The three hundred subsequent years of Protestantism have produced but a single benefactor to emulate the pious achievements of Catholic times; and Downing College, founded in 1800, is the only one which has had its rise in the seventeenth, eighteenth, or nineteenth centuries. The modern revival of hostels has not been markedly successful, two out of three founded having been closed in recent years; nor has the institution of the non-collegiate system (introduced in 1869) attracted a great number of students, in spite of the advantages it offers of a considerably more economical university career.

Many of the features of the collegiate discipline and internal government as originally instituted are due to the fact of the earlier colleges having been largely modelled on the monasteries. Magdalene (like Gloucester, now Worcester, College, Oxford) was actually established for students belonging to the Benedictine Order, the young monks resorting thither from Croyland, Ely, Ramsey, and other East Anglian abbeys; while Emmanuel was built in 1584 on the site of a former Dominican house, becoming afterwards, curiously enough, the favourite resort of Puritan students. To the semi-monastic origin of the colleges must be traced such rules as those enjoining on the fellows celibacy and the clerical status, which were in force until almost the close of the nineteenth century. The final abolition of the restrictions as to marriage and clerical orders was brought about only in 1881, when new statutes were issued by the Cambridge commissioners in conformity with an act of Parliament passed four years previously. All religious tests have been abolished within the same period, except for degrees in divinity, examinations and degrees in the other faculties being now thrown open to students of every creed. The Anglican element is still strongly represented in the governing body, more than half the heads of houses, for example, being (1907) clergymen of the established Church.

Looking back on the past three centuries of the history of the university, one is struck by the long succession of eminent men whom Cambridge has produced, notwithstanding the narrow and cramping influence of a system which, during a great part of that time, rigidly excluded non-members of the Church of England from every position of influence and emolument, and even from the benefits of a degree. A list by no means exhaustive includes, among philosophers and men of science, Bacon, Newton, Herschel, Adams, Darwin, Rayleigh, and Kelvin; among statesmen, Burleigh, Strafford, Cromwell, Pitt, Palmerston, Devonshire, and Balfour; among scholars and men of letters, Erasmus, Bentley, Porson, Paley, Sterne, Ben Johnson, Lytton, Macaulay, and Thackeray; among lawyers, Coke, Littleton, Ellenborough, and Lyndhurst; among historians, Hume and Acton; and (last, not least) among the galaxy of poets who are perhaps the brightest gems in Cambridge's crown of famous men, Spenser, Milton, Herbert, Dryden, Cowley, Otway, Prior, Gray, Coleridge, Byron, Wordsworth, and Tennyson. Apart from the unbroken chronicle of the intellectual achievements of her sons, the university as such has never during the six centuries and more of her existence figured prominently in history. Her part in politics has been on the whole unimportant, and her tendency, in matters both of Church and State, has ever been towards moderation and an avoidance of extremes. Her relations with kings and rulers have been friendly, if not always cordial; during the troubles of the Civil War she was loyal, but not with the exuberant loyalty of Oxford, to Charles I; her colleges sent him their plate, but they came later easily into the obedience of the Commonwealth. So in religious matters she has never been in the forefront of the great religious movements which have originated at Oxford and have shaken England to its centre. She has bred eminent divines both high and low in their ecclesiastical views; but her chief glory has been, and is, in that stamp of churchmen who form the broad, or liberal, section of the Anglican body. Ellicott and Alford, Vaughan and Kingsley, Lightfoot and Maurice, are names as typical of Cambridge as those of Newman and Pusey, Wilberforce and Liddon and Bright, are characteristic of Oxford. It remains to add that the corporate existence of Cambridge University dates from the thirteenth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when it was incorporated under the designation of "The Chancellors, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge". The endowment of the first professorships dates from an earlier period of the same century, the Lady Margaret professorship of divinity having been founded in 1502 by Margaret, mother of Henry VIII, who himself established in 1540 the five regius professorships of divinity, civil law, physics, Hebrew, and Greek. Thirty-nine professorships have since been founded, making a total of forty-five, in addition to assistants, demonstrators, and readers.

II. Constitution and Government.—(A) *The University.*—Nothing is more difficult to foreigners than to understand the constitution of such a university as that of Cambridge, complicated as it is by the dual and simultaneous existence of the central governing body with its complete organization and staff of officials, and of the separate colleges, each an autonomous corporation, with its own officers, its own property, and its own statutes, and yet all constituting an essential part of the university as a whole. The combined university and college system of Cambridge and of Oxford is in fact unique, and is in as marked contrast with the pure university system prevailing in Germany, France, and Scotland, as well as of the most recently founded universities in England, as it is with the pure college system of some universities in the United States. The supreme legislative and governing power of the whole body (for the statutes of the several colleges are subject to the paramount authority of the university laws) is vested in the senate, whose place of meeting is called the senate-house. The constituent members of the senate are the chancellor, vice-chancellor, doctors of the six several faculties, bachelors of divinity, and all masters of arts, law, surgery, and music, who have their names on the university register. The matters to which the jurisdiction of the senate extends, include the management of the finances and property of the university (as distinguished from that belonging to the individual colleges), the general conduct of the studies and examinations, and the regulations affecting morals and discipline. It is, however, to be noted that nothing whatever can be proposed for enactment or confirmation by the senate except with the sanction of the council, a body established by the authority of Parliament about 1857. The council is really a committee of the whole senate, consisting of the chancellor, vice-chancellor, four heads of colleges, four university professors, and eight other members of the senate elected by the whole body. Meetings of the senate, styled congregations, and presided over by the vice-chancellor or his deputy, are held about once

a fortnight during term for the transaction of university business. The executive power of the governing body is vested in the following officials: the Chancellor, elected for life, who is head of the university, and has power to adjudicate in all matters affecting members of the university, excepting cases of felony; the Vice-Chancellor, elected annually, who exercises the full powers of the chancellor in his absence or in case of a vacancy in the office; the High Steward, who has special powers to try scholars, within the limits of the university, even in cases of felony, and appoints a resident deputy; the Sex Viri, elected by the senate every two years, with power to hold a court for the trial of all senior members of the university charged with offences against the statutes; the Court of Discipline, consisting of the chancellor and six elected heads of colleges, for the trial of scholars in *statu pupillari;* the Public Orator, who voices the senate on public occasions, writes letters when required, in the name of the university, and presents to all honorary degrees with an appropriate oration; the Registrary, who keeps the record of all university proceedings, and the roll of members of the university, and is the custodian of all important documents; the two Proctors (with their Pro-Proctors), who are responsible for the morals and discipline of the younger members of the university, and assist the vice-chancellor in the discharge of his duties. Other university officials are the two members elected by the senate to represent the university in the imperial parliament; the Counsel to the university, appointed by the senate; the Solicitor, nominated by the vice-chancellor; the General Board of Studies, consisting of the vice-chancellor, and various elected members of the senate, and of special boards; the Financial Board, for the care and management of the property of the university, consisting of the vice-chancellor and eight members of the senate, half elected by the colleges and half nominated by the vice-chancellor. The university property consists chiefly of a small amount of landed estate, the fees charged for matriculations, examinations, and graduating, the quarterly due or tax paid by every member of the university whose name is on the register, the profits of the university printing-press, contributions from the various colleges, as provided by the statutes, and various minor sources of income of a fluctuating kind.

(B) *The Colleges.*—The order of the members of the several colleges, which number seventeen in all, is as follows: (1) The head, who is usually, but not necessarily or always, a doctor in his own faculty. The head of King's College is styled provost; of Queen's, president; of all the other colleges, master. (2) The fellows, numbering altogether about 400, and as a rule graduates (usually masters) in some faculty. (3) Doctors in the several faculties, bachelors in divinity, masters of arts, law, and surgery, who are not on the foundation of the college. (4) Bachelors in the four faculties last-named. (5) Fellow-commoners, generally men of rank and fortune, who are entitled to dine at the fellows' table (hence their name) and enjoy other privileges. (6) Scholars, foundation-members of the several colleges, and enjoying certain emoluments and advantages accordingly. They are as a rule elected by direct competitive examination prior to the commencement of their residence. (7) Pensioners (corresponding to "commoners" at Oxford), the great body of undergraduate students, who pay for their board and their lodging either within or without the college precincts. (8) Sizars, students of limited means who receive, as a rule, their rooms and commons free.

The following is a list of the colleges at Cambridge, in chronological order, with the date of the foundation of each: St. Peter's or Peterhouse (1257), Clare (1326), Pembroke (1347), Gonville and Gaius (1348), Trinity Hall (1350), Corpus Christi (1352), King's (1441), Queen's (1448), St. Catherine's (1473), Jesus (1496), Christ's (1505), St. John's (1511), Magdalene (1519), Trinity (1546), Emmanuel (1584), Sidney Sussex (1595), Downing (1800). There is also one public hostel, Selwyn College, founded in 1882, and restricted to members of the Church of England, and a body of non-collegiate students (under a censor) who under a statute of 1869 are admitted into the university without becoming members of any college or hostel. The total number of members of the university having their names on the register was, in July, 1907, 14,053, including 7220 members of the senate and 3463 undergraduates. Of these many more were on the books of Trinity than of any other college, namely 3675, the next in order being St. John's, with 1475. The total number of matriculations (of new members) in the academical year 1906–1907 was 1083, the highest in the history of the university. The government of each college is by its own master (or other head) and fellows, or else by the master and council, a select committee of the fellows. Each college has its visitor, either the Sovereign, the Lord Chancellor or the Chancellor of the University, or some bishop or other high dignitary, to whom reference is made when questions arise as to the interpretation of the college statutes; but no college statute is binding unless in harmony with the general code of statutes for the university approved by Queen Victoria in Council in 1882.

III. Studies and Discipline.—(A) *Studies.*—The Cambridge University system may be defined as one which subjects all candidates for degrees, and for all university and college distinctions, to the test of competitive written examinations, held at fixed intervals, and which allows the preparation and study for these examinations to be held whenever, and in whatever way, the individual thinks proper. Professors and readers, lecturers, demonstrators, and tutors, public and private, in every subject of the university curriculum, are provided in abundance by the university itself, by the various colleges, and by private enterprise. But the test, and practically the sole test (apart from certain disciplinary regulations), of the fitness of an undergraduate to receive the degree, whatever it be, which is the object of his university career, is not regular attendance at lectures, still less proficiency or perseverance in his course of private study, but his success in passing the various examinations, whether with or without "honours", which are the only avenue to the baccalaureate. For the ordinary degree of B.A., which may be taken in the ninth term of residence (that is, there being three terms in each academical year, in two years and eight months after coming into residence), the ordinary "passman", who does not aspire to honours, has to pass (1) the "previous examination", or "little go", in Greek, Latin, and mathematics (all of a pretty elementary kind), and Paley's "Evidences of Christianity". The Gospel, which is one of the Greek books set, and Paley can if desired be replaced by a classic and logic. Oriental students may take Arabic, Chinese, or Sanskrit instead of Greek or Latin, under certain conditions. (2) The General Examination, in somewhat more advanced classics and mathematics and (optional) English literature. (3) A Special Examination, in one of the following subjects: theology, political economy, law, history, chemistry, physics, modern languages, mathematics, classics, mechanics and applied science, music.

Candidates for honours have to pass in certain additional subjects in their "little go", being then exempt from further examination until the final, or "tripos"—a word sometimes derived from the three-legged stool on which candidates formerly sat, but now referring to the three classes into which successful candidates are divided. Honours may be taken in any of the following triposes: mathematics, clas-

sics, theology, law, history, medieval and modern languages, Oriental languages, moral sciences, natural sciences, mechanical sciences, and economics. Nearly all these tripos examinations are divided into two parts, with an interval between them; and only those who have obtained honours in the first part may proceed to the second. The three classes into which the successful candidates in the mathematical tripos are divided are called respectively wranglers, senior and junior optimes. The names in each class are placed in alphabetical order, the distinction of "senior wrangler", long the blue ribbon of Cambridge scholarship, having been abolished in 1907. The prominence formerly assigned to mathematics at Cambridge is shown by the fact that up to 1851 no candidate could obtain classical honours without previously gaining a place in the mathematical tripos. Although this rule no longer exists, the Cambridge theory remains on the whole the same, that mathematical studies form the most perfect course of intellectual training. Cambridge scholarship is sometimes said to derive its accuracy from mathematics; but the complete course of mathematics at Cambridge demands different and higher qualities than mere accuracy, namely breadth of reasoning, readiness to generalize, perception of analogies, quickness in the assimilation of new ideas, a keen sense of beauty and order, and, above all, inventive powers of the highest kind. This is the spirit of the typical Cambridge scholar, and it has produced and fostered some of the keenest intellects and brightest geniuses in the world of science, using that word in its widest and most general sense.

The instruction in preparation for the manifold examinations which are the gates to degrees in arts and other faculties, is derived from three sources: the university professors, the college tutors, and private instructors, usually known as "coaches". Least important, strangely enough, are the lectures given by the five-and-forty highly-paid professors, some of whom lecture very infrequently, while others may be themselves sound and even brilliant scholars, without being competent to impart the knowledge which they possess. The provision made by each college for the instruction of those residing within its walls consists of a system of lectures given by the college tutors, and annual or terminal examinations of all its own members. These lectures include every subject comprised in the university examinations, both pass and honour; attendance at them is compulsory on the students, and they are often of high excellence. Nevertheless the main work of tuition of serious and most successful students is done by the entirely extra-official private tutors, who are in no way publicly recognized as part of the university staff, but who undertake the greater part of the strenuous task of preparing their pupils for the various examinations. The position of these tutors is, in fact, in entire consonance with the general university system, the object of which is to ascertain, at stated intervals, and in the most thorough and searching manner, what a young man knows, without seeking to inquire how he knows it, or from what source, public or private, official or unofficial, his knowledge is derived. Under recent statutes, "advanced students", over twenty-one years of age, may be admitted as members of the university (their name being placed on the books of some college or hostel), may enter in their third term for certain honour examinations, and after six terms' residence proceed to the B.A. degree. They may be students either of the arts course or of law, or may pursue a course of research, and present a dissertation embodying the results of such research, as a qualification for their degree. These students can afterwards proceed to the degree of M.A., or to other degrees, under the usual conditions.

(B) *Discipline.*—The general discipline of the university, for which the senate is responsible, is in the hands of the proctors, two members of their body nominated annually by the different colleges in turn. The disciplinary powers of these officials, which formerly extended to the townsmen as well as to the students, have become decidedly restricted in recent years, and would be difficult accurately to define; but they may be said to be generally responsible for the good order and morals of the younger members of the university outside the college walls, and have authority to punish in various ways public breaches of discipline or of the university statutes. Within the college the discipline is in the hands of the tutors and the dean. Every undergraduate on his arrival is assigned to a particular tutor, who is supposed to stand *in loco parentis* to him, and exercises more or less control over every department of his undergraduate career. Both deans and tutors have punitive powers of different kinds, including pecuniary fines, admonitions, varying in seriousness, "gating", or confining within college or lodgings at an earlier hour than usual, and (as a last resource) "rustication", i. e. sending down for one or more terms, or even for good. In serious matters there is of course an appeal to the head, whose authority is absolute within his own college walls. On the whole, the system, though certainly framed for the control of youths considerably younger than the average undergraduate of to-day, works satisfactorily; and though minor breaches of discipline are numerous, grave delinquencies are happily rare.

IV. University and College Buildings.—It is a commonplace remark that Cambridge as a town contrasts unfavourably with Oxford, and an acute American writer, himself an alumnus of Trinity College, has gone so far as to describe it as, of all English provincial towns, the most insignificant, the dullest, and the ugliest. Certainly there is nothing at Cambridge comparable to the unrivalled High Street of Oxford. The street architecture is mean, dingy yellow brick being the chief material of the houses, and the site, on the edge of the chalk and fen country, is as dreary and uninteresting as anything in England. But the glory of Cambridge is of course its group of colleges, whose varied beauty is rivalled only by Oxford; and the Cantab will not easily allow that anything at Oxford, even Magdalen itself, is finer than Trinity, King's, or the FitzWilliam Museum. Of the university buildings, the last-named, founded by Viscount FitzWilliam, who died in 1816, is one of the noblest classical buildings in England, and contains valuable books, paintings, prints, and sculpture. The Senate-house, opened in 1730, is a building of admirable proportions, with a richly-decorated interior. Near it are the schools and the University Library, containing about 400,000 books and MSS., and entitled (like three or four other libraries) to a copy of every book published in the United Kingdom. Other buildings are the Pitt Press, conspicuous with its lofty tower, erected in 1831 in memory of William Pitt; the Geological Museum, containing the Woodward collection; and the excellently equipped Observatory, about a mile outside the town. Among the colleges, Trinity holds the premier place as the largest in any English university. Its great court covers more than two acres of ground; the splendid library was designed by Christopher Wren; the hall, 100 feet long, contains many interesting pictures; and the chapel, dating from Queen Mary's reign, has within the last generation been restored and elaborately decorated. King's College, founded by Henry VI, in connexion with his famous school at Eton, is celebrated for its chapel, unquestionably the finest building in Cambridge. It was finished in 1536, and ranks with St. George's Chapel, Windsor, among the most perfect existing specimens of perpendicular architecture. The other buildings of the college are of little interest. Third in architectural importance is St. John's, with its four

CAMBRIDGE

JESUS COLLEGE, GREAT GATE
KING'S COLLEGE AND KING'S PARADE

CLARE COLLEGE
ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE

courts, one of the most notable modern additions to any college in Cambridge. The picturesque buildings are mostly Tudor or Jacobean, while Gilbert Scott's magnificent chapel, opened in 1869, is Early Decorated. In size and wealth St. John's ranks next to Trinity, and it has produced many famous scholars.

Taking the remaining colleges in alphabetical order, we have first St. Catherine's, its red brick buildings dating from the end of the seventeenth century, and its court, planted with elms, opening to the street. Many noted ecclesiastics and theologians have been educated here. Christ's College, founded (like St. John's) by the mother of Henry VII, is associated with Milton, and the mulberry-tree said to have been planted by him is still shown. The ancient buildings were all modernized in the eighteenth century. Clare is the second oldest college in the university, but the present structure is entirely of the seventeenth century, and is a very pleasing example of the Palladian style. Corpus Christi, founded in 1352 by the guilds of Corpus Christi and of the Blessed Virgin, came early to be known as Benet College, from the neighbouring church of St. Benedict, and its proper name was, curiously enough, revived only in the nineteenth century. The modern buildings are imposing from their size, and the library contains a most valuable collection of books brought together by Archbishop Parker from the dissolved monasteries. Downing, the only modern college in Cambridge (founded 1800), has large grounds, but there is nothing noteworthy about its buildings. Emmanuel, on the site of a Dominican monastery, and the chosen home of the Puritans for a hundred years, has a chapel and picture-gallery designed by Wren. The founder of Harvard College, U. S. A., was a member of Emmanuel. Gonville and Caius (usually known as Caius, pronounced "Keys") has some valuable medical studentships, and is the chief medical college. The stained glass in the chapel depicts the miracles of healing. The college buildings have been greatly altered and enlarged, but the three famous old gates (of Humility, of Virtue, and of Honour) are still preserved. Jesus (dear to Catholics as the college of the martyred Bishop Fisher of Rochester) occupies the site of a Benedictine convent, of which the fifteenth-century chapel still remains, and has been restored by Pugin. It is the only college with a complete range of cloisters. Magdalene, the only college on the north side of the river Cam, was a Benedictine foundation. Not much remains of the ancient buildings, the finest part of the college being the Pepysian library, containing the books of the famous diarist, and many black letter volumes. Pembroke, the college of Spenser, Gray, and Pitt, has a chapel built by Wren, but has little architectural interest. It has been a noted nursery of Anglican prelates. St. Peter's or Peterhouse, the oldest college in Cambridge (founded 1257), preserves some of its ancient buildings, has pretty gardens and a small deer-park, and a library rich in medieval theology. The chapel is Laudian Gothic, dating from 1633. Queen's College, founded by the consorts of Henry VI and Edward IV (the only college which has a president, not a master), is charmingly picturesque, its ancient buildings having suffered less than most from restoration. It boasts Erasmus, whose study is still shown, as its most famous alumnus; but the college has hardly kept up its ancient reputation for learning. Sidney Sussex, with its pretty gardens, is the college of Oliver Cromwell, and possesses the best extant portrait of him. It occupies the site of a Franciscan monastery, but almost all that was old or interesting in the buildings was destroyed by Wyattville's "restorations" about 1830. Trinity Hall, also with charming gardens, has mostly been rebuilt since a fire in 1851. It has always been more or less the legal college, as Caius, the medical, and has also turned out many famous boating men. Selwyn College, the hostel founded in 1882 in memory of a well-known Anglican prelate, aims at economy, and is exclusively Anglican by its foundation charter. Girton and Newnham, the two colleges for female students at Cambridge, are in no sense part of the university. Apart from the beauty and interest possessed by the individual colleges, a peculiar charm common to nearly all is their picturesque position on the bank of the little river Cam, the buildings and gardens of the larger colleges extending on either side of the river, which is spanned by nine bridges. This unique combination of river, meadow, avenue, garden, and collegiate buildings is known collectively as the "backs", and it would be difficult to exaggerate its charm, especially on a fresh morning in the early summer.

V. Cambridge and English Catholics.—Up till about the middle of the nineteenth century, although no religious test, or subscription to the Anglican Articles was (as at Oxford) required on matriculation into the University of Cambridge, it was impossible to proceed to the bachelor's (or of course to any higher) degree without first signing the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and declaring oneself a *bona fide* member of the Church of England. It was not until nearly thirty years after these disabilities and restrictions were removed that Catholics began once again to frequent the universities in any numbers; not, in fact, until, in response to a petition addressed to the Congregation of Propaganda, through the English Bishops, by a representative body of English Catholics (including many Peers and university graduates), permission was formally granted by the Holy See, under certain conditions and with certain safeguards, for the Catholic youth of Great Britain to attend the national universities. During the ten years from 1897 to 1907, considerable advantage has been taken of this concession, Catholics coming in gradually increasing numbers both from the principal English Catholic schools, and from other parts of the British Empire, as well as from the Continent of Europe and from the United States, to avail themselves of the peculiar advantages of English university education. At the beginning of the academical year 1907–1908 there were (at Cambridge) seventy-six Catholics in residence at the university, including six members of the senate, two bachelors of arts, and sixty-eight undergraduates. About two-fifths of the Catholic students were from English Catholic schools (Beaumont, Downside, the Oratory, Stonyhurst, Ushaw, etc.); two-fifths had been educated at non-Catholic public schools (Eton, Harrow, Wellington, St. Paul's, etc.); while the remaining fifth were foreigners, many of them young Austrians or Hungarian nobles, and others from Germany, France, Spain, or Italy, and a few from India and the United States. The largest number, as was to be expected, were members of Trinity College, the others being pretty well distributed over the other colleges. The Catholic students, small as is their number in comparison with the great mass of the undergraduates, have earned a good reputation both for steadiness and industry, and a large majority of them are, as a rule, reading for honours. There is always a fair percentage of Catholics who hold college scholarships, gained in open competition.

St. Edmund's House, an institution for students preparing for the (secular) priesthood, occupies a house formerly known as Ayerst's Hostel, but later purchased for the Catholic body by the Duke of Norfolk. It is not corporately recognized by the university, as an attempt, soon after its foundation, to have it erected into a regular hostel was defeated in the senate, although the university authorities were not opposed to the idea. The members of the house are, however, all affiliated either to some college or to the non-collegiate body, permission being granted to them to live together under their own head or rector. Besides the seminarists, who belong to various English

dioceses, there are generally one or two members of the secular or regular clergy living and studying at St. Edmund's.

St. Benet's House, a small house of studies for members of the Benedictine Order, was founded in 1896 by the community of Downside, near Bath, Dom Cuthbert Butler (afterwards abbot) being the first head of it. The members of this house belong (like the members of St. Edmund's) to one or other of the colleges, with leave from the authorities to live together in community and enjoy certain exemptions from the ordinary collegiate rule. All the Benedictines who have passed through St. Benet's have graduated with honours, except two who entered as "advanced students" and have taken research degrees.

A final word may be said as to the annual expense of living at Cambridge for an undergraduate. It must be remembered that the regular university terms last little more than half the year, although an extra, or subsidiary, term may now be kept during the long vacation, and many men, especially those reading for honours, are therefore in residence for about eight months out of the twelve. It would probably be fairly accurate to estimate the average income of an undergraduate at Cambridge, available for the period of his residence, to be about two hundred pounds a year. A large number of men, especially those belonging to the smaller colleges, undoubtedly spend less than this annual sum, but on the other hand there is a considerable number whose income is much higher. The acute American observer (himself a Cantab) already cited concludes that an undergraduate with an allowance of two hundred and fifty pounds per annum could live surrounded by comforts, and what to an American student would be luxuries, but that he could not live on much less without great care and a certain amount of self-sacrifice. The estimate is perhaps unduly high; but so much depends on a young man's antecedents, training, disposition, and tastes, that it is impossible to give more than an approximate idea of the total cost of an undergraduate's academic career. Scholars of the various colleges receive an annual emolument, varying from fifty pounds to one hundred pounds, for a period of residence of from three to five years, and enjoy other advantages and allowances which reduce their necessary annual expenditure to a very moderate figure. Many clever boys also come up to Cambridge with scholarships or exhibitions gained at the public schools where they have been educated, and their expenses at the university are of course reduced in proportion.

Cambridge University Calendar (1907–1908); COOPER, *Athenæ Cantabrigienses* (1858–61); LE KEUX, *Memorials of Cambridge* (1880); MULLINGER, *The University of Cambridge* (1873); WORDSWORTH, *Scholæ Academicæ* (1877); WILLIS AND CLARK, *Architectural History of the University of Cambridge* (1886); EVERETT, *On the Cam* (1866); HUBER, *The English Universities* (1843); RASHDALL, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (1895); WALSH, *Historical Account of the University of Cambridge* (1837); CAMBRIDGE, *Report of the Universities' Commission* (1874); CLARKE, *Cambridge* (London, 1908).

D. O. HUNTER-BLAIR.

Cambuca. See PASTORAL STAFF.

Cambysopolis, a titular see of Asia Minor. The name is owing to a mistake of some medieval geographer. After his victory at Issus (333 B. C.) Alexander the Great built, near the ancient town of Myriandros, a city called after him Alexandria Minor (or *ad Issum*, more frequently *Scabiosa*, i. e. mountainous). It became a suffragan of Anazarbus, metropolis of Cilicia Secunda. Lequien (II, 903) mentions a dozen bishops; among them St. Helenus, St. Aristion, and St. Theodore, martyrs, and Paulus, a Monophysite (E. W. Brooks, The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, II, 98). In an Antiochene "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of the tenth century [A. P. Kerameus, Maurocordatos' Library (Greek), Constantinople, 1884, p. 66], instead of Alexandria Scabiosa, we read the strange form Alexandroukambousou, in one word. A little later, and surely in the twelfth century, this corrupt form was mistaken for two names and thus arose Alexandrou and Kambysou (*polis*). Hence came two episcopal titles connected with one city, and the name Cambysopolis passed into all the Greek and Latin "Notitiæ episcopatuum". The Roman Curia to-day preserves only the title Cambysopolis; the only correct name, Alexandria Scabiosa, exists no more. The city is now called Alexandretta (by the Turks, Iskanderoun); it is situated on the bay of the same name in the vilayet of Aleppo, and is united to the latter city by a carriage-road. It has about 7000 inhabitants (3000 Greeks, 500 Catholics of Latin and Eastern Rites). The Catholic parish is conducted by Carmelites, and there are attached to it Sisters of St. Joseph.

CUINET, *Turquie d'Asie*, II, 201–208; ALISHAN, *Sissouan* (Venice, 1899), 499–502.

S. VAILHÉ.

Camel (or KAMEL), GEORGE JOSEPH, botanist, b. at Brunn, in Moravia, 21 April, 1661; died in Manila, 2 May, 1706. He entered the Society of Jesus as a lay brother in 1682. Although sometimes spoken of as "Father Camellus" it is not sure that he was ever a priest. He was sent as a missionary to the Philippine Islands six years later. There he took up the study of the plants and the natural history of the Islands, and sent the results of his investigations to Europe, where they were published in the "Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society" (London). In his honour, Linnæus gave the name Camellia to a genus of evergreen shrubs remarkable for the beauty of their flowers, among them being the well-known Japan rose (*Camellia Japonica*). The mere enumeration of Camel's contributions to the pages of the "Philosophical Transactions" is ample evidence of the industry of this simple missionary and his orderly method of investigation. Besides many treatises on the plants and animals of the islands, Camel left two bulky volumes on the "Medicinal Plants of the Philippine Islands", which were published in part in the "Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society" (London) and in the "Historia Plantarum" of Ray. In the library of the Jesuits at Louvain there is a manuscript collection of his drawings, representing 360 varieties of plants and herbs of the Island of Luzon. Ray published the text of the work, but omitted the drawings. Camel established a pharmacy in Manila where the poor were supplied with remedies gratis.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II, 578, 579, 580; VELARDE, *Hist. de la Prov. Philipinas*, IV, xvii, n. 892–4.

E. P. SPILLANE.

Camel in Scripture. See ANIMALS IN THE BIBLE.

Camera Romana. See CURIA ROMANA.

Camerino (CAMERINUM), DIOCESE OF (CAMERINENSIS). Camerino is a city situated in the Italian province of Macerata in the Apennines, about 40 miles from Ancona. When the Exarchate of Ravenna was donated to the Holy See, it became subject to the Roman pontiff. It suffered much under Frederick II on account of its loyalty to the pope; Manfred besieged it (1262?), but happily Camerino was saved by Gentile Varano, under whom it became a papal fief. In the sixteenth century it became a fief of the Farnesi. During the persecution of Decius (249), the priest Porphyrius, master of the youthful martyr Venantius, and the Bishop Leontius suffered martyrdom at Camerino. Gerontius appears at the Council of Rome in 464. Other bishops were St. Ansovinus (816); Alberto degli Alberti (1437), prominent at the Council of Florence, where he was made cardinal and sent as legate by Eugenius IV to Alfonso of Aragon and René of Anjou, between whom he

brought about a peace; Agapito Rufo (1465), of whom Pius II said "that it was doubtful if there ever was a more joyous poet or a more illustrious orator"—he was also a prudent and zealous pastor; Berardo Buongiovanni (1537), legate in Poland and present at the Council of Trent, where he gave proof of great erudition; Alfonso Binarino (1547) and Girolamo Bobo (1580), who distinguished themselves by their zeal for reform; Innocenzo del Bufalo (1601), legate to Henry II of France. In the last century the local university was widely known. Camerino was the cradle of the Capuchin Order. The famous medieval Abbey of Fiastra is now abandoned. The diocese contains 182 parishes, 45,900 inhabitants, 13 religious orders of men and 13 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), IV, 231; TURCHI, *De Ecclesiæ Camerinensis pontificibus* (Rome, 1762).

U. BENIGNI.

Camerlengo (Lat. *camerarius*), the title of certain papal officials. The Low Latin word *camera* (chamber) means the treasure of the prince, monastery, etc.; also in general the royal treasury (*fiscus*), the temporal administration of a monastery. The term *camerarius* was, therefore, very frequently equivalent to civil treasurer, and in the case of monasteries meant the monk charged with the administration of the monastic property. This is also the sense of the Italian term *camerlengo*, still borne at Rome by three ecclesiastics, (1) the Camerlengo of the Holy Roman Church, (2) the Camerlengo of the Sacred College (of Cardinals), and (3) the Camerlengo of the Roman Clergy. The Roman confraternities have also an officer similarly entitled. (1) *The Camerlengo of the Holy Roman Church* is the administrator of the property and the revenues of the Holy See, and as such is successor both of the Archdeacon of Rome and of the *Vicedominus*, the former of whom administered the property of the entire Roman Church, i. e. the Diocese of Rome, while the latter was especially charged with the administration of the *mensa* of the pope and the entire personnel of the *patriarchium Lateranense* (St. John Lateran).

This latter official was the same as the *syncellus* at Constantinople. The office of Archdeacon of Rome was suppressed by Gregory VII, himself its last incumbent under Alexander II; owing to its numerous ancient privileges and rights it had come to be a frequent hindrance to independent papal action. When these were lopped off, the (Roman) office of archdeacon shrank to its original proportions. Thereafter the cardinal to whom was committed the supervision of the *Camera Apostolica* (a term even then customary for the administration of the temporalities of the Holy See) was known as *Camerarius* or, in popular language, Camerlengo. The subordinates of this official are known as clerks (*chierici*) of the Camera; chief among them are the treasurer and the auditor *di Camera*. Their body is known as *Reverenda Camera Apostolica* (see APOSTOLIC CAMERA). When the cardinal-camerlengo happened to be absent on some pontifical business, a vice-camerlengo was chosen in his place. The office of camerlengo included not only the supervision of the immediate properties of the Holy See, but also the fiscal administration of the Pontifical States, the *Patrimonium Petri*.

The following were its chief attributions: (a) the collection of the *taxæ*, or dues paid for the delivery of the Bulls of appointment to dioceses and abbeys (see CHANCERY, APOSTOLIC); (b) the registry of the oblations or gifts of the faithful; (c) charge of the papal coinage (*Moneta*); (d) jurisdiction, civil and criminal, over officials of the Camera (*chierici di Camera*). Under the Avignon popes and their successors the office of camerlengo received more definite organization; at the same time its rights and jurisdiction were increased. When Boniface VIII founded the Roman University (Sapienza) he decreed that the cardinal-camerlengo should be always its archchancellor. Briefly the Camerlengo of the Holy Roman Church was, for the Papal States, Minister of Finance, Public Works, and Commerce. From the sixteenth century the office was purchasable from the Papal Government. Cardinal Cibo bought it in 1521 for 35,000 *scudi;* Cardinal Vitellozzo, under Pius IV, for 70,000 *scudi*, and under Pius V Cardinal Cornaro paid as much for the place; the revenue thus gained served to keep up the wars against the Turks, etc. By the Constitution "Post Diuturnos" Pius VII restricted greatly the authority of the camerlengo, in keeping with the thorough reorganization of the Papal Government undertaken by him. Between the death of the pope and the election of his successor (*sede vacante*) the cardinal-camerlengo is the head of the Sacred College. It is his duty to verify the death of the pope (see POPE), to direct the preparations for the Conclave, and to take charge of the same.

(2) *The Camerlengo of the Sacred College* (of Cardinals) does not antedate Leo X (1513–21). He administers all fees and revenues belonging to the College of Cardinals, pontificates at the requiem Mass for a deceased cardinal, and is charged with the registry of the "Acta Concistoralia" (see CONSISTORY, PAPAL). (3) *The Camerlengo of the Roman Clergy* is elected by the canons and parish priests of Rome; he has an honorary place in the great processions, presides over the ecclesiastical conferences of the parochial clergy, acts as arbiter in all questions of precedence, and administers the "oath of free estate" (*juramentum de statu libero*), obligatory on persons desirous of marrying.

BOUIX, *De Curiâ romanâ* (Paris, 1880); BANGEN, *Die römische Curie* (Münster, 1854); HUMPHREY, *Urbs et Orbis* (London, 1899), 359–60.

U. BENIGNI.

Camilleri, G. M. See GOZO, DIOCESE OF.

Camillus de Lellis, SAINT, b. at Bacchianico, Naples, 1550; d. at Rome, 14 July, 1614. He was the son of an officer who had served both in the Neapolitan and French armies. His mother died when he was a child, and he grew up absolutely neglected. When still a youth he became a soldier in the service of Venice and afterwards of Naples, until 1574, when his regiment was disbanded. While in the service he became a confirmed gambler, and in consequence of his losses at play was at times reduced to a condition of destitution. The kindness of a Franciscan friar induced him to apply for admission to that order, but he was refused. He then betook himself to Rome, where he obtained employment in the Hospital for Incurables. He was prompted to go there chiefly by the hope of a cure of abscesses in both his feet from which he had been long suffering. He was dismissed from the hospital on account of his quarrelsome disposition and his passion for gambling. He again became a Venetian soldier, and took part in the campaign against the Turks in 1569. After the war he was employed by the Capuchins at Manfredonia on a new building which they were erecting. His old gambling habit still pursued him, until a discourse of the guardian of the convent so startled him that he determined to reform. He was admitted to the order as a lay brother, but was soon dismissed on account of his infirmity. He betook himself again to Rome, where he entered the hospital in which he had previously been, and after a temporary cure of his ailment became a nurse, and winning the admiration of the institution by his piety and prudence, he was appointed director of the hospital.

While in this office, he attempted to found an order of lay infirmarians, but the scheme was opposed, and on the advice of his friends, among whom was his spiritual guide, St. Philip Neri, he determined to become a

priest. He was then thirty-two years of age and began the study of Latin at the Jesuit College in Rome. He afterwards established his order, the Fathers of a Good Death (1584), and bound the members by vow to devote themselves to the plague-stricken; their work was not restricted to the hospitals, but included the care of the sick in their homes. Pope Sixtus V confirmed the congregation in 1586, and ordained that there should be an election of a general superior every three years. Camillus was naturally the first, and was succeeded by an Englishman, named Roger. Two years afterwards a house was established in Naples, and there two of the community won the glory of being the first martyrs of charity of the congregation, by dying in the fleet which had been quarantined off the harbour, and which they had visited to nurse the sick. In 1591 Gregory XIV erected the congregation into a religious order, with all the privileges of the mendicants. It was again confirmed as such by Clement VIII, in 1592. The infirmity which had prevented his entrance among the Capuchins continued to afflict Camillus for forty-six years, and his other ailments contributed to make his life one of uninterrupted suffering, but he would permit no one to wait on him, and when scarcely able to stand would crawl out of his bed to visit the sick. He resigned the generalship of the order, in 1607, in order to have more leisure for the sick and poor. Meantime he had established many houses in various cities of Italy. He is said to have had the gift of miracles and prophecy. He died at the age of sixty-four while pronouncing a moving appeal to his religious brethren. He was buried near the high altar of the church of St. Mary Magdalen, at Rome, and, when the miracles which were attributed to him were officially approved, his body was placed under the altar itself. He was beatified in 1742, and in 1746 was canonized by Benedict XIV.

BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints* (Derby, 1845); *Bullar. Roman.*, XVI, 83; CICATELLO, *Life of St. Camillus* (Rome, 1749); GOSCHLER, *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1869), III.

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Camisards (probably from *camise*, a black blouse worn as a uniform), a sect of French fanatics who terrorized Dauphiné, Vivarais, and chiefly the Cévennes in the beginning of the eighteenth century. Their origin was due to various causes: the Albigensian spirit which had not completely died out in that region, and which caused Pope Clement XI to style the Camisards "that execrable race of ancient Albigenses"; the apocalyptic preaching and literature of the French Calvinists, such as Jurieu's "Accomplissement des prophéties", on which they were nourished; and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), along with the singular methods of conversion employed by the agents of Louis XIV. If the Camisards withstood the armies of Louis for wellnigh two decades, the reason is to be found in the desultory manner of warfare which the latter adopted, in the failure of Louis' generals, de Broglie, Montrevel, Villars, etc., properly to realize the danger of the situation, and also, to a very great extent, in the support given them by the Protestant house of Nassau, then in control of Holland and England. The insurrection began in the Cévennes. Du Serre, an old Calvinist of Dieulefit in Dauphiné, became suddenly "inspired", and his religious hysteria spread rapidly. The murder of the Abbé de Chaila, inspector of the missions in Cévennes, in 1702, was tantamount to a declaration of war. Armed bands led by Séguier, Laporte, Castanet, Ravenel, Cavalier, and others carried on a sort of guerilla warfare till about 1705, when they either surrendered or were destroyed. In 1709 Cavalier, who had sought refuge in England, tried, though without much success, to rekindle the revolt in Vivarais. There were a few more disturbances as late as 1711, when a treaty of peace with England deprived the Camisards of a powerful support. On the 8th of March, 1715, by medals and a proclamation, Louis XIV announced the entire extinction of the sect.

Much has been written on the "prophets" of the Camisard uprising. Fléchier and Brueys believed in a school of prophets, wherein Du Serre gave a systematic training, chiefly to young recruits. The prophetic inspiration, of which there were four degrees, *avertissement*, *souffle*, *prophéties*, *dons*, was communicated by breathing upon subjects who had gone through severe macerations, memorized long Biblical texts and formulæ of imprecation, learned to perform the strangest contortions, and generally wrought themselves into a sort of trance. On the other hand, Court and Arnauld, themselves Calvinists, deny the very existence of such a school. They cast aside as obviously fraudulent a number of so-called spiritual manifestations. The rest they trace to an overheated imagination, pietism, excessive fasts, the reading of the Prophets and Jurieu's pastoral letters, and also to the peculiar temperament of those Southern mountaineers. If such is the case, there is no need of admitting with Görres, Mirville, and H. Blanc supernatural influences—diabolical, of course —to account for the Camisards' antics.

Though Calvinists, the Camisards should not be too closely identified with Calvinism. Many Calvinists condemned their cruelties and despised their visions. The Synod of Nîmes, 1715, enacted two statutes, evidently aimed at the Camisards: that women and unauthorized persons be debarred from preaching; and that Holy Scripture be adopted as the sole rule of faith and source of preaching. Fourteen years after that synod Court had organized in Languedoc a strong Calvinist community, in which no traces of the Camisard spirit could be discerned. It is true that those who had fled to England did try to propagate their "mystical phalanx" in London, and published in 1707, in the British capital, a mass of Camisard literature: "Le théâtre sacré des Cévennes"; "A cry from the desert"; etc.; but the Consistory of the French Church in the Savoy pronounced their ecstasies to be assumed habits. Voltaire (Siècle de Louis XIV, xxxvi) relates that Elie Marion, one of the refugees, became unpopular, both on account of his writings (*avertissements prophétiques*) and false miracles, and was at last compelled to leave England. Catholics, too, organized under the name of White Camisards, or Cadets of the Cross, the better to check the black Camisards, but they soon fell into atrocities similar to those they sought to punish, and were disowned by Montrevel.

FLÉCHIER, *Récit fidèle* in *Lettres choisies* (Lyons, 1715); BRUEYS, *Hist. du fanatisme de notre temps* (Montpellier, 1713); CAVALIER, *Mem. of the Wars of the Cévennes* (London, 1726); COURT, *Hist. des troubles des Cévennes* (Alais, 1819); BLANC, *De l'inspir. des Camisards* (Paris, 1859); DUBOIS, *Sur les prophètes Cévenols* (Strasburg, 1861); ARNAULD, *Hist. des protestants de Dauphiné* (Paris, 1876); LEGRELLE, *La révolte des Camisards* (Braine-le-Comte, 1897). See also ROSBACH in *Hist. gén. du Languedoc*, XIII; MONIN in *La grande encycl.*, s. v.; VERNET in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Camões (or CAMOENS), LUIS VAZ DE, b. in 1524 or 1525; d. 10 June, 1580. The most sublime figure in the history of Portuguese literature, Camões owes his lasting fame to his epic poem "Os Lusiadas," (The Lusiads); he is remarkable also for the degree of art attained in his lyrics, less noteworthy for his dramas. A wretched exile during a large part of his lifetime, he has, like Dante, enjoyed an abundance of fame since his death; his followers have been legion, and his memory has begot many fabulous legends. Actual facts regarding his career are not easily obtained. There are but few documentary sources of information regarding him, and these are

concerned simply (1) with the trifling pension which King Sebastian bestowed upon him and which Philip II continued in favour of his mother, who survived him; (2) with his imprisonment as a result of an assault made by him upon a public official; and (3) with the publication of "The Lusiads". Personal references contained in various letters and in his literary works, all of a certain autobiographical value, provide further data.

Camões came of a reduced noble family. The place of his birth has been the subject of contention, but in all probability he was born at Coimbra. He belonged to the same stock as the noted explorer, Vasco da Gama, who is so important in "The Lusiads". His father was a sea-captain who died at Goa in India as the result of a shipwreck, soon after the birth of Luiz. It seems likely that the poet received his training at the University of Coimbra, where his uncle, Bento de Camões, was chancellor for several years. Some early love lyrics, Platonic of inspiration and Petrarchian in form, date back to his college days. Passing to the court at Lisbon, he there fell in love with Catherina de Athaide, a lady of the queen's suite. Catherina, the Natercia (anagram of Caterina) of his lyrics, responded to his suit, but those in authority opposed it, and Camões, meeting their resistance with words of wrath and violent deeds, was ere long banished from the court. For two or three years, that is between 1546 and 1549, he fought in the campaign in Africa and there lost one of his eyes, which was struck by a splinter from a cannon. Back once again in Lisbon, he found himself utterly neglected, and in his despair he proceeded to lead a disorderly life. Wounding an officer of the royal court, he was incarcerated for some months and was released in March of 1553 only on condition that he go to India as a soldier. Forthwith he departed, a private in the ranks, on his way to the region which his great kinsman had made known to the Occident. In the East his career was full of the greatest vicissitudes. At one time fighting valiantly against the natives, he was again languishing in jail on a charge of malfeasance in office while occupying a governmental post in Macao; he entered into a new love affair with a native, either before or soon after the death of Catherina (1556); now rolling in wealth, he was again overwhelmed with debt, and he was always gaining more enemies by his too ready pen and tongue; seldom stationary anywhere for long, he engaged in long journeys which took him as far as Malacca and the Moluccas, and upon one occasion he escaped death by shipwreck only through his powers as a swimmer. Finally, in 1567, he began the return trip to Portugal. Stopping at Mozambique in his course, he there spent two years, a prey to disease and dire poverty. With the help of generous friends he continued his journey and reached Lisbon in 1570, after an absence of sixteen years. There was no welcome for Portugal's greatest bard in a capital that had just been visited by plague, and was governed by that visionary and heedless young monarch, Dom Sebastian; but Camões, publishing his epic, dedicated it to the king and was rewarded with a meagre royal pension. His last gloomy years were spent near his aged mother, and he died, heart-broken at the misfortune that had come to his beloved land with the great disaster of Alcacer-Kebir, where Sebastian and the flower of the Portuguese nobility went to their doom.

Luis Vaz de Camões

It is possible that Camões had conceived the purpose of writing an epic poem as early as his student days, and there are reasons for supposing that he had composed some passages of "The Lusiads" before 1544; but in all likelihood the idea of making Vasco da Gama's voyage of discovery the central point of his work occurred first to him during the voyage to India in 1553. During that trip and on the return, with the delay at Mozambique, he could acquire that familiarity with the ocean and with the coast of Africa which is clear in some of his most striking octaves; but it was during the long sojourn in India that he gave shape to the major part of the epic. Adopting a metrical form—the octave—of which the Italian Ariosto had proved the pliancy, and modelling his epic style on that of Vergil, Camões set up as his hero the whole Lusitanian people, the sons of Lusus, whence the title, "Os Lusiadas". His purpose was a serious one; he desired to abide by the sober reality of his country's history, which, in poetic speech, is related in a long series of stanzas by Vasco da Gama himself. From first to last the ten cantos of the work glow with patriotic fervour inspired by the genuine achievements of the poet's compatriots. But, side by side with chronicled fact, there appears also a somewhat complicated mythological machinery. Venus, the friend of the wandering Portuguese; Bacchus, their enemy; Mars, Jupiter, deities of the sea, and a number of symbolical figures play a large part in the fortunes of Vasco da Gama's nautical expedition, and at times the union of Christian belief and pagan fable is carried to absurd extremes, as when Bacchus is made to assume the form of a Christian priest and offer a feigned worship to the Christian God. For the introduction of pagan mythology into a Christian and historical epic Camões has been harshly censured by many; yet it must be admitted that much of the charm of the poem is to be found in just those parts in which the mythological elements abound. It is interesting, furthermore, to note that the ecclesiastical authorities, as represented by the Dominican Ferreira, who examined the manuscript and gave the necessary permission to print the book, found nothing contrary to faith or morals in it; the mythology was regarded as a mere poetic fiction. The action of the poem is not of great extent, yielding often to passages of narration and description; of course it is developed in accord with the events of Vasco da Gama's voyage along the African coast to Mombaça and Melinde, on to Calicut in India, and back again over the ocean to Portugal. The chief edition of "The Lusiads" is that of 1572, prepared by the poet himself; the modern editions still leave much to be desired in the way of critical apparatus.

It has been the lot of Camões, the epic bard, to be more talked of and written about by foreigners than he is read by them. Hence the uncertainty of opinion regarding his proper rank among modern poets. There is, however, no need of depreciating Ariosto, or Tasso, or any others who have essayed the epic, in order to render to Camões his just deserts. In artistic feeling and accomplishments he is doubtless not the equal of several among them; as the exponent of patriotic pride in national endeavour and sturdy enterprise, and as the greatest master of Portuguese poetic style and diction, he will ever command the admiration of his countrymen and of all who love what is best in literature. The mass of lyrics still attributed to Camões requires much deliberate sifting;

fully a fifth part of it is probably not his work. The poems that may with certainty be ascribed to him follow, as has been said, the Petrarchian model. They comprise sonnets, odes, elegies, eclogues, *canções, redondilhas*, and the like, and in sentiment reflect the moods and passions of the poet's mind and heart throughout the periods of his varied and ill-starred life. He produced three comedies in verse, which are of decided merit as compared with the pieces hitherto written in Portuguese, but yet show no transcendent powers as a dramatist on his part. One of them, the "Filodemo", gives scenic setting to the plot of a medieval story of love and adventurous travel; another, the "Rei Seleuco", takes up a love episode in the life of the Syrian King Seleucus and his son Antiochus, which had been narrated by Plutarch and treated by Petrarch and many other poets; the third and best of all, the "Enfatriões" (or "Amphitryões"), is a free and attractive rendering of the "Amphitruo" of Plautus.

Os Lusiadas, ed. von Reinhardstöttner (Strasburg, 1874); *Os Lusiadas*, ed. Braga (Lisbon, 1898), a photolithographic reproduction of the edition of Lisbon, 1572; *Os Lusiadas de Loys de Camões, co tôdas as liçẽcas necessarias, em Lisboa por Pedro Crasbeeck, Impressor del Rey, An. 1626*, a facsimile from a copy in the library of A. Huntington, New York (De Vinne Press, 1903); *Os Lusiadas*, tr. into English verse by Aubertin (2 vols., London, 1878); *The Lusiad*, tr. Mickle (London, 1809); *The Lusiad, Books I-V*, tr. Quillinan (London, 1853); *Os Lusiadas*, tr. Burton (London, 1880); *Camões' Lyricks*, tr. Burton (London, 1884); Strangford, *Poems from the Portuguese of L. de C.* (4th ed., London and Philadelphia, 1805); Adamson, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of L. de C.* (2 vols., London, 1820); Shelley, *Lives of the Most Eminent Literary and Scientific Men*, etc. (London, 1835), III, 295 sq.; Braga, *Bibliographia Camoniana* (Lisbon, 1880); de Brito Aranha in da Silva, *Diccionario bibl. portuguez* (1886), s. v. *L. de C.*; Almeida-Garrett, *Camoens* (7th ed., Oporto, 1880); de Petris, *Il Petrarca nelle liriche del Camoens, saggio critico* (Atri, 1906); von Reinhardstöttner, *Die plautinischen Lustspiele in späteren Bearbeitungen*, I, *Amphitruo* (Leipzig, 1880); de Vasconcellos, *L. de C.*, in Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* (Strasburg, 1897), II, Part 2, s. v. *L. de C.*

J. D. M. Ford.

Campagna, Diocese of. See Conza.

Campagna, Girolamo, b. in Verona, 1552; d. about 1623 or 1625. He was an able, but not strikingly individual sculptor of Northern Italy. He studied under Jacopo Sansovino and Danese Cattaneo, and completed many of the latter's works. To him we owe the figure of Doge Leonardo Loredano on the tomb which Cattaneo made at SS. Giovanni e Paolo, Venice. After his master's death, Campagna went to Padua where he secured the commission intended for Cattaneo in the church of St. Anthony. This was his masterpiece, a bas-relief of the saint bringing back to life a man who had been murdered. Some years later Campagna made another trip to Padua and wrought the bronze tabernacle for the chapel of the Blessed Sacrament. The greater part of his life was spent in Venice, and there we have the majority of his works: the statues of St. Francis and St. Clare bearing the ostensorium at Santa Maria de' Miracoli; that of St. Giustina over the door of the Arsenal, commemorating the battle of Lepanto, which occurred on her feast-day (7 October, 1571), during Campagna's lifetime; the colossal St. Sebastian at the Zecca; the figures of Our Lady, the Archangel Gabriel and patron saints of Venice, in relief on the Ponte di Rialto; the group in bronze of Christ on a globe, supported by the Four Evangelists at San Giorgio Maggiore. In Verona there is a good Annunciation over the portal of the old Palazzo del Consiglio and a Madonna at the Collegio dei Mercatanti.

Perkins, *Italian Sculptors* (London and New York); Idem, *Historical Handbook of Italian Sculpture* (New York, 1883).

M. L. Handley.

Campagnola, Domenico, painter of the Venetian school, b. at Padua in 1482; date of death unascertained. This excellent artist was one of the cleverest pupils of the School of Titian, and was so proficient that he is said to have aroused the jealousy of his master. He was also an expert engraver, and is known to have executed etchings and woodcuts. His fresco paintings are to be seen in the Scuola del Santo at Padua and in Venice. They are marked by fresh animated colour, strong poetic sympathy, and easy brilliant technic. He is said to have been even more daring than Titian in the manner in which he drew the nude figure. A fine panel picture by him representing Adam and Eve is in the Pitti Palace, Florence. He was also a painter of landscapes which so closely resemble the works of Titian that they are often attributed to that artist. Many of these landscapes have been engraved by Corneille. His etchings, ten of which are known, almost all bear the same date, 1517. On some his name appears in full, on others abbreviated Do.Cap. or Do.Camp.

For his work as an engraver, see Ottley, *Inquiry into the Origin and Early History of Engraving;* Passavant, *Peintre-Graveur;* Galichon, *Life of Giulio Campagnola* (1862). For his paintings, see Lanzi, *Storia pittorica dell' Italia;* Ridolfi, *Le Maraviglie dell' arte.*

George Charles Williamson.

Campan, Jeanne-Louise-Henriette, *née* Genest (known as Madame Campan), a French educator, b. 6 November, 1752, at Paris; d. in 1822, at Mantes. She was carefully educated under the direction of her father, a head-clerk in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in whose house she met such distinguished men of letters as Duclos, Marmontel, and Thomas. At the age of fifteen she spoke English and Italian, and read so well that she was appointed reader to the young princesses, Victoire, Sophie, and Louise, the daughters of Louis XV. Soon afterwards she married M. Campan, whose father was secretary to the queen's cabinet. On that occasion Louis XV gave her an annual income of 5000 livres ($1000) as dowry. She then entered the service of Marie-Antoinette, as first lady of the bed-chamber (1770), and retained that position till 20 June, 1792. When the unfortunate queen was sent to prison, Mme Campan courageously asked to be allowed to share her sad lot. Her request was denied, and she retired to Coubertin, a small village in the Chevreuse valley. She found herself in straitened circumstances, having to provide for her young son and for her husband who was heavily in debt and in poor health. With a nun as associate she established a boarding-school for girls at Saint-Germain, which soon achieved success and counted among its pupils Hortense de Beauharnais, the daughter of Joséphine. Napoleon was so much pleased with the order, elegance, and distinction of the school that he appointed Mme Campan superintendent of the Imperial Academy of Ecouen, founded for the education of the daughters of members of the Legion of Honour (Dec., 1807). She adopted the programme of the old Saint-Cyr house, modifying it to suit the new conditions. Her chief aim was to train girls to be useful women and good mothers. In 1814 the school was abolished and Mme Campan bitterly denounced as a traitor by the Royalists, because she had accepted the favours of the "usurper". She retired to Mantes and spent her time in writing didactic and historical essays. Mme Campan's principal works are: "Mémoires sur la vie de Marie-Antoinette, suivis de souvenirs et anecdotes sur le règne de Louis XIV et de Louis XV" (3 vols., Paris, 1823); "Lettres de deux jeunes filles" (1811); "L'éducation des femmes" (1823); "Conversations d'une mère avec ses filles" (1804); "Nouvelles et comédies à l'usage de la jeunesse" (1823). These four books have been published under the title of "Œuvres complètes de Mme Campan sur l'éducation" (Paris, 1823).

Journal anecdotique de Mme Campan, ou souvenirs recueillis de ses entretiens, ed. Maigne (1823); Barrère, *Notice sur Ma-*

dame Campan in the first volume of her memoirs; D'AUBIER, *Observations sur les mémoires de Mme Campan* (Paris, 1823).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Campaña, PEDRO, Flemish painter, known in France as Pierre de Champagne, and in Brussels as Pieter de Kempeneer (his actual name), or, as translated into Flemish, Van de Velde, b. at Brussels in 1503; d. there in 1580, after spending the greater part of his life in Spain. He is said to have been a pupil of Raphael, but it is exceedingly doubtful whether this was the case. In his early days he spent some time in Italy, especially in Venice, Rome, and Bologna, and studied very closely the paintings of Raphael. In 1530 he decorated the triumphal arch erected at Bologna for the coronation of Charles V. Under the protection of Cardinal Grimani he went to Spain, sojourned in Seville between 1537 and 1552, and there established a school of painting in conjunction with Louis de Vergas and the Italian sculptor Torrigiano. This school eventually became an academy and numbered among its pupils the illustrious Morales. Campaña's masterpiece is the "Descent from the Cross", painted in 1548 for the church of Santa Cruz and removed to the Seville cathedral when the former church was destroyed. This painting was enthusiastically admired by Murillo, who highly appreciated its life-like qualities and desired to be buried below the picture. There are two other paintings by Campaña in the same cathedral and important works at Carmoña and Triana. Campaña returned to Brussels about 1564.

His pictures were all painted on panel, and are irreproachable in accurate draftsmanship, admirable in composition, and vigorous in execution. The luminous quality of their colour-scheme recalls the best Italian work, and the finest paintings are dignified and life-like, full of strength and power. There are five of his best pictures in the churches of Seville, and his work can also be studied in Berlin and Paris.

BRYAN, *Dict. of Painters and Engravers* (London—New York, 1903); CONWAY, *Flemish Painters;* BERMUDEZ, *Diccionario Histórico* (Madrid, 1800); BLANC, *Histoire des Peintres* (Paris, 1854); GESTOSO, *Diccionario de Artistas* (Madrid, s. d.); HARTLEY, *Spanish Painting* (London, 1904).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Campanella, TOMMASO (baptized GIOVANNI DOMENICO), Dominican philosopher and writer, b. 5 Sept., 1568, at Stilo in the province of Calabria, Italy; d. at Paris, 21 May, 1659. He was a facile writer of prose and verse at the age of thirteen, and when not yet fifteen entered the Dominican Order, attracted by the fame of Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. With a predilection for philosophical inquiry, he was sent to different convents to hear the best masters. Campanella wrote his first work, "Philosophia sensibus demonstrata" (Naples, 1590) in defence of the naturalistic philosopher Bernardino Telesio. He next went to Rome and afterwards to the University of Padua, from Oct., 1592, to the end of 1594. An ardent and somewhat captious temperament led him into the expression of views offensive to many of the older and newer schools alike. He was especially vigorous in his opposition to the authority of Aristotle, and was cited before the Holy Office at Rome, where he was detained till 1597. Some accounts speak of his having been accused of magic and of his fleeing to Florence, Venice, Padua, and Bologna, thence back to Naples and Stilo. Continuing to lecture and write, however, he retained favour in certain circles. At length, in Sept., 1599, he was seized as the head of a conspiracy against the Spanish rule. In the trial at Naples, involving many persons, lay and ecclesiastical, he was charged with divers heresies and with aiming to set up a communistic commonwealth. Arraigned before an ecclesiastical tribunal, he was at the same time harassed and put to torture by a political court. On 8 Jan., 1603, he was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. Among several who sought to obtain his liberation was Pope Paul V. In the meantime the viceroy, Giron, who used to visit Campanella in prison, seeking his counsel about matters of state, became involved in trouble. In his endeavours to extricate himself he laid the blame largely on Campanella, who was again subjected to many indignities. Through Pope Urban VIII, who applied directly to Philip IV of Spain, the unfortunate prisoner was at last released from his Neapolitan captivity, 15 May, 1626, an event which was commemorated by Gabriel Naudé in his "Panegyricus" (Paris, 1644). He was taken to Rome and held for a time by the Holy Office, but was restored to full liberty, 6 April, 1629. In 1634 another Calabrian conspiracy under one of Campanella's followers threatened fresh complications. With the aid of Cardinal Barberini and the French ambassador, De Noailles, Campanella, disguised as a Minim, withdrew to France. Louis XIII and Richelieu received him with marked favour, the latter granting him a liberal pension. He spent the rest of his days, enjoying papal favour, in the Dominican convent of St-Honoré at Paris.

Of the life and character of Campanella, conflicting estimates are given. He was well thought of by Popes Clement VIII, Paul V, and Urban VIII. Cardinal Pallavicini declared him a "man who had read all things and who remembered all things; of mighty but indomitable character." In faith and theological allegiance he was held above suspicion by Juan De Lugo, afterwards cardinal; Théophile Raynaud considered him heretical. Vincent Baron, O. P., who knew him well, gave a careful eulogy of him as skilled in mathematics, astrology, medicine, and other sciences; more famous, perhaps, than he deserved to be, but still a man of extraordinary gifts. John Addington Symonds, who translated a book of his sonnets (Sonnets of Michael Angelo Buonarotti and Tommaso Campanella, London, 1878), refers to him as the "audacious Titan of the modern age, possessing essentially a combative intellect; a poet and philosopher militant, who stood alone making war upon the authority of Aristotle in science, of Machiavelli in statecraft, and of Petrarch in art". His *nunquam tacebo* is evidenced in almost every act and utterance of his strange career. Campanella's work is critical and composite rather than constructive and original. It exhibits an almost encyclopedic acquaintance with all the known sciences of his day. His doctrine does not form a system, but discloses a syncretic adaptation of certain fundamental principles of St. Thomas Aquinas and Albert the Great, modified by original opinions and fused with ideas, often unsound and bizarre, borrowed from Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Empedocles, the Christian mystics, and the Jewish and Arabic schools of thought. He aimed to reconstruct scholastic philosophy, but, lacking grasp and depth, his judgment was often obscured by an untempered imagination, and his writings, of widest scope, abound in the inequalities of undisciplined genius. With the fondness of the Renaissance for disputation and innovation, he was also singularly swayed by the popular pseudo-science of judicial astrology. Unlike Bruno, however, he remained loyal to his order and to the Church.

In his theologico-cosmological theory, being, both created and Divine, is invested with three primordial properties: power, wisdom, and love. Non-being is characterized by impotence, darkness, and odium or metaphysical aversion. In God, Who is pure being, simple and infinite, the three properties of being exist and subsist in simplest unity to the absolute exclusion of non-being and its attributes. Creatures participate in God's wisdom, power, and love; but, because derived from nothingness, their essence

is a mixture of being and non-being. The Divine, impressed upon, immanent in, and shared by, finite natures, is the principle, the sufficient reason, and the measure of their relative perfection and of their development in time and space. The universe is vivified, directed, and governed by a universal soul of sense and intelligence. The world is as a living statue of God. The sun and the earth are its principal parts and the common source of animal life and movement, and of the sensation which is also found in all material things, light, air, metals, and wood. Prior to Descartes, to whom he was otherwise superior in erudition, Campanella demonstrated the absurdity of scepticism and undertook to establish by psychologico-ontological argument the existence of God against Atheism. In the field of natural science Campanella preceded Bacon in insisting on the direct observation and experimental study of nature. It is noteworthy that whilst Bacon rejected the astronomical theory of Galileo, Campanella favoured it, and wrote a brilliant defence of his author. In his treatise, "De Monarchiâ Hispanicâ" ["A Discourse touching the Spanish Monarchy", tr. by Edmund Chilmead (London, 1654) and again by Wm. Prynne (ibid., 1660)], Campanella evinces, among ideas singularly strange and erroneous, considerable practical knowledge of civil government. To extend Spanish rule in Europe he advised intermarriage of the Spaniards with other nationalities, urged the establishment of schools of astronomy, mathematics, mechanics, etc., and the immediate opening of naval colleges to develop the resources of the New World and further the interests of its inhabitants. In general he advocated natural honesty and justice and the universal love of God and man in place of the utilitarian principles and egoism of Machiavelli.

Because of its political character, his "Civitas Solis" (City of the Sun), is the most celebrated of his works. It appears in "Ideal Commonwealths" (New York, 1901) and in "Ideal Empires and Republics" (Washington and London, 1901). It was probably intended by Campanella as a philosophical fiction, like Plato's "Republic" and More's "Utopia", for its essentially communistic delineation, and advocacy, of goods, education, women, labour, and all necessaries in common could hardly represent the true mind of an author who, after all, was faithful to at least the spirit of Christianity, and who vehemently resisted the rationalistic trend of his contemporaries. Various lists, some furnished by Campanella himself, show him to have been the author of about eighty-eight works. The more important are: "Prodromus Philosophiæ instaurandæ" (Frankfort, 1617); "Philosophiæ rationalis partes quinque" (Paris, 1638); "Realis philosophiæ epilogisticæ partes quatuor" (which contains the "Civitas Solis", Frankfort, 1623); "Medicinalium juxta propria principia libri VII" (Lyons, 1635); "Astrologicorum libri VI" (Lyons, 1629); "Apologia pro Galileo mathematico" (Frankfort, 1622); "Atheismus triumphatus" (Rome, 1631); "De prædestinatione, electione, reprobatione et auxiliis divinæ gratiæ, cento thomisticus" (Paris, 1636). Numerous unpublished MSS. are preserved in the archives of the Dominican Order at Rome.

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *Scriptores Ord. Præd.* (Paris, 1721), II, 505–521; MANDONNET in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1904), s. v., who furnishes a comprehensive bibliography especially of Italian works; GONZALEZ, *Hist., de la Philosophie*, tr. PASCAL (Paris, 1891), III, 191; TURNER, *Hist. of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903), 430; UEBERWEG, *Hist. of Philosophy*, tr. MORRIS (New York, 1903), II, 20, 28, 29, 465, 470; MICHAUD, *Biog. univ.* (Paris, 1880), VI, 491.

JOHN R. VOLZ.

Campani, GIUSEPPE, an Italian optician and astronomer who lived in Rome during the latter half of the seventeenth century. His brother, Matteo Campani-Alimensis, and he were experts in grinding and polishing lenses, especially those of great focal length and slight curvature. These lenses were used in long telescopes of considerable power. The astronomer Cassini made his discoveries with these lenses. Campani also made many observations himself. Cassini called his attention to the spots on Jupiter, and he disputed with Eustachio Divini, an Italian optician, the priority for their discovery. His astronomical observations and the descriptions of his telescopes are detailed in the following papers: "Ragguaglio di due nuovi osservazioni, una celeste in ordine alla stella di Saturno, e terrestre l'altra in ordine agl' instrumenti" (Rome, 1664, and again in 1665); "Lettere di G. C. al sig. Giovanni Domenico Cassini intorno alle ombre delle stelle Medicee nel volto di Giove, ed altri nuovi fenomeni celesti scoperti co' suoi occhiali" (Rome, 1666).

His brother, mentioned above, is also noted as a mechanician for his work on clocks. He was a priest in charge of a parish in Rome. Louis XIV of France ordered several long-focus lenses (86, 100, 136 feet respectively) for Cassini, who discovered with their aid additional satellites of Saturn.

JÖCHER (ADELUNG), *Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexicon;* AUZOUT, *Lettre à l'abbé Charles.*

WILLIAM FOX.

Campanile. See BELFRY.

Campeche, DIOCESE OF, in the State of Campeche, Republic of Mexico, suffragan of the Archdiocese of Yucatan (see YUCATAN). It was created 24 March, 1895, by division of the Diocese of Yucatan. Its territory includes the western portion of the Peninsula of Yucatan, and in the north is mainly a plain, from which rise the heights of Sierra Alta. Broad savannahs and dense forests abound. The southern part is abundantly watered by running streams. The Spanish captain, Hernández de Córdova, and the pilot, Anton de Alaminos, discovered (20 March, 1517) a seaside village inhabited by Maya Indians, and known to the natives as Ah Kin Pech, which the Spaniards translated *Campeche*, often anglicized as *Campeachy*. In 1540 Captain Montejo, with thirty Spaniards, founded on this site a seaport town. A church was at once begun (Santa María de la Concepción, the present cathedral); the first priest was Francisco Hernández, Montejo's chaplain. Later on a storm drove upon the Campeche coast the vessel in which Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, Bishop of Chiapas, was returning to his diocese; this illustrious man was therefore the first bishop to visit Campeche. Its first missionaries were Franciscans; in 1715 the Jesuits came to Campeche, but were expelled 12 June, 1767.

The diocese is bounded on the north by the Diocese of Yucatan; on the south by the Archdiocese of Guatemala and the Vicariate Apostolic of Belize; on the south-east and west by the Dioceses of Chiapas and Tabasco, and by the Gulf of Mexico. It has a population of about 100,000, with twenty-three parishes. The third bishop, Don Francisco Mendoza y Herrera, who was appointed 17 January, 1905, opened a diocesan seminary and three colleges, and built an episcopal residence. Since 1901 there has been in the Diocese of Campeche a small group of non-Catholics. The episcopal city, Campeche, situated on the bay of that name, about ninety miles south-west of Mérida, has about 16,000 inhabitants, two parishes, and twelve churches. The chief exports are maize, sugar, sisal-hemp, salt, wax, logwood, and mahogany. Ship-carpentry is the principal local industry, the harbour, though shallow, being quite capacious.

Gerarchia Cattolica (Rome, 1907); BATTANDIER, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1907), 217; *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1907), Foreign, 187.

ALBERTO MARCILLA.

Campeggio, Lorenzo, Cardinal, an eminent canonist, ecclesiastical diplomat, and reformer, b. 1472 (1474) at Bologna, the son of Giovanni Campeggio, a famous civil lawyer; d. at Rome, 25 July, 1539. He studied civil law under his father at Padua and Bologna, and in due course married and had a family of five children. After the death of his wife (1509), he entered the ecclesiastical state. In 1512 he was appointed to the Bishopric of Feltre by Julius II, and was made auditor of the Rota, at that time the supreme court of justice in the Church, and the universal court of appeal. Thenceforth till his death he took a leading part as papal representative in some of the greatest events of the Reformation, especially in Southern Germany and England. In 1513 he was sent by Leo X as Nuncio to Maximilian I, to bring about peace among the Christian princes and unite them in a crusade against the Turks. While still in Germany he was nominated cardinal (1 July, 1517), at first of the Title of San Tommaso in Parione, afterwards of Sant' Anastasia, and finally of Santa Maria in Trastevere. Returning to Rome, he was sent as cardinal legate to England for the purpose of engaging Henry VIII in the crusade. He set out on his journey in the middle of April, 1518, but was not allowed to enter England until the end of July. The delay arose from Henry's objection to the presence of a foreign legate within his dominions. The pope agreed that Campeggio should share the legatine powers with Wolsey, who was his senior in the Sacred College. Accordingly the two cardinals worked together, though Wolsey managed to secure the precedence. The main object of Campeggio's mission was not accomplished; instead of a universal league against the Turk, Wolsey arranged an alliance between France and England. He also contrived to obtain an extension of his legatine powers for three years and afterwards for life. Campeggio made a favourable impression on Henry, who bestowed upon him the Bishopric of Salisbury (which he held until 1534) and the Roman residence now known as the Giraud-Torlonia palace, then recently built from Bramante's designs.

Lorenzo Cardinal Campeggio

On his return to Rome (28 November, 1519), Campeggio was appointed to the *Segnatura*, at that time a post of the highest dignity and power. When Adrian VI was elected pope (1522), many plans for reform of the abuses in the Church were submitted to him. One of the best and most thorough-going of these was that of Campeggio. He boldly declared that the chief source of all the evils was the Roman Curia, of which, as has been stated, he was himself a most influential member. He recommended that the powers of the Dataria, whose officials he styled "bloodsuckers", should be greatly curtailed; that benefices should not be combined, or reserved, or held *in commendam;* and that none but able and virtuous men should be appointed to them. He bewailed the fact that the Holy See had, by means of concordats, surrendered the rights of the Church to the secular powers. He spoke strongly against the reckless granting of indulgences: especially against those of the Franciscans, and those connected with the contributions towards the building of St. Peter's in Rome. As one who had held high diplomatic posts, he urged the importance of peace between the Emperor Charles V and Francis I of France, so that these two great monarchs might join hands against the common enemy, the Turk. He also pleaded strongly for the extirpation of the Lutheran errors by the enforcement of the Edict of Worms. Adrian's pontificate was too short to enable him to carry out any of the proposed reforms. His successor, Clement VII, appointed Campeggio to the See of Bologna and sent him to Germany as cardinal legate (8 January, 1524).

Campeggio soon had reason to note the vast changes which had taken place since his former visit. At Augsburg he was grossly insulted by the populace: at Nuremberg he was obliged to dispense with the ceremonies of a public entry. He adopted a conciliatory attitude at the diet which was being held at the latter city, but he insisted that the Edict of Worms should be carried out. The members of the diet demanded that a national council should be held at Speyer, but he induced the emperor to veto this, on condition that a general council should be summoned at Trent. Moreover he obtained from Charles a promise that the Edict of Worms should be enforced. Campeggio, however, saw clearly that the spread of the Lutheran errors could be checked only by a reform of the German clergy. For this purpose he held an assembly of twelve bishops, with the Archduke Ferdinand and the Bavarian dukes. The outbreak of the Peasants' War (November, 1524) destroyed all hope of a peaceful solution of the difficulties with the Reformers. Campeggio was recalled because his efforts had not met with the success which the pope had expected, and also because he was said to be on too friendly terms with the emperor. He was back in Rome 20 October, 1525, and was made a member of the papal commission on the affairs of the Teutonic Knights. During the sack of Rome by the imperial troops (1527), he remained with Clement in Castel Sant' Angelo, and after the escape of the pontiff was left behind as legate.

The next year (1528), at Wolsey's request, he was sent to England to form, jointly with Wolsey, a court to try the so-called divorce suit of Henry VIII. (For a complete account of the case see article Henry VIII.) Here we need only refer to Campeggio's conduct in it. He did his best to escape the responsibility which the pope thrust upon him, for he knew well the difficulties both of law and fact connected with the case; and he thoroughly realized, from his intimate acquaintance with Henry and Charles (Catherine's nephew), that, whichever way it was decided, a great nation would be lost to the Church. His instructions were to proceed with extreme slowness and caution; to bring about if possible the reconciliation of Henry with Catherine; and under no circumstances to come to a final decision. In spite of all Wolsey's wiles and the bribes held out to him by the king, he refused to express any opinion and adhered strictly to the orders which he had received. He did, indeed, try his best to induce Catherine to enter a convent, but when she with much spirit declined to do so, he praised her conduct. In the trial (June–July, 1529), it should be noted, Campeggio treated Wolsey as a subordinate and as the king's advocate rather than as a judge. On the last day (23 July), when everyone expected the final decision, he boldly adjourned the court. Some days later the news arrived that Catherine's appeal had already been received in Rome and that the case was reserved to the Holy See. On his way back to Italy Campeggio was detained at Dover, while his baggage was searched by the king's officials in the hope of finding the decretal Bull defining the law of the divorce. But the prudent legate had already destroyed the document, and the search only proved that he left the country poorer than when he had entered it.

We next find Campeggio at Bologna, his episcopal

city, present at the coronation of Charles V by the pope (24 February, 1530), and afterwards accompanying the emperor to the Diet of Augsburg as legate. His influence was now greater than ever. He wrote triumphantly to Clement, assuring him that all would soon be made right in Germany. He opposed the holding of a council, because he did not believe in the good faith of the Protestants, and relied chiefly on the exercise of the imperial authority to put down Protestantism, if necessary by force. After Clement's death (25 September, 1534), Campeggio returned to Rome and took part in the conclave in which Paul III was elected. By him he was appointed to the suburbicarian See of Præneste (Palestrina), and was sent to Vicenza for the opening of the council. His death took place, as above stated, at Rome, and he was buried at Bologna.

As noted above, Campeggio's career is described in the histories of the early Reformation and the divorce of Henry VIII; the best account is by PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste* (Freiburg, 1906–7), parts I–II; see also GAIRDNER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v., and *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1779–81. An extensive life of Campeggio was written by SIGONIUS, *De Episcopis Bononiensibus* (Bologna, 1586), also in the latter's *Opp. Omnia* (1723–37), III, 531–76. A number of his letters, of great value for the study of the history of his times, may be found in *Epistolarum Miscell.* (Basle, 1550), Lib. X. In his *Römische Dokumente*, etc., pertaining to the divorce of Henry VIII (Paderborn, 1893), DR. EHSES of the German Campo Santo at Rome made known many of Campeggio's letters written from Germany (1530–32), of which Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J., says (*Clement VII, Campeggio, and the Divorce* in *Amer. Cath. Quart. Rev.*, 1904, 233–306) that "it would be hard to find in the diplomatic correspondence of those days a more striking example of a manly upright spirit". He dismisses as quite unproven the charges against the honesty and morality of the cardinal; as much may be said of the gossip related by BRIEGER in *Realencyk. f. prot. Theol. und Kirche* (3d ed., III, 698–704). The documentary collections edited by BROWN and by BREWER in the *Calendar of State Papers*, the latter's *Life of Henry VIII* (London, 1884), and POCOCK, *Records of the Reformation* (the divorce documents—Oxford, 1870) are important sources for a fuller knowledge of the life of Campeggio in England. For his *Pro memoriâ ad Hadrianum papam de depravatione status romanæ ecclesiæ*, see *Deutsche Zeitschr. f. Gesch* (2d series, 1897), 1, 71. His *Constitutio ad removendos abusus et ordinatio ad vitam cleri reformandam*, published at Ratisbon in 1524, is in LE PLAT, *Monumenta Conc. Trid.* (Louvain, 1782), II, 226–37. The writings of Campeggio are described at length by FANTUZZI in *Notizie degli Scrittori Bolognesi* (1783), vols. III and IX. For Campeggio as a canonist see SCHULTE, *Gesch. d. Quell. und Litt. des can. Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1880), II, 559. See also HURTER, *Nomenclat. Litt.* (Innsbruck, 1906), II, 1326; and EHSES, *Röm. Dokumente*, quoted above, XVI–XXXI, and in *Röm. Quartalschrift* (1900), 256–68; (1903), 383–406; (1904), 358–843. Some of Campeggio's reports are in LÄMMER, *Monumenta Vaticana* (Freiburg, 1861). His name is written variously by contemporaries, Campegio, Campegi, etc.; he was wont to sign in the latter way.

T. B. SCANNELL.

Campi, BERNARDINO, an Italian painter of the Lombard School, b. at Cremona, 1522; d. at Reggio, about 1590. His father, Pietro Campi, was his first teacher and instructed the boy in his own art, the goldsmith's; but when Bernardino saw Titian's drawings, and prints, and designs for tapestries, the youth at once abandoned plastic art to study painting. Giulio Campi was his teacher at Cremona; later, at Mantua, he was Ippolito Corta's pupil. He commenced painting when nineteen years old, and soon excelled his masters. Deeply impressed by the works of Correggio, Titian, Raphael, and Romano, he endeavoured—as did his teacher Giulio—to unite all their merits into a "style" and establish a standard of excellence. Finally, however, Bernardino acquired a vigorous style of his own, painted excellent portraits, and decorated many of the Lombardy churches. When he added a Cæsar to the eleven Cæsars of Titian it was difficult to distinguish his picture from those of the great Venetian. His masterpiece is at Cremona in the cupola of S. Sigismondo. Here are depicted the multitude of saints and the blessed, with their symbols. This prodigious composition, exhibiting great invention, variety, and harmony, he finished in seven months; and so successfully did he manage the drawing and perspective that the figures seem to be of natural size, whereas they are ten feet high. In 1580 or 1584 he published at Cremona a quarto, "Parere sopra la pittura", a book full of valuable information for the artist. Bernardino had many pupils, and his influence on Italian art in the sixteenth century was most healthful and invigorating. He was buried in San Prospero, at Reggio, a church he was engaged in decorating with frescoes when he died. Noteworthy among his works are the "Descent from the Cross" in the Brera gallery at Milan, "Mater Dolorosa" in the Louvre at Paris, and the frescoes in the cupola of S. Sigismondo at Cremona.

CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *History of Painting in North Italy*, II; BURCKHARDT, *Art Guide to Painting in Italy* (London, 1883); JAMESON, *Sacred and Legendary Art* (London, 1850); BLANC, *Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles: Ecole Lombarde* (Paris, 1877).

LEIGH HUNT.

Campi, GALEAZZO, an Italian painter, b. at Cremona, 1475; d. 1536. He commenced his studies, according to Vasari, with the noted Boccaccino; but Lanzi doubts this, because Galeazzo's style is so different from that of Boccaccino. Galeazzo did not possess great talent, most of his work being but a weak imitation of Perugino's. His best production is a portrait of himself (1528) which was accorded a place in the Uffizi gallery at Florence. The most celebrated and the most interesting of his paintings, however, is the quaintly curious "Raising of Lazarus", painted in 1515 and owned (1903) by Canon Bignami. A "Virgin and Child" at Cremona is also worthy of mention. He left three sons, all painters. It is not determined definitively whether Bernardino Campi was of his family or not.

LANZI, *History of Painting in Italy*, tr. ROSCOE (London); VASARI, *Lives of the Painters*, tr. FOSTER (London, 1878); see, also, CAMPI, BERNARDINO.

LEIGH HUNT.

Campi, GIULIO, an Italian painter and architect, b. at Cremona about 1500; d. there, 1572. He was the eldest son of Galeazzo Campi, who was his first teacher. In 1522, in Mantua, he studied painting, architecture, and modelling under the great Romano. He visited Rome, became an ardent student of the antique, and like Bernardino—who may have been related to him—he came so strongly under the influence of Raphael's and Correggio's paintings, that he endeavoured to combine the best in them into a composite style; indeed, Giulio and the other members of the Campi family were pioneers in the movement to rid painting of its empty mannerisms and to instil into it a healthy vitality. Giulio is called the "Ludovico Carracci of Cremona" although he preceded the founder of the "Eclectics". When but twenty-seven Giulio executed for the church of Sant' Abbondio, his masterpiece, a "Virgin and Child with SS. Celsus and Nazarus", a decoration masterly in the freedom of its drawing and in the splendour of its colour. His numerous paintings are grandly and reverently conceived, freely drawn, vigorously coloured, lofty in style, and broadly handled. He was a real founder of a school, and was animated in all his work by a deep piety. The churches in Cremona, Mantua, and Milan are filled with his frescoes; and Saint Margaret's, in his native town, is a Giulio Campi gallery. Among his chief works are the "Descent from the Cross" (S. Sigismondo) at Cremona, and the frescoes in the dome of S. Girolamo at Mantua. An altarpiece in S. Sigismondo and his "Labours of Hercules" were engraved by the celebrated Ghiso, "il Mantovano".

For bibliography see article CAMPI, BERNARDINO.

LEIGH HUNT.

Campofulgosus (CAMPOFULGOSIO). See FREGOSO.

Campo Santo de' Tedeschi (Holy Field of the Germans), a cemetery, church, and hospice for Ger-

mans on the south side of St. Peter's, Rome, which covers part of the ancient Circus Vaticanus, where great numbers of Christians suffered death by the order of Nero. After the Emperor Constantine built his great basilica over the graves of the Apostles Peter and Paul, the faithful sought to be buried in the vicinity of these holy sepulchres. On account of local conditions the graves were dug chiefly on the south side of the basilica, in the earth with which Nero's circus was filled during the construction of St. Peter's. Whether St. Helena covered this burial place with earth from Mount Calvary, or whether, at the time when Pisa obtained earth from Jerusalem for its cemetery, the basilica of the Vatican also obtained sacred soil for this cemetery, is uncertain, but it is a fact, that since the fifteenth century the soil of this cemetery has been held to be sacred earth from Jerusalem, and as such it has been asked for and obtained, under papal sanction, by many localities when new cemeteries were to be laid out. This tradition, in connexion with the immediate vicinity of the graves of the Apostles and with the memory of the first martyrs under Nero, fully justifies the name of *campus sanctus*, "holy field".

In 796 Charlemagne, by permission of Pope Leo III, founded on ground adjoining this spot a hospice for pilgrims, which was intended for the people of his empire. In connexion with the hospice was a church dedicated to the Saviour and a graveyard for the burial of the subjects of Charlemagne who died in Rome. From the beginning this foundation was placed under the care of the ecclesiastical authorities of St. Peter's. The decline, soon after this period, of the Carlovingian empire, brought the hospice, the *Schola Francorum*, entirely under the jurisdiction of the basilica; at the same time the original intent of a place for pilgrims and the poor was preserved. In the complete ruin which overtook Rome during the residence of the popes at Avignon (1309–1378), and during the following period of the Schism, the ecclesiastical foundations in the vicinity of St. Peter's sank into decay. After the return of the popes new life sprang up, and the enthusiasm for building and endowing foundations in this part of the Eternal City was rekindled under Popes Martin V, Eugenius IV, and Nicholas V. The remembrance of Charlemagne and his hospice revived in the mind of the large and influential German colony then residing at Rome, and during the reign of Martin V (1417–1431) the enlarged cemetery was surrounded with a wall built by Fredericus Alemannus, who also erected a house for its guardians. Johannis Assonensis, a German confessor attached to St. Peter's and later Coadjutor Bishop of Würzburg, assembled his countrymen there during the pest of 1448 and founded among them a brotherhood, the object of which was to provide suitable burial for all poor Germans dying in Rome. This brotherhood built a church, a new hospice for German pilgrims on the adjoining land, and developed the Campo Santo into a German national institution.

In the fifteenth, sixteenth, and even in the nineteenth century the German nation was represented at Rome by numerous officials at the papal court and by guilds of German bakers, shoemakers, and weavers; in these ages Germans were to be found in every industry of ordinary life, and German bankers and inn-keepers were especially numerous. Nevertheless the steadily decreasing German population of Rome during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries caused the Campo Santo, as a national foundation, and the brotherhood to sink more and more into neglect. Pius IX, who thoroughly understood the change of conditions and the demands of modern times, in 1876 sanctioned a new foundation in a college for priests in which archæological studies and church history were to be pursued. Friends of the undertaking in Germany endowed five free scholarships and made possible the acceptance of resident students. The library contains 6000 volumes and embraces large collections of works on Christian antiquities and modern church history. The museum includes sarcophagi, carvings, inscriptions, a large number of early Christian lamps, textile fabrics of the sixth century from Egypt, and many small articles of various kinds. In 1887 a periodical was established under the name of "Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte", and in 1901 another periodical entitled "Oriens Christianus". These publications afford the members of the college the opportunity to publish at once the results of their studies and researches. The college gives the German people a new institution for the cultivation and development of ecclesiastical science. Its students have already furnished a large number of university professors and church dignitaries of high rank. The church of the foundation has been restored and adorned with stained-glass windows and the building greatly enlarged and newly furnished; furthermore, it has received a large number of sacred utensils and vestments.

The tombstones in the adjoining cemetery bear many distinguished names, among them those of Cardinal Hohenlohe, Archbishop de Mérode, Bishop von Anzer, Monsignor Schäpman, and other church dignitaries. The names of many artists also occur, as those of Koch, von Rhoden, Ahlborn, Achtermann; among the diplomats and scholars buried here are Theiner, Platner, Diekamp; other tombs are those of the queen-mother Carlotta of Denmark, Princess Caroline Wittgenstein, Princess Sophie Hohenlohe, and other women of high rank. Some of the monuments are of artistic value. Formerly the Campo Santo was seldom visited by the Germans in Rome and was scarcely known in Germany. Now, especially on the great church festivals, they gather for service and prayer in the church of the Campo Santo and in the cemetery. The priests of the college often guide German travellers through the catacombs and accompany them on visits to the other objects of interest in the Eternal City. The Campo Santo is a national foundation for the Catholics of the former German Confederation, that is, it is intended both for Austrians and Germans. The secular protector is the Emperor of Austria, while the spiritual protectorate is exercised by a cardinal in the name of the pope. The cardinal protector has, in conjunction with the archbishops of Salzburg, Munich, and Cologne, the right to name the rector.

EHSES, *Festschrift* (1907); DE WAAL, *La Schola Francorum* (1897); BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlex.* (Munich, 1906).

ANTON DE WAAL.

Camus de Pont-Carré, JEAN-PIERRE, French bishop, b. 3 November, 1584, at Paris; d. there 25 April, 1652. A Burgundian of good birth, he was ordained priest, immediately won a reputation for eloquence, and by a special dispensation of Paul V was made Bishop of Belley at the age of twenty-six, being consecrated by St. Francis of Sales, Bishop of Geneva. From that event (1609) dates the close friendship which ever united the two prelates. The episcopal administration of Camus was marked by an ardent, though somewhat inconsiderate, zeal. In 1614 he went as delegate of the clergy to the Etats-Généraux, and there stoutly defended the rights of the Church. Love of study and contemplation tempted him to resign his see, but, in deference to the counsels of St. Francis of Sales, Camus remained at his post until the death of that saint in 1629, when he left Belley and retired to the Abbey of Aulnay, near Caen. The coveted retirement, however, was of brief duration. François de Harlay, Archbishop of Rouen, being incapacitated by illness, claimed the services of Camus as auxiliary. This connexion with the archiepiscopal see lasted until the resigna-

tion of de Harlay in 1651, when Camus retired to the Hospice des Incurables, at Paris, less to be a patient than to be a sympathizer with patients. Louis XIV pressed the Bishopric of Arras upon him, but Camus, having at length reluctantly accepted the charge, died before the arrival of the papal confirmation. His remains were laid to rest in the nave of the hospice chapel, where, until 1904, an epitaph told the tale of his disinterestedness and charity: Qui sibi pauper—Pauperibus dives—Inter pauperes—Vivere, mori et humari voluit (Poor for himself, rich for the poor, he wished to live, die, and be buried among the poor).

JEAN-PIERRE CAMUS, AFTER AN ENGRAVING BY MELLAN

Richelieu said of Camus that his acrimony against the mendicant orders was the only flaw in his character. Owing, doubtless, to this well-known antipathy, verging on hatred, some strange charges have been made against him: Voltaire makes him the author of a vile book, "Apocalypse de Méliton", which was really written by Claude Pitois, an apostate monk, in 1668. Sauvage (Réalité du projet de Bourg-Fontaine) accuses him of joining the Jansenists in a plot against the Church, basing his accusation on the fact that, in the alleged plot, the work of defaming the religious orders had been assigned to one "P. C." (Pierre Camus). Sainte-Beuve (Port-Royal, I, 241) probably comes nearer the truth when he describes Camus as naively eager for public notice, and led by this foible to consort with the Jansenists of Port-Royal, though he did not escape their ridicule. His literary activity was prodigious. Leclerc and Nicéron enumerate over two hundred books written by him. His sermons and religious novels have been completely forgotten, in spite of the efforts of H. Rigault (preface to his edition of "Palombe", 1853) and St.-Marc-Girardin (Cours de littérature, IV) to rescue them from oblivion. Of his theological and controversial works, such as "Introduction à la théologie" (1645); "Du chef de l'église" (1630); "De la Primauté" (1630); "Enseignements catéchétiques" (1642); "Correspondance de l'écriture sacrée et de la sainte église" (1683); "Antithèses protestantes" (1638), only one survives, "L'avoisinement des protestants vers l'église romaine" (Paris, 1640, re-edited by Richard Simon (1703), and translated into Latin by Zaccaria, in Migne, "Theol. cursus compl.", V. On the other hand, his ascetical books, e. g. "L'usage de la pénitence et communion" (1644), "Du rare ou fréquent usage de l'Eucharistie" (1644), "Pratique de la communion fréquente" (1644), have had a great influence. One of them, "L'esprit de Saint François de Sales" (Paris, 1641), a minute and loving portrayal of the saint, has gone through many editions (Collot, Paris, 1727; Depéry, Paris, 1840), and two English translations of it have appeared, that of Sidney Lear (London, s. d.) and O'Shea (New York, 1869). To the same class of writings, at least in the mind of Camus, belong several pamphlets against the mendicants: "Le voyageur inconnu" (1630); "Le directeur spirituel" (1631); "L'antimoine" (1632); "Pauvreté évangélique" (1634); "Rabat-joie du triomphe monacal" (1634), and so on—sometimes quoted under the general head, "Des moines". Of these it may be said that they only detract from the otherwise good fame of their author. The Spanish translation by Cabillas of a treatise by Camus on the love of God has been on the Spanish Index since 1747.

BOULAS, *Un ami de S. François de Sales, Camus* (Lons-le-Saunier, 1878); NICÉRON, *Mémoires*, XXXVI, 132; *Introductions* of DEPÉRY, LEAR, and O'SHEA to their editions of *The Spirit of St. Francis de Sales;* FELLER in *Biographie universelle* (Paris, 1851); MANGENOT in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Cana, a city of Galilee, Palestine, famous throughout all ages as the scene of our Lord's first miracle, when He turned water into wine at the Marriage Feast (John, ii). It is mentioned by the same Evangelist in two other passages, once (iv, 46) in connexion with another miracle, when He cured the ruler's son at a distance, and once (xxi, 2) as the birthplace of Nathaniel, or St. Bartholomew. No direct indication can be gathered of its locality, except that it was not far from either Nazareth or Capharnaum, and higher than the latter city, as indeed all the land west of the plain of Genesareth is; and that an ordinary traveller from Jerusalem to Nazareth would pass through or near it. It is not mentioned by either of the Synoptists, nor indeed anywhere else in the Scriptures. An old tradition identifies the site of Cana with the modern Kefr' Kenna, a village of about 600 inhabitants. This lies some four or five miles north-east of Nazareth, on the road from thence to Tiberias, at the foot of a short, steep hill. The tradition dates back at least to the eighth century, and probably a good deal earlier, while the site fulfils all the requisite conditions mentioned above. At the time of the Crusades, or before, there was a church which was believed to be on the spot where the miracle of Our Lord was worked. This site is now in the hands of the Franciscans, who have built a large new church. In recent years some interesting excavations have been carried out within its walls, discovering parts of the old church beneath. The Greeks also have a church close by, inside which are two large jars, said to be the original "waterpots of stone" in which the water was turned into wine; but the probability of their being genuine is not great. The fountain still existing in the village, however, must have been the actual source from which the water was drawn. The inhabitants of the village are very rough and uncivilized. About one-third of them are Christians, the majority belonging to the Greek Church.

Towards the far end of the town, there is a church dedicated to St. Bartholomew, said to be on the site of his house, though this tradition cannot be traced back very far. A curious light is thrown on the ease with which such traditions used to originate by the existence of a similar church on the supposed site of the house of Simon the Cananean. The name Cananean must have deceived some, who consequently sought for the site of his house, and the demand created the supply. In reality, however, the Chanaanites were a strict national sect among the Jews, and the name is wholly unconnected with Cana. The site at Kefr' Kenna held almost undisputed possession for many centuries. It is only in recent years that its authenticity has been seriously questioned. There are now two other claimants for the site. One of these, Kanet-el-Jelil, is some six miles farther north, on the slope of a hill. There is nothing there now but ruins. Some remains of cisterns have been discovered, but there is no fount or spring. It seems to have been known in quite early times as possibly the site of Cana, and has in its favour that the name is said to be a closer equivalent than that of Kefr' Kenna. Recently a third site has been put forward by Dr. Robinson, Ain Kana, which is somewhat nearer to Nazareth. This site is accepted by Dr. Conder; but, al-

though the name is said to be still closer etymologically than either of the other two, there is no tradition whatever to support this hypothesis.

The miracle which has made Cana forever famous was worked by Christ before his public life had fully commenced. This is usually taken to be the meaning of the words: "My hour is not yet come". He had, however, already five disciples—Sts. Peter, Andrew, John, Philip, and Bartholomew (Nathaniel). They had followed him from the banks of the Jordan, but had received as yet no permanent call, such as is recorded later on in the other Gospels. Our Lord was on His way back to Nazareth when He passed by Cana. From the language of the Gospel we should infer that the marriage which was taking place was that of a close relative of the Blessed Virgin, for it is said without comment that she was there; and it was no doubt in her honour that Christ was invited. Again, the cause of the shortage of wine is not explained by St. John; but it has been inferred that it may have been due to the presence of Our Lord and the five Disciples who accompanied Him, who would have made a substantial increase in a small and modest party. If this was so, it would explain the confidence with which Our Lady appealed to Him when she noticed it. The answer of Christ, which has been variously rendered, has given rise to long discussion, and cannot be said to be even yet properly understood. The Greek *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ. γύναι;* is translated in the Vulgate, *"Quid mihi et tibi est mulier?"* In most English Catholic Bibles this is rendered, "Woman, what is it to me and to thee?" The translation adopted in the Authorized and Revised Versions, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" even if better idiomatically, conveys a wrong impression, for it gives the idea of a rebuke which is totally against the context. Father Rickaby, S. J., in his short commentary on St. John, suggests as a fair English equivalent, "Leave me alone, Lady". At any rate, she at once told the waiters to take orders from Our Lord. They filled the jars with water, which Jesus converted into wine. Taking the narrative as it stands, we have one of the best authenticated of Our Lord's miracles; for, unlike the case of the cure of bodily ailments, the waiters were comparatively disinterested parties, and yet they bore witness that the water had become wine and was even the best wine of the feast. Not only the miracle, but also the whole incident of Christ's attendance at the marriage feast has always been taken as setting His seal on the sanctity of marriage, and on the propriety of humble rejoicing on such occasions. And if the bride or bridegroom was, as is believed, a relative of Our Lady, we may take it as an example of the sympathy which family ties should bring in the ordinary joys, no less than in the sorrows, of life.

EWING in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; THOMPSON, *The Land and the Book* (1876), 425; STANLEY, *Sinai and Palestine;* SANDAY, *Sacred Sites of the Gospel.*

BERNARD WARD.

Canaan. See CHANAAN.

Canada, or to be more exact, the Dominion of Canada, comprises all that part of North America north of the United States, with the exception of Newfoundland, Labrador, and Alaska. The distance from the Atlantic Ocean on the east to the Pacific Ocean on the west is 3000 miles, and from the borders of the United States to the farthest point in the Arctic Ocean at least 1500 miles. With its 3,745,574 square miles, Canada exceeds in size both the United States and Australasia, and is almost as large as Europe.

Physical Features.—The physical aspect of the land shows a wide central plain lying between two mountainous regions, the Columbian on the west and the Laurentian plateau on the east. The most important mountain system is that of the west, which consists of the northern end of the Cordilleran region. The great parallel chains enclose British Columbia and Yukon, then decreasing in height turn towards the west, finally ending on the shores of Alaska. The most prominent of these ranges is the eastern, known as the Rocky Mountains. From an average height of 5000 to 10,000 feet, they rise at times to 13,000 and 14,000 feet, like Mounts Brown, Columbia, Hooker, etc. Mounts Purcell, Selkirk, and the Gold Range, which rise west of the Rocky Mountains in successive and parallel lines, are not as high but are very picturesque, bordering on the plateau of British Columbia. Of an average height of 2000 or 3000 feet and more than 100 miles wide, this plateau is crossed by the rivers Fraser and Columbia, which flow through wide basins interrupted here and there by rapids and waterfalls. It extends towards the west as far as the Coast Range, which lies parallel to the Pacific Ocean, where it suddenly rises to a great height, cut by innumerable fiords reaching as far as the borders of Alaska. The highest peak in Canada is Mount Logan (19,539 feet). Finally, there is a range, partly submerged, which forms the islands of Vancouver and Queen Charlotte; it attains a height of 6840 feet in the Victoria Peak in Vancouver. The mountains in the east of Canada, which are far less important, are called the Laurentians because they rise on the left shore of the St. Lawrence River. From Labrador to Hudson Bay, whose basin it outlines, as it also does that of the St. Lawrence, this range is at least 3000 miles in length. The average elevation is 1500 feet, but a few peaks in the northern part reach a height of 3000 to 4000 feet. Studded with innumerable lakes and crossed here and there by rivers, these mountains of granite, quartz, gneiss, and mica are extremely picturesque. South of the St. Lawrence, the Alleghanies or Appalachian Mountains, leaving their course from south to north, turn towards the east and form the peninsulas of Gaspé and Nova Scotia.

The immense central plain which stretches as far as the frozen north is simply the continuation of the Missouri and Mississippi valley in the United States. In the valley of the Mackenzie the altitude varies between 500 and 1000 feet, and from the border of Lake Winnipeg to the Arctic Ocean the width is from 100 to 300 miles. Between the two the ground rises to a maximum height of 2000 feet, the highest parts being near the Rocky Mountains. In Alberta and the southern part of Saskatchewan the elevation varies between 2000 and 5000 feet. This vast plain contains many lakes, pools, and ponds, which have no doubt taken the place of glaciers. Besides the great lakes to the south of Canada which form the boundary and belong, with the exception of Lake Michigan, partly to the United States and partly to Canada, there are also many sheets of water such as Great Slave Lake, Great Bear Lake, Lake Athabasca, Reindeer, Manitoba, Winnipeg, and Winnipegosis Lakes. The lakes of Canada cover an area of 77,391,304 acres, distributed as follows: British Columbia 1,560,830; Manitoba 6,019,200; Maritime Provinces 277,332; Ontario 25,701,944; Quebec 3,507,318; Alberta and Saskatchewan 8,665,620; Mackenzie 18,910,080; Keewatin 8,588,260; Ungava 3,745,440; Yukon 415,280. These immense bodies of water drain into the oceans through large rivers which empty into four basins: the Pacific basin with an area of 387,800 sq. m. into which empty the Fraser, Columbia, Stikine, and Yukon; the Hudson Bay basin, area 1,486,000 sq. m., principal rivers Nelson, Red River, Saskatchewan, Churchill, Albany, Dubawnt, Assiniboine, Winnipeg, Moose, Nottaway, Big, and Koksoak; the Atlantic basin, area 554,000 sq. m., principal rivers the St. Lawrence, with its tributaries Ottawa, St. Maurice, and Saguenay; and the Arctic basin, area 1,290,000 sq. m., principal rivers the Mackenzie, Peace, Athabasca, and Liard.

Field Products.—The vegetable products are di-

verse, owing to the varied climates. There are three principal zones. The southern zone close to the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence is known for its fruit, especially apple, trees, its grain, and its prairies. In the central zone, which extends somewhat beyond 60° N. lat., grain is also grown, but this region is better known for its forests, north of 50°. In the great northern region, beyond 60°, where winter reigns during the greater part of the year, there is nothing to the west but sparsely grown forests and stunted trees, and to the east barren lands covered during the summer with moss and lichens. Agriculture is the source of Canada's greatest wealth. The census of 1901 valued at $363,126,384 the annual farm production of Canada, and the value of farms, including live stock, was appraised at $1,787,102,630. There is no doubt that these figures have increased since then. In the five years, 1901-06, the production of wheat was doubled. In 1901 it was 55,572,368 bushels, in 1906, 119,011,136. As will be seen by the table of statistics, farm products occupy a conspicuous place among the exports.

TABLE OF EXPORTS

	1871	1881	1891	1901	1906	1907
Total Exportation	$74,173,618	$98,290,823	$98,417,296	$186,996,224	$240,123,646	$272,206,605
Field Products	9,853,146	21,268,327	13,666,858	36,940,785	52,173,705	58,327,323
Animals and Animal Products	11,473,019	15,849,776	16,458,941	57,558,796	67,580,378	68,659,980
Cheese	1,109,906	5,510,443	9,508,800	20,696,951	24,441,664	22,028,281*
Forest Products	22,352,211	24,960,012	24,282,015	28,814,055	36,568,418	46,017,000
Mineral Products	3,221,461	2,767,829	5,784,143	33,297,336	34,761,048	36,390,759
Manufactures	2,201,331	3,075,095	6,296,249	15,844,959	26,365,311	29,614,436
Fisheries	3,994,275	6,867,715	9,715,401	11,076,380	15,265,256	13,828,234

*Nine months only.

The farm products of Canada are quoted in the exports of 1906 at $120,518,297, that is more than half the total value of the exports for that year. It is evident also that the progress of agriculture has been very rapid during the last decade, exceeding that of the lumber industry.

Forests.—Throughout Canada there are vast forests. It is estimated that 1,326,258 square miles are covered with timber, this being more than a third of the total area of Canada. Outside of the Maritime Provinces, which have altogether more than 8000 square miles of forests, there are three distinct wooded zones. That of British Columbia is 770 miles long by 200 to 300 miles wide, where grow the red or Oregon pine, the red and the yellow cedar, the fir tree, and the western oak. Owing to the mildness of the climate these trees attain an enormous size. The northern zone runs from the banks of the Mackenzie to the border of Labrador, a length of 3000 miles, with a width of about 200 miles, and contains the largest forest of fir trees in the world. The southern zone is between 45° and 50° N. Lat. in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario and stretches towards the west, taking in the northern part of Saskatchewan and Alberta as far as the Peace River. The chief resource of this region is the white pine. The figures of exportation do not show the entire value of the wood, which serves many purposes. It is used not only for building purposes but is also ground to pulp and converted into paper, in consequence of which a great many paper mills have been erected. In 1904 they employed nearly 55,000 men, and the income from this industry is estimated at $51,082,605, distributed as follows: Quebec, $18,969,716; Ontario, $21,351,898; Nova Scotia, $3,409,528; New Brunswick, $2,998,-038; British Columbia, $2,634,157; Manitoba, $950,-057; the Territories, $484,263; Prince Edward Island, $285,038.

The Dominion Government has kept under its control 742,798 square miles of land, of which 506,220 square miles are managed by the Provincial Governments, which concede the right of exploitation within certain limits. For some years now the Federal Government has retained immense territories under the name of parks or reservations, where game and furred animals are protected. This example has been followed by the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The best known are Yoho Park in the Rocky Mountains, Algonkin Park of more than 200,000 acres, in Ontario, and Victoria Park near Niagara Falls. Quebec also has a reservation in the northern part of the province, covering 1,620,000 acres.

Fisheries.—This industry has always employed many hands and is still on the increase. In 1881 there were 59,056 fishermen; in 1886, 62,000; in 1891, 65,575; in 1900, 78,290; in 1903, 79,134. Fishing, which in 1881 yielded an income of $15,817,-162, in 1891 brought $18,977,878; in 1901, $25,737,154; in 1903, $23,101,878. Nova Scotia, British Columbia, New Brunswick, and the Province of Quebec rank highest. The value of the boats, nets, and fishing tackle has been estimated at $12,241,454. Cod, lobster, salmon, herring, and mackerel form the principal catch. The salmon fisheries of Columbia are known all over the world. In 1901 their value of $7,221,387 headed the list, but in 1903 they fell to third place, with a valuation of $3,521,158. The chief exports go to Great Britain (in 1903, $3,904,793); the United States ($3,760,266); the West Indies ($938,721), France, and the Antilles.

MINERAL OUTPUT OF THE DOMINION

	1886	1889	1894	1899	1904	1906
Gold	$1,365,496	$1,295,159	$1,128,688	$21,251,584	$15,400,000	$12,023,932
Pit-coal	2,841,780	5,049,330	7,578,019	10,633,519	16,483,309	19,945,032
Copper	385,650	836,341	736,960	2,655,319	5,510,119	10,994,095
Nickel	498,286	498,286	1,870,958	2,067,840	4,219,153	8,948,834
Silver	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,723,097

Mines.—Though there are many mines in Canada, they are far from being all in operation. Coal is found in large quantities on Vancouver Island and in Nova Scotia and even in Manitoba and Saskatchewan; pit-coal in Nova Scotia north of Lake Superior and in the Province of Quebec. Nickel is found at Sudbury, Ontario and in British Columbia; asbestos in the Province of Quebec and mica in Ontario. Besides the rich placers of the Klondike, there is gold in the Province of Quebec and in Saskatchewan. The mineral products, which in 1886 amounted to $10,221,255, reached $19,931,158 in 1894; $49,584,027 in 1899, $60,343,165 in 1904, and $80,000,048 in 1906. From 1899 the gold production is included in the sum total. Columbia

holds first rank in the output of minerals. Ontario comes next, with its silver mines at Cobalt.

Manufactures.—Canadian factories employ a large number of labourers. The census of 1900 gave the number of employees as 313,344 and the capital invested $446,916,487. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec stand first. In 1900 Ontario produced $241,533,486, and Quebec $158,287,994 of the total value of manufactured articles.

Commerce.—Of the $273,173,877, the value of exports in 1907, all but $28,992,955 represented the natural products of the country. The most important commerce is with Great Britain and the United States, as is evident from the following figures. In 1907 the value of exports to England reached $134,469,420, to the United States $109,772,944, to other countries $27,964,242. The total value of imports for 1906 reached $340,374,745; imports from England $83,229,256, from the United States $208,741,601, other countries $45,304,148; the custom receipts $46,671,101. The total commerce for 1907 reached $612,581,351.

Population.—A census of Canada is taken every tenth year. That of 1901 gives the population as 5,371,315, which has, however, greatly increased since. In 1906 it was estimated by the Department of the Interior as 6,440,000. The increase is chiefly the result of immigration and has taken place principally in the Provinces of the West, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. During the nineteenth century the increase in population was 5,000,000. The population is for every 10,000 inhabitants, 5,123 men to 4,877 women. 87 per cent are natives of Canada and 94 per cent are British subjects. The yearly increase in immigration has swelled these figures and altered this proportion, as is evident from the statistics of immigration to Canada between 1 January, 1897, and 31 March, 1907.

POPULATION FOR 1901

Native Country		Native Country	
Canada	4,671,815	Russia and Poland	31,231
England	201,285	China	17,043
Iceland	101,629	Norway and Sweden	12,331
Scotland	83,631	France	7,944
Newfoundland	12,432	Italy, Spain, and Portugal	7,124
Other British possessions	6,906	Austria-Hungary	28,407
United States	127,899	Belgium	2,208
Germany	27,300	Holland	385

IMMIGRATION, 1897–1907

Calendar Year	British Isles	The Continent	United States	Totals
1897	11,383	7,921	2,412	21,716
1898	11,173	11,608	9,119	31,900
1899	10,600	21,938	11,945	44,483
1900 (6 mo.)	5,141	10,211	8,548	23,900
FISCAL YEAR.				
1900–01	11,810	19,352	17,987	49,149
1901–02	17,259	23,732	26,388	67,379
1902–03	41,792	37,099	49,473	128,364
1903–04	50,374	34,728	45,229	130,331
1904–05	65,359	37,255	43,652	146,266
1905–06	38,621	19,216	32,726	90,563
1906–07 (9 mo.)	55,791	34,217	34,659	124,667

According to this table during the decade ending 1907, 35 per cent of the immigrants were of British origin, 33 per cent from the United States, and 32 per cent of other nationalities. During the first nine months of the fiscal year 1906–07, 90,008 immigrants received at the various ports were classed according to occupation: 18,191 agriculturists, 26,807 general labourers, 24,414 mechanics, 6,686 clerks, 2,878 miners, 4,583 female servants, 6,449 unclassified. Of these the Maritime Provinces received 6,491, Quebec 18,063, Ontario 32,265, Manitoba 17,036, Saskatchewan 4,257, Alberta 3,474, British Columbia 8,406, and Yukon 16. These figures do not include the 34,659 arrivals from the United States.

The Indians.—In all parts of Canada there are still to be found descendants of the aborigines whom the white men met on landing three hundred years ago. But their condition now is very different. Deprived of all they possessed, they are dependent on the nation which despoiled them. They are divided into four large families: (1) The Huron-Iroquois; (2) the *Innuit* or Eskimo; (3) the Tinneh; and (4) the Algonquins. The first three named belong to the Turanian race and are allied to the Mongolians and the Turks; the fourth belongs to the Polynesian Malays of the Pacific Islands. Their language, physique, and disposition indicate two different races. The Iroquois loves the land, the Algonquin the water; the former is fond of war and all manly sports, the latter although aggressive is lazy; the Algonquin is taciturn and nomadic, the Iroquois is garrulous and sedentary in his habits. The Eskimo (consumers of raw flesh) live on the shores of the Arctic Ocean from Labrador to Alaska. They speak the same language and form but one tribe. The *Tinneh* or *Déné Dindejies* are found in the valleys of the Athabasca and Peace Rivers, in the regions of the Great Bear Lake and on the slopes of the Rocky Mountains south of British Columbia, on Vancouver and Queen Charlotte Islands. They are divided into nineteen tribes. The Algonquins are scattered from the Atlantic Ocean to the Rockies and comprise eleven tribes. To the east are the Micmac, Malecite, Abnaki, Nascapi, and the Montagnais of Labrador; west of Quebec are the Missisauga and the Ojibwa Confederacy; and in the southern part of the north-west the Saulteurs, Wood Cree, Plain Cree, the Blackfeet, the Mixed-bloods, and the Piegans. The home of the Iroquois is in the valley of the St. Lawrence, at Lorette near Quebec; Caughnawaga; Lake of the Two Mountains; Saint Regis; between Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie; and near the Rocky Mountains where they are known as Assiniboin and Sioux.

The first Indian census was taken in 1871. They then numbered 102,358, as follows: Eskimo 4028; Tinneh 42,000; Algonquins 46,000; Huron-Iroquois 10,330. Their division according to provinces is: Prince Edward Island 323; Nova Scotia 1666; New Brunswick 1403; Quebec 6988; Ontario 12,978; Manitoba 500; British Columbia 23,000; Rupert's Land 33,000; Labrador and the Arctic regions 22,000. The census of 1901 shows a decrease of 8904 in thirty years, if the given figures (93,454) are correct. In 1905, the superintendent of the Indian Bureau gave the total number of Indians as 107,637. Of this number 22,084 lived outside the reservations. The 85,553 who were in the reservations in 1905 owned 44,195 acres of cultivated land and had 44,972 head of cattle and 33,119 horses. They had at that time 302 schools with an attendance of 10,113 pupils. 104 of these schools were under Catholic clergy, 86 under the Anglicans, 49 under the Methodists, 16 under Presbyterians, and 47 were nonsectarian. The same census gave 35,060 Catholic Indians, 15,079 Anglicans, 11,791 Methodists, 1489 Presbyterians, 1103 Baptists, 646 other Christians, and 10,906 pagans.

Freedom of Worship.—Freedom of worship and the equality of all creeds before the law form the basis of the political constitution of Canada. When Canada became a British dependency, the Catholic Church ceased to be the State Church. Governmental

favour was now transferred to Anglicanism, which strove to acquire on Canadian soil the position it occupied in Great Britain. This gave rise to a constant friction between the two religions, intensified by the differences of nationality (English and French) and the relative positions of conquerors and conquered. Protected by the British colonial rights, by the terms of surrender of Quebec and Montreal, and by the Treaty of Paris (1763), the Catholic religion was free and independent, in spite of the systematic persecutions organized against it in England. It was the Legislature of Lower Canada that first gave expression to this principle of freedom of worship now recognized throughout the Dominion. It stated in 1851 that "the equality before the law of all religious denominations is a recognized principle of the colonial legislation and that in the state and condition of this province [Quebec] to which it is particularly applicable, it is desirable that this principle receive the direct sanction of the Legislative Assembly, which recognizes and declares that it is the *fundamental principle of our social policy*". Then it was proclaimed by statute "that the free exercise and enjoyment of profession and religious worship without distinction or preference, but in such manner as not to serve as an excuse for outrageous acts, nor as a justification for practices at variance with the peace and safety of the province, be allowed by the constitution of this province to all her Majesty's subjects living therein" (14 and 15 Victoria, Ch. 175). This liberty, so clearly formulated in 1851, had by degrees entered into public legislation.

Incorporation of Bishoprics.—The Catholics of Upper Canada who were in the minority had already benefited by this. In 1843 the Legislative Assembly drafted a bill allowing all denominations the right of corporation; in this it was declared that the Catholic bishops of Upper Canada, those occupying the present bishoprics then in existence as well as the bishoprics to be erected in the future, would each form a corporation sole. The Legislative Council rejected this bill. But in 1845 a special act, embodying the same idea, was adopted by Parliament and approved by the Crown, at the request of Bishop Power of Toronto and Bishop Phelan, coadjutor of Kingston. This act constitutes each bishop a perpetual corporation, with the right of owning real estate in mortmain without restrictions as to extent or revenue. It further states that all church goods, buildings, chapels, cemeteries, rectories, and immovable property of any kind, be declared and recognized as belonging exclusively to the bishop of the diocese. All this was to apply equally to churches, chapels, etc., which should be erected in the diocese at any future time. Any one holding immovable property in trust for the Catholic Church was to transfer titles to such property to the bishop, who thereby becomes sole proprietor of church goods. He alone can transfer them, with the consent of the coadjutor and vicar-general, or in their absence, in the presence of two priests chosen by him. These provisions applied to any bishopric which might be established in Upper Canada in the future. They are still in force in the dioceses where no parishes are canonically erected though still having churchwardens (*marguilliers*), and a board of trustees (*conseil de fabrique*) responsible for the administration of church property.

Therefore, outside of the Province of Quebec ecclesiastical property is directly under the episcopal corporation, though the management of it is in the hands of the parish or resident priest, sometimes assisted by a committee of laymen chosen by himself; within that Province its administration rests with the board of trustees of each parish. This board, like any ecclesiastical body, exercises its administration according to laws laid down by a higher authority. The civil law also in clear terms recognizes these holdings as "things sacred by their very nature as well as their purpose, inalienable and imprescriptible so long as they serve their original purpose" (Cod. civ., art. 1486, 2217). Church goods comprise in addition to the immovable property mentioned above (1) the pew rents; (2) the dues connected with certain ecclesiastical functions; (3) funds from which is derived the income necessary for the support of Divine worship and the maintenance of the parish priest; and (4) pious endowments for educational purposes or the celebration of Masses; these are *res ecclesiæ proindeque sub potestate et jurisdictione ecclesiæ constitutæ*, as expressed in the Eleventh Provincial Council of Quebec. The parish priest is at the head of the *marguilliers*, and by right the president of the board of trustees, which cannot convene without him.

Taxation.—Throughout the Dominion, places of worship and adjacent land used for religious purposes are exempt from taxation. The same may be said of colleges, schools, universities, and educational institutions with their yards and gardens, also any immovable property and land set apart for charitable purposes. The religious communities in the Province of Quebec enjoy the same immunity from taxes. The laws governing asylums, hospitals, and other charitable institutions are left to the provincial governments which support them in whole or in part as the case may be. Sometimes the districts or cities in which these institutions are established maintain them entirely or obtain a grant for that purpose from the provincial government. Generally, these grants are in the form of a fixed sum and an allowance *per capita* for the inmates, though the methods are also used separately. The Federal Government also allows a certain sum for each alien received in these institutions. These grants, however, would rarely be sufficient for the support of such houses, hospitals, hospices, homes, crèches, and shelters, were it not for previous endowments or the ingenuity and labour of the religious in charge. Many have formed committees of patronesses who by means of entertainments and personal contributions strive to provide these charities with the necessary funds. Similarly, institutions in charge of men have formed committees of patrons.

Wills and Testaments.—The greatest liberty in the matter of wills exists in Canada. A man may dispose of all his goods in any manner he chooses, without any restriction of law. A father may leave everything to one of his children to the exclusion of the rest. He may even exclude them all and leave his property to a stranger. There is the same liberty in the choice of testamentary executors. A priest, even the testator's confessor, may be legally chosen for the office. However the lawful heirs who have been dispossessed may contest the document in court and have it declared null and void, if it is proved that undue influence was used to coerce the will of the testator. These testaments are generally in one of three forms: (1) written entirely by hand by the one making the will and signed by himself, when it is called holographic; (2) written in the presence of two proper witnesses, who may be women, and signed by the testator after it has been read to him, and countersigned by the witnesses; this is the form derived "from English law"; (3) it may be written before a notary and two witnesses or, as it is generally done to-day, before two notaries; or written by one in the presence of the other at the dictation of the testator, and the two notaries or the notary and witness; this is the "public" or "authentic" will. In case the testator cannot sign his name, mention is made of this fact at the end of the will and the reason stated.

Marriage.—The North American Act has left to the Federal Government the question of marriage and divorce. Divorce is not recognized in the Dominion of Canada. The solemnization of marriage and every-

thing pertaining thereto is left by the same Act to the provincial legislatures. In the Province of Quebec the civil law has adopted the legislation of the Church on this point; in other words there is no such thing as civil marriage. Marriage is a religious ceremony and the law recognizes the impediments and conforms to the dispensations of the Church. When two persons have decided to be married the banns are published in the presence of the assembled faithful three successive Sundays before the solemnization; a dispensation may be obtained from one or two publications, but not from all. If there is no impediment the marriage takes place before the parish priest, generally the bride's pastor, and two witnesses, after which an entry is made in a special register. It is read aloud, and signed by the priest, the witnesses, the bride and bridegroom, and all those present who wish to do so. The same entry with the same signatures is made in a second register which the parish priest returns to the city or county record office at the end of each year. The Church is strongly opposed to all mixed marriages, viz. of Catholics with Protestants or schismatics. In cases where consent is given *ad duritiam cordis* to such unions, promise must be given not to go before a clergyman, Protestant or otherwise, and to rear the children in the Catholic Faith after having them baptized.

Exemption for Priests.—As military duty is voluntary in the Dominion, a priest is not compelled to serve. He is also exempt from jury duty both in criminal and civil cases. He cannot belong to the municipal council in his own parish or any other. But there is no law to prevent his becoming a member of Parliament or taking an active part in the agricultural development of his country. In point of fact it is the colonizing priests who give much needed help in directing the work of colonization and in applying progressive methods to the cultivation of the land.

Primary Education.—Education in Canada is a provincial and not a federal matter. Each province has its own system. Ontario and British Columbia have a minister and a general superintendent of education. In the Province of Quebec, education is under the control of the superintendent of public instruction, assisted by a council of 35 members divided into two committees, one in charge of Catholic, the other of Protestant schools. In Manitoba, New Brunswick, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, the schools are left in control of the executive, who names a superintendent and other competent persons to take charge; in Nova Scotia educational matters are under the executive and a superintendent, in Prince Edward Island under a committee and superintendent.

Public schools are divided, on a religious basis, in Quebec and part of Ontario. In those two provinces there are separate schools for Catholics and for Protestants, and it is left to the parents to decide which schools their children shall attend. In the other provinces the educational laws do not recognize any such distinctions. In fact, Catholics, who are in the minority in other provinces, strive, as far as their means and the tolerance of the civil authorities will permit, to maintain separate schools, which more aptly, perhaps, should be named minority schools. The foregoing table gives the number of primary schools in each province of the Dominion, the pupils who attend, and the teachers in charge.

SCHOOL STATISTICS

	Schools	Pupils	Teachers	Amount Expenses
Prince Edward Isl.	480	19,956	572	$166,617
Nova Scotia	2,353	96,667	2,441	985,031
New Brunswick	1,722	59,198	1,816	631,817
Quebec	6,261	349,178	7,413	3,816,395
Ontario	6,151	488,584	9,456	5,077,869
Manitoba	1,669	58,547	2,218	1,786,311
Alberta and Saskatchewan	998	33,191	1,152	1,066,602
British Columbia	354	25,787	624	597,764
Totals	19,988	1,131,108	25,692	$14,128,406

Atlas of Canada, published by the Department of the Interior (Ottawa, 1906); *Le Canada, son histoire, ses productions et ses ressources naturelles*, published by the Minister of Agriculture of Canada (Ottawa, 1906); *Annual Report of the Department of the Interior* (1907); PAGNUELO, *La liberté religieuse en Canada* (Montreal, 1872); MIGNAULT, *Droit civil canadien* (Montreal, 1895-98); IDEM, *Droit paroissial des curés* (Montreal, 1893); LANGELIER, *Droit civil canadien* (Quebec); *Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce* (Ottawa, 1907).

A. FOURNET.

CANADA, CATHOLICITY IN.—The subject will be treated under three headings: I. Period of French domination, from the discovery of Canada to the Treaty of Paris, in 1763; II. Period of British rule, from 1763 to the present day; III. Present conditions.

I. PERIOD OF FRENCH DOMINATION.—To France belongs the honour of having planted Catholicism in Canada. To-day there seems little doubt that Basque, Breton, and Norman sailors had raised the cross on the shores of this country before the landing of the Venetian, Cabot (1497), and the Florentine, Verrazzano (1522), and above all before Jacques Cartier, of Saint-Malo, who is regarded as the discoverer of the country, had reached Canada and made a brief sojourn on its shores. This celebrated explorer, spurred on by the favour of Francis I, made three voyages to Canada. On the first he discovered Gaspé Peninsula, and had Mass celebrated there (7 July, 1534); on the second he sailed up the St. Lawrence, which he named (10 August, 1535), reached Stadacona (Quebec), and even proceeded as far as Hochelaga, on the site of which now stands the flourishing city of Montreal. His last voyage (1541–42) is unimportant. If Cartier did not succeed in founding a colony in the territory which he added to his country's possessions, it is due to him to state that the thought of spreading the Catholic Faith in new lands, far from being foreign to his undertaking, was its principal incentive.

The second half of the sixteenth century witnessed some attempts at settlements in Acadia which resulted in the foundation of Sainte-Croix and Port Royal (Annapolis in Nova Scotia). The appearance in this country of the first missionaries, secular priests and Jesuits, is worthy of note, though internal divisions and the hostility of England prevented their success. We must come down to Champlain and the opening of the seventeenth century to find traces of a regular colony. Samuel de Champlain (q. v.), after several voyages to Canada, settled there in 1608, and that same year laid the foundations of Quebec. Being a fervent Catholic he wished to spread the blessings of the Faith among the pagan savages of the country. With this object in view, he sought aid from the Franciscan Recollects, who arrived in 1615, and inaugurated in the interior of Canada the missions so famous in the seventeenth century, in which the Jesuits (1625) as well as the Sulpicians (1657) were soon to have so glorious a share. The Canadian Indians, to whose conversion the Catholic missionaries devoted themselves, were divided into two quite distinct stocks: the Algonquins and the Huron-Iroquois. The former were found under various names north of the St. Lawrence and in the basin of the Ottawa, from the mouth of the great river to the prairies of the North-West; the latter were settled south of Lake Ontario and in the Niagara peninsula. Their total population does not seem to have exceeded 100,000 (See ALGONQUINS).

On the arrival of the Recollects (1615), Father d'Olbeau began his labours among the Montagnais of the River Saguenay, and Father Le Caron, ascending the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa, carried the Faith into the heart of the Huron country, while two of their

companions remained at Quebec to look after the colonists and the neighbouring Indians. For ten years they made repeated journeys, opened schools for the young Indians, summoned recruits from France, among them Friar Viel, who was hurled into the Ottawa by an apostate Indian and drowned, and Friar Sagard, the first to publish a history of Canada. Feeling themselves unable to carry on unaided a work of such importance, the Recollects sought the assistance of the Jesuits, whereupon Fathers Brébeuf, Charles Lallemant, and several others went to Canada (1625). But the united efforts of the missionaries were thwarted in a measure by the Merchant Company to which the King of France had conceded the colony. As the spirit of gain prevented the Company from helping the missionaries, and co-operating with them for the welfare of the country, it was suppressed by Louis XIII and Richelieu (1627), and replaced by the "Company of New France", also known as the "Company of the Hundred Associates", which pledged itself "to bring the peoples inhabiting Canada to a knowledge of God and to instruct them in the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Religion". These promises bore no fruit. In less than two years (1629) Quebec fell into the hands of David Kertk (Kirk) a native of Dieppe, who was battling for English interests. Acadia, with the exception of Fort Saint-Louis, had surrendered the preceding year. All the missionaries returned to France.

Canada belonged to England until 1632, when the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye restored it to France. Thereupon Cardinal Richelieu gave to the Jesuits the privilege of resuming their missions, and several of them set sail for Canada. Champlain, the governor, and Lauson, president of the "Company of the Hundred Associates" (*Les Cent Associés*) lent them all possible aid. Father Lejeune organized religious services in Quebec, founded a mission at Three Rivers, and opened the College of Quebec (1635). In the meanwhile other Jesuits had established a mission at Miscou, an island at the entrance of the Baie des Chaleurs, whence they evangelized Gaspé, Acadia, and Cape Breton. For more than thirty years (1633–64) the chief results of their sacrifices were the baptism of children in danger of death and the conversion of some adults. In 1664 the Recollects once more took charge of Acadia and of Gaspé. In the meantime Champlain had died (25 Dec., 1635) in the arms of Father Lallemant, rejoicing at the spread of the Faith. The ardour of the missionaries did not cool. Father Lejeune followed the wandering tribe of the Montagnais and returned with a definite plan of evangelization. It was profitable and even necessary, he argued, to establish missions among fixed and settled tribes like the Hurons, but this was useless among nomadic tribes. These wandering Indians must be induced to group themselves in villages near the French settlements, where they could be protected from hostile invasion and be taught to lead an industrious and settled life. Two settlements were made on this plan: one at Three Rivers and one near Quebec. In 1640, a new mission was opened at Tadousac, and it soon became a centre of Catholic evangelization.

About this time nursing sisters and the first Ursulines arrived in Quebec from France. The former took charge of the Hôtel-Dieu, which had been endowed by the Duchesse d'Aiguillon, a niece of Richelieu; the latter, under the celebrated Marie de l'Incarnation, devoted themselves to the education of girls. Their protectress, Madame de la Peltrie, followed them. These heroic women vied with one another in their zeal for the conversion of the savages. Meanwhile the "Company of Associates" paid no more regard to its obligations than had its predecessors. It attracted few colonists, did nothing towards the civilization of the Indians, and showed no interest in the spread of the Faith. On the other hand the Iroquois were daily becoming more menacing. In 1641 Governor de Montmagny had to conduct a campaign against them. At this juncture the "Company of Montreal" was formed, which proposed, without laying any burden on the king, the clergy, or the people, "to promote the glory of God and the establishment of religion in New France". This inspiration of two men of God, Jean-Jacques Olier and Jérôme de la Dauversière, encouraged by Pope Urban VIII, found in Paul de Chomedey de Maisonneuve a faithful instrument of its purpose. The new association purchased from M. de Lauson of the old company the island of Montreal (1640). Less than two years later Maisonneuve, at the head of a little band of chosen Christians, among them Jeanne Mance, future foundress of the Hôtel-Dieu, landed on the island and laid the foundations of Ville-Marie, or Montreal (18 May, 1642). We shall not recall the energy, vigilance, and resourcefulness required of Maisonneuve to strengthen and develop the infant colony, nor recount the heroic struggles made for thirty years by the colonists against the Iroquois. In 1653 there arrived at Montreal Marguerite Bourgeoys, foundress of the Congregation of Notre Dame, which has been so great an educational factor in Canada and the United States. Four years later M. Olier, then on his death-bed, sent the first four Sulpicians, with M. de Queylus at their head, to Montreal, whither he himself had ardently desired to go.

Meanwhile the Jesuits were actively prosecuting their labours among the Indians. For them the era of martyrdoms had arrived. The years 1648–49 saw the destruction of the flourishing mission of the Hurons, at which eighteen Jesuits had toiled for nearly ten years. In the course of their apostolic journeys they traversed the region lying between Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe, scarcely ever meeting in their residence of Sainte-Marie, save for their annual retreat. They had won many Christians to the Faith before the incursion of the Iroquois, a massacre of extermination to which Fathers Daniel, Brébeuf, G. Lallemant, Garnier, and Chabanel fell victims. Fathers Brébeuf and Lallemant succumbed before the atrocious tortures practised upon them, mingled with buffoon gibes at their religion. They were burned at a slow fire, lacerated, and mutilated with a devilish ingenuity which aimed to prolong life and drag out their sufferings. Their firmness in supporting all these horrors in order to strengthen the faith of the Hurons doomed to death like themselves has earned for them from the people the title of martyrs. The Hurons who escaped from the fury of the Iroquois took refuge, some in Manitoulin Island, others in Ile Saint-Joseph (Christian Island) in Georgian Bay. In the spring of 1650 this remnant came down to the Ile d'Orléans, near Quebec. Three years prior to the massacre of the Hurons, the Iroquois had murdered Father Isaac Jogues (18 Oct., 1646), who had attempted a third missionary journey to one of their tribes, the Agniers. It should be said that Father Bressani had escaped from these barbarians only with the greatest difficulty, and that Father Buteux perished in one of their ambushes (1652). These and other acts of violence had made the Iroquois a terror to the French colony. Montreal owed its safety solely to the heroic courage of Maisonneuve and Lambert Closse, and to the heroism of young Dollard.

The year 1659 marks the beginning of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Canada. Up to that time the missionaries regarded themselves first as directly dependent on the Holy See, and afterwards for some time as under the authority of the Archbishop of Rouen. Rightly or wrongly, the latter looked upon Canada as subject to his jurisdiction in matters spiritual, and acted accordingly. Neither the French Government nor the sovereign pontiff opposed this as

an illegitimate pretension. When M. de Queylus was sent to Montreal by M. Olier, he received from the Archbishop of Rouen (1657) the title of vicar-general, nor did anyone in Canada think of questioning his authority. The arrival (1659) of François de Montmorency-Laval, appointed by Alexander VII titular Bishop of Petræa and Vicar Apostolic of New France, caused a conflict of jurisdiction between the new and the old authority, resulting in the suspension of M. de Queylus for disobedience and obstinacy, and in his consequent return to France. When he came back five years later Bishop Laval received him with open arms, and conferred upon him the title of vicar-general (cf. Aug. Gosselin, "Vénérable François de Laval-Montmorency", Quebec, 1901, 286–87). The new bishop encountered many difficulties. They arose in the first place from the sale of intoxicating liquors, a traffic which the governors, d'Argenson, d'Avaugour, and Mésy abetted, or at least did not prohibit, and which was a perpetual source of conflict between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities. The Church braved the disfavour of those in power rather than surrender the interests of souls and of Christian morality. Bishop Laval had other dissensions with M. de Mésy on occasions when the episcopal rights of the former clashed with the despotic administration of the governor. The governor had recourse to violent measures. He forced Maisonneuve to return to France, where he died at Paris, poor and unknown (1677).

Mésy, who was reconciled with Bishop Laval before his death, was succeeded by Courcelles. He had come to Canada in the company of Tracy, who bore the title of Viceroy, and the Intendant, Talon. They came to a satisfactory understanding with the bishop, carried on two campaigns against the Iroquois (1665–66), whom they reduced to an inaction of twenty years, and promoted in many ways the colony's interests, above all by attracting to it new settlers. In 1668 Bishop Laval had begun a preparatory seminary (*petit séminaire*). Ten years later he opened a seminary (*grand séminaire*) for the training of his clergy. The increase in population necessitated a more numerous clergy as well as a better arrangement of parishes. In 1672 outside of Quebec the parishes numbered twenty-five, each with a resident priest. To provide for the support of the clergy the bishop imposed a tax on the faithful, which by an act of 1663 was fixed at a thirteenth part of the crops; later this was reduced to one twenty-sixth, the king agreeing to make up the rest. The parish priests then formed with the seminary of Quebec a sort of corporation, the respective rights and duties of whose members were legally established. The progress of the missions had not ceased between 1660 and 1680. The Jesuit, Father Allouez, penetrated to Lake Superior, and there founded two missions (1665). Fathers Dablon and Marquette planted the cross at Sault Sainte Marie. Other Jesuits, allying themselves with the discoverers Saint-Lusson and Cavelier de la Salle, took possession of the western shores of Lake Huron; two years afterwards Father d'Albanel pierced the wilderness as far as Hudson Bay. The Jesuits also restored the Iroquois missions south of Lake Ontario, and founded, south of Montreal, the permanent mission of "La Prairie de la Madeleine". This was the home of Catherine Tegakwitha, the "Lily of Canada", who died at the age of twenty-three in the odour of sanctity. The Third Council of Baltimore asked to have the cause of her beatification introduced. This Christian community, transferred to Sault Saint Louis (Caughnawaga), is still flourishing, and numbers more than 2000 souls. After many changes it was once more placed under the care of the Jesuits (1902). We may note here that it was from Canada that L. Jolliet and the famous Father Marquette set forth for the discovery of the Mississippi (1673). The missions of the Sulpicians, who were already engaged in evangelizing the savages, will be treated in the articles SULPICIANS and MONTREAL. The Recollects (Franciscans) had returned to Canada in 1670, and from their establishment at Quebec had founded four missions: Three Rivers, Ile Percée, River St. John, and Fort Frontenac on Lake Ontario. In 1682 M. Dollier de Casson invited them to Montreal. Later Bishop Saint-Vallier entrusted to them the Cape Breton mission and that of Plaisance in Newfoundland.

During this development of the missions, Bishop Laval had prevailed upon Clement X to make Quebec an episcopal see (1674); he had confirmed the affiliation of his seminary with that of the Missions Etrangères in Paris, had erected a chapter of canons, organized his diocese, and maintained a struggle against Governor Frontenac for the rights of the Church and the prohibition of the sale of liquors to the savages. In 1684 he placed his resignation in the hands of Louis XIV. On his return to Quebec in 1688, he lived twenty years in retirement and died (1708) in the odour of sanctity. In 1878 his body was removed from the cathedral to the chapel of the seminary, where he wished to lie, and a process for his canonization was begun and submitted for the approbation of Leo XIII. Bishop Laval was succeeded by Bishop Saint-Vallier, to whom Quebec owes the foundation of its General Hospital, a work of no little labour and expense. He freed the seminary from the parochial functions imposed upon it by his predecessor, so that it might be thenceforth devoted solely to the education of the clergy. Meanwhile the English admiral, Phipps, had attacked Quebec (1690) with thirty-two ships. While Frontenac made preparations for its defence the bishop in a pastoral letter exhorted the Canadians to do their duty valiantly. After fruitless attacks the enemy withdrew, whereupon the bishop, in fulfilment of a vow, dedicated to Our Lady of Victory the church in the lower town. It is still standing. The era of the great missions had come to an end, yet de la Mothe-Cadillac with a hundred Canadians and a missionary founded, in 1701, the city of Detroit. The Seminary of Quebec sent apostles to the Tamarois, between the Illinois and the Ohio rivers. The Recollects took over the missions of the Ile Royale, or Cape Breton. The Jesuits on their part evangelized the Miamis, the Sioux, the Outaouais (Ottawas), and the Illinois.

In the meantime England continued to cast envious eyes on the Catholic colony of Canada, which France, with her lack of foresight, was neglecting more and more. After the close of the seventeenth century there was scarcely any emigration from the mother-country to New France, and Canada was forced to rely on her own resources for her preservation and growth. Her population, which in 1713 was 18,000, had increased to 42,000 by 1739, the year of the last census taken under French administration. This was a small number at best to stand out against the colonists of New England, who numbered 262,000 in 1706. Acadia was especially weak, having only 2000 inhabitants, and against her the efforts of England and her American colonies were first directed. Port Royal was taken in 1710, and three years later, by the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), France ceded to England Acadia, Newfoundland, and the Hudson Bay territory. As early as 1604 Catholic missionaries had gone to Acadia and converted to the Faith its native Indians, the Micmac and the Abnaki. The English conquest did not interrupt their missionary activity, but it often rendered their labours more difficult. Fortified by them, the Acadians increased in number, despite English persecution, and about 1750 their number had risen to 15,000. The Company of Saint-Sulpice and the Seminary of Quebec supplied them with their principal missionaries. The incredible

vexations to which the unhappy Acadians were subjected by unworthy English governors will not be recounted here. History has branded their memory with infamy, especially that of Lawrence, who with calculating violence embarked (1755) the Acadians on English vessels and scattered them throughout the American colonies. This act of barbarism, which has caused his name to be execrated by all men, furnished Longfellow with the inspiration for his touching poem, "Evangeline". Canada in the meantime enjoyed comparative peace. There was a presentiment, however, that England would soon make a final effort to conquer the country. Instead of sending colonists and troops the French Government persisted in constructing at great expense fortifications at Louisburg and at Quebec.

After making rich donations to the religious establishments of Quebec (estimated at 600,000 livres, about $120,000), Bishop Saint-Vallier died in 1727. His successor was Bishop Duplessis-Mornay, whom infirmities prevented from coming to Canada. Bishop Dosquet, his coadjutor and administrator from 1729, succeeded him in 1733, and laboured earnestly for education and for the increase of religious communities. The education of girls was in the hands of the Ursulines, who had one boarding-school at Quebec and another at Three Rivers, and of the Sisters of the Congregation of Notre Dame, of Montreal, who had fourteen houses. Primary instruction for boys was conducted by male teachers. Prematurely exhausted by the rigour of the climate, Bishop Dosquet resigned his office and left Canada. His successor, Bishop Lauberivière, died on his arrival at Quebec, a victim of his devotion to the sick soldiers on the voyage from France. With Bishop Pontbriand (1741–1760) we reach the end of the French rule. He restored the cathedral of Quebec then falling into decay, went to the assistance of the Ursulines of Three Rivers and the Hôtel-Dieu of Quebec on the occasion of disastrous fires, administered his diocese wisely, and was a model for his clergy in wisdom and virtue.

At Montreal the Sulpicians still pursued their beneficent work. To their superior, M. de Belmont (1701–32) must be ascribed the construction of the Fort of the Mountain and of the old seminary which is still in existence, and the opening of the Lachine canal. M. Normant du Faradon, his successor (1732–59), saved the General Hospital from ruin, and entrusted it to the "Grey Nuns", whose founder he may be called, together with the Venerable Mère d'Youville. The Abbé François Picquet, honoured by the city of Ogdensburg as its founder (1749), was also a Sulpician. The well-known events which hastened the fall of the colony are a part of general history. After the capture of Quebec by Wolfe (1759), Bishop Pontbriand took refuge with the Sulpicians at Montreal, where he died before that city fell into the hands of the English. On 10 February, 1763, the Treaty of Paris was signed, ceding Canada to England, closing for the Church in Canada the period of establishment and settlement, and opening the period of conflict and development.

II. Period of British Rule (1763——).—At the time of the Treaty of Paris (see Quebec) the Catholic population of Canada, all of French descent, scarcely numbered 70,000. Abandoned by their civil rulers and representatives, who had returned to France, they owed to their clergy the preservation of their Faith and in great measure the recovery of their political and civil rights. While the clauses of the Treaty of Paris were still under discussion a memorial had been laid before the French ambassador in London concerning the religious affairs of Canada. This demanded, among other things, security for the See and Chapter of Quebec. The intentions of the British Government were quite different. It proposed to substitute the Anglican hierarchy for the Catholic, and English Protestantism for Catholicism, and it flattered itself that it could easily overcome the scruples of a handful of French colonists. With this end in view it spared priests and laity no vexation. The government policy was especially active against the young, who were to be educated in schools of a marked Anglican tone. The Canadians, who had good cause for anxiety, sent a deputation to King George III, to demand the maintenance of their ecclesiastical organization and to complain of violations of the Treaty of Paris, which assured them religious liberty.

In the meantime the Chapter of Quebec proceeded to elect M. de Montgolfier, superior of the Sulpicians of Montreal, bishop. The English authorities refused consent to his consecration. Oliver Briand, vicar-general to Bishop Pontbriand, was then consecrated with only the tacit consent of the Government, which always refused him the title of Bishop, which it reserved for the head of the Anglican hierarchy; instead of bishop they used the term Superintendent (*Surintendant*) of Catholic Worship. The communities of men, Recollects, Jesuits, and Sulpicians, were forbidden to take novices in Canada, or to receive members from abroad. They were marked out for extinction, and the State declared itself heir to their property. The English confiscated the goods of the Recollects and Jesuits in 1774, and granted the religious modest pensions. The Sulpicians fared better. In 1793, of the thirty Sulpicians living in 1759 there remained only two septuagenarians, whose last moments were being eagerly looked for, when the British Government relaxed its rigour in favour of the victims of the French Revolution, and opened Canada as a place of refuge for persecuted French priests.

While Catholic interests on the banks of the St. Lawrence were thus menaced by the new English masters there was brewing an event, big with consequences, that counselled more moderation. The British American colonies were threatening revolt. England realized that she must conciliate the Canadians at any cost, and by the Quebec Act of 1774 she granted them many liberties hitherto withheld or suppressed. (See Quebec.) This was due chiefly to Governor Guy Carleton (1769–96), who was wise, judicious, and tolerant, very sympathetic toward Catholicism, and much loved by Bishop Briand and his flock. The Americans were unable to induce the French Canadians to take part in the American Revolution, and Montgomery's invasion (1775) was checked at Quebec. Led by Bishop Briand, the champions of loyalty were the Catholic priests, whom Great Britain had hitherto regarded with suspicion. Bishop Briand resigned in 1784. By this time Catholics numbered 130,000. The Maritime Provinces—New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and even the Ile Saint-Jean (Prince Edward Island)—were being peopled by Scotch and Irish Catholics (see Burke, Edmund). Bishop d'Esglis succeeded Bishop Briand, who, to forestall a vacancy hastened to secure a successor in the person of François Hubert (1788). The diocese now contained 160 priests, among them the Abbés Desjardins, Sigogne, Calonne, and Picquart, who gathered again the scattered remnants of the Acadians, a race supposed to be practically extinct. There is an interesting memorial of Bishop Hubert to the Holy See (1794), in which he notes the fidelity of the Catholics to their religion, and dwells upon the necessity of creating new sees. The opposition of the British Government continued inexorable, so that it was necessary to wait for more propitious circumstances. This opposition was all the more unjustifiable, becoming evident, as it did, shortly after the Constitutional Act of 1791. This was the famous act which granted Canada a constitutional government, and divided the country into two provinces, Upper and Lower Canada, each having a governor, an assembly, and a legislative council.

1. CHURCH OF NOTRE DAME, MONTREAL
2. PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, OTTAWA
3. STATUE OF MAISONNEUVE, MONTREAL
4. CHURCH OF SAINTE-ANNE DE BEAUPRÉ, QUEBEC
5. THE BASILICA, QUEBEC
6. CATHEDRAL OF ST. JAMES, MONTREAL

Concerning the French Catholic inhabitants of Lower Canada the Act read: "All possible care must be taken to ensure them the enjoyment of the civil and religious rights guaranteed them by the terms of the capitulation of the province, or since accorded them by the liberal and enlightened spirit of the British Government" (Christie, op. cit. infra, 16; Pagnuelo, 69).

During the episcopate of Bishop Denaut (1797–1806) and Bishop Octave Plessis (1806–1825) the antagonism of Anglican Protestantism manifested itself in two very different forms. Under the name of "Royal Institution" Dr. Mountain, the Anglican Bishop of Quebec, devised a corporation which was to monopolize instruction in all its stages by concentrating all educational authority in the hands of the governor. In this way the entire educational system was to be withdrawn from the Catholic clergy and fall under Protestant control; the natural result would be the easy seduction of childhood and youth. The vigilance of the clergy and of Bishop Denaut balked these astute machinations (Pagnuelo, "Etudes historiques et légales sur la liberté religieuse en Canada", Montreal, 1872). The difficulties which beset Bishop Plessis were of a different kind. He had to deal with a powerful and fanatical oligarchy determined to reduce the Church to a condition of servitude to the civil power, to make it, as in England, a docile instrument of the Government, in a word, to insensibly render Canada Protestant by administrative pressure. The chief spirit of this coalition was a certain Witzius Ryland, secretary to the governors of Canada from 1790 to 1812. His policy was the confiscation of all ecclesiastical property and the exclusion of Catholicism from its dominant position. It was to be treated as a dissenting sect, tolerated by the condescension of the authorities. Chief Justice Monk, Attorney-General Sewell, and the Anglican Bishop Mountain shared the same ideas, and they had no difficulty in converting to their opinions the governor, James Craig, whose administration has been called a "reign of terror". Bishop Plessis was given to understand that he must recognize the royal authority in religious matters, renounce his jurisdiction in parochial matters, and subordinate his administration to state supremacy. The bishop was quite able to hold his own against his opponents. Firm yet gentle, he knew how to maintain his independence, abdicate no right, and renounce no just claim, yet he never wounded English feeling. In the end he was successful. It must be admitted indeed that Providence sent him unexpected support. The War of 1812 had just broken out between Great Britain and the United States. Bishop Plessis took the same stand as Bishop Briand thirty years before. He did all in his power to maintain the loyalty of Catholics and to promote the defence of Canada. When the American invasion had been repelled, the governor, Sir George Prévost, felt that a renewal of the early conflict would be a poor return on the part of the Government. He conceded to the bishop and his successors the official recognition of the title of Catholic Bishop of Quebec (1813), and granted them a yearly stipend of $5000. For some years (1814–20) the Catholic Church enjoyed a certain degree of favour. During this time the Vicariate Apostolic of Nova Scotia was erected (1817), and the Bishop of Quebec given the title of Archbishop, with auxiliary bishops (1819). Upper Canada was placed under Bishop Alexander MacDonnell (q.v.) and Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick under Bishop McEachern (q.v.) Bishops were later placed over the North-West and the district of Montreal (1820).

The favour granted to the Catholic Church could not fail to arouse some dissatisfaction. A group of fanatics resolved to abrogate the Constitution of 1791, which had separated Upper from Lower Canada, and to bring about the union of the two provinces, the one Catholic, the other Protestant, on the most unjust terms, with a view to destroying the influence of the Catholic and French population. The plot found a powerful agent in England in a certain Ellice, who succeeded in having a bill to this effect brought before the House of Commons (1822). It would have passed almost unnoticed had not one Parker, an enemy of Ellice, put the ministry on its guard. The news of this attempt caused great excitement in Lower Canada. Bishop Plessis and the clergy drew up protests, which were quickly endorsed with 60,000 signatures, and were taken to London by Papineau and Neilson, legislative councillors. Their mission was successful, and the bill was withdrawn.

Meanwhile the Canadian population continued to increase. In 1832 the French Canadians alone numbered 380,000. Primary schools multiplied everywhere, promoted by the Educational Society (*Société d'éducation*) of Quebec and by the law of the parish schools (*Ecoles de fabrique*). Colleges for secondary instruction were founded wherever needed, and several episcopal sees were erected: Kingston (1826), Charlottetown (1829), and Montreal (1836). In all these movements Bishop Panet (1825–32), successor to Bishop Plessis, took a leading part. He died the year of the cholera, which carried off 4000 in five weeks, and was succeeded by Bishop Signay, whose episcopate was marked by several calamities: a second scourge of the cholera (1834); civil war (1837–38); disastrous fires which reduced Quebec to a mass of ruins (1845); and the typhus fever brought by the Irish immigrants, driven from their country by the terrible famine and evictions of 1847.

This period is marked by the solution of a question which had been agitated since the conquest: the recognition by the British Crown of the property of the Sulpicians, which, being of considerable value, aroused great cupidity. The bigoted counsellors who surrounded Sir James Craig at the beginning of the nineteenth century urged its confiscation. Sewell made reports and suggested plans; Ryland made vigorous use of his pen and was most active in promoting the cause; he went to London for the same purpose. The British Government did not reply. In his memoir of 1819 M. Roux, superior of Saint-Sulpice at Montreal, answered every adverse claim, and Bishop Plessis pleaded the same cause with great force before Lord Bathurst (1821). The attacks were renewed in 1829, and the seminary was on the point of giving up its rights in exchange for an annual income. Rome, when appealed to, refused to ratify any such transaction, and the matter dragged on. Finally Queen Victoria, by an ordinance of the Privy Council, declared the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice the lawful owner of its holdings, an act of justice which permitted the Sulpicians to continue their beneficent work. Montreal owed to them its prosperity, the settlement of the surrounding districts, its flourishing college and great church of Notre-Dame, the work of M. Roux (1825–30). It owed to them also its schools. A short time previous M. Quiblier, successor of M. Roux, had brought to Canada the Brothers of the Christian Schools. The Grand Séminaire, now so prosperous, was soon to open (1840).

In 1840 the union of Upper and Lower Canada, so long fought off by the latter as an act of gross injustice, was accomplished. The avowed aim of the Protestants of Ontario was to make Quebec subject to Ontario, the French element to the English, the Catholic to the Protestant. Contrary to all expectation, this act turned out favourable to the liberty and progress of Catholicism. Far from abrogating the provisions of the constitution of 1791 concerning the Catholic religion, it extended them, at the same time providing for their enforcement. For in 1840, after the guarantees of liberty given the Catholic

Church by the British Government, the spiritual supremacy of the king in religious affairs could not be maintained as defined in the Royal Instructions of 1791. Let us add that Lord Elgin, a broad-minded governor, appeared on the scene, and recognized that it was time to put an end to a system of government based on partiality and the denial of justice.

To this governor Canada is indebted for her religious liberty, plainly granted in an act of 1851 issued by the King of Great Britain and published in the Canadian press, 1 June, 1852. Here it is formally stated that the "free exercise and enjoyment of profession and religious worship, without distinction or preference, are permitted by the constitution and laws of this province of Canada to all the subjects of His Majesty in the said province."

The fifteen years that followed the Act of Union were therefore very productive for Canadian Catholicism. Archbishop Signay of Quebec, his successor, Archbishop Turgeon (1850), and in an especial manner Bishop Ignace Bourget, the successor of Bishop Lartigue in the See of Montreal, gave a great impetus to the religious life of Canada. During their episcopates five religious communities of men and sixteen of women either arose on Canadian soil or came thither from France. The following may be mentioned: Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate, who were to repeat among the savages of the "Far West" the missionary successes of the Society of Jesus during the seventeenth century; the Jesuit Fathers (1842), whom Canada had been calling in vain for over fifty years; the Clerics of St. Viator, and the Fathers of the Holy Cross. In this period were founded at Montreal: the Sisters of Providence (1843), the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary (1843), the Sisters of Mercy (1848), the Sisters of St. Anne (1850); at Quebec, the Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (1850). The number of sees was increased by the foundation of Toronto (1841), Halifax (1842), raised to an archdiocese in 1852, St. John, New Brunswick (1842), Arichat, Nova Scotia (1844), transferred to Antigonish in 1886, Bytown or Ottawa (1847), St. John's, Newfoundland (1847). The First Council of Quebec, since 1844 a Metropolitan See, with Montreal, Kingston, and Toronto for suffragans, was held in 1851. The Sees of Three Rivers and St. Hyacinthe were erected in 1851. This decade was also marked by: (1) the celebrated "missions" of Monsignor de Forbin-Janson, former Bishop of Nancy, and the institution of parochial retreats; (2) the adoption of a school system that assured separate primary and normal schools for Catholics and Protestants (1841); (3) a genuine crusade for the promotion of temperance (1843) and the founding of societies for the suppression of alcoholism; (4) the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith and the Work of the Holy Childhood; (5) colonization societies to provide for the surplus of the Canadian population (1848). A glance at the following table shows the rapidity of this increase: —

Date	Total Population	Increase in Population	Catholics	Increase in Catholics	Protestants	Increase in Protestants
			Province of Quebec			
1831	511,922	per cent	425,000	per cent	86,000	per cent
1844	681,806	33	572,643	34	100,163	27
1851	886,356	30	746,866	30	139,490	27
1861	1,110,664	25	942,724	27	167,940	20
			Province of Ontario			
1831	261,000		40,000		221,000	
1844	480,000	88	78,000	96	411,000	86
1851	952,000	94	167,000	115	785,000	91
1861	1,396,091	47	258,141	55	1,137,000	44

The Catholic population now needed more primary schools; the need was met chiefly by Meilleur, the superintendent of education. On assuming office he found a school attendance of only 3000, which, when he retired in 1855, thirteen years later, had increased to 127,000. New centres of secondary education had been opened: the college of Joliette (1846), Saint-Laurent (1847), Rigaud (1850), Sainte-Marie de Monnoir (1853), and Lévis (1853). The following year (1854) the inauguration of a Catholic university, the Laval University at Quebec, crowned all the generous efforts already made for the cause of education. This was also due to the Canadian clergy. The First Council of Quebec had manifested the need and desire for such an institution; less than ten years later all the difficulties had been surmounted, and the Seminary of Quebec, which had undertaken this difficult task, could exhibit fresh proof of its devotion to Church and country. Laval University had already proved its worth and accomplished much good when it was canonically established by a Bull of Pius IX (1876).

While the Church was thus progressing in Eastern Canada, in the West it was only beginning its work. About 1818 a priest of the Diocese of Quebec, the Abbé Provencher, founded on the banks of the Red River the first Western Canadian missions beyond the pale of civilization. Two years later he was consecrated bishop, and for the remaining years of his life Bishop Provencher multiplied his labours, called to his aid assistants, and sent missionaries as far as British Columbia. In 1844 he was made Vicar Apostolic of the North-West, and in 1847 Bishop of St. Boniface. The same year another missionary from Quebec, Modeste Demers, was named Bishop of Vancouver. To establish his missions securely Bishop Provencher invited to his diocese the Oblate Fathers, recently established at Montreal. They accepted the invitation, and in 1853 one of their number, Bishop Taché, succeeded the first Bishop of St. Boniface. In 1862 the Vicariate Apostolic of Athabaska was erected, with Bishop Faraud (1828–90) as titular. The ecclesiastical province of St. Boniface (Manitoba) was created in 1871. Bishop Taché was raised to the rank of archbishop by Pius IX, and his coadjutor, Monseigneur Grandin (1829–1902), was named Bishop of the newly-erected see of St. Albert. To the See of St. Albert and the Vicariate Apostolic of Athabaska were added in 1890 the Vicariate Apostolic of Saskatchewan, raised, in 1908, to the rank of a bishopric, with the title of Prince Albert, and the See of New Westminster (British Columbia), and in 1901 the Vicariate Apostolic of Mackenzie and the Yukon. The last department, by a Brief of Leo XIII (1903), was detached from St. Boniface and attached to Victoria (Vancouver), which was raised to archiepiscopal rank, and has been known since 1904 as the archdiocese of Victoria.

While the ecclesiastical hierarchy was forming in the West the Church was pursuing her beneficent work in Eastern Canada. At the Second Council of Quebec (1854) the bishops promulgated disciplinary regulations concerning primary schools, secret societies, temperance, educational institutions, politics, erroneous Bibles, immoral books, and parochial libraries. The definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception (8 Dec., 1854) brought joy to the hearts of pastors and faithful. During the ensuing years the Catholics of Canada watched sadly the march of ideas and events in Europe, and bishops drew attention in their pastorals to errors condemned by the head of the Church. Canadian Catholics were indignant at the invasion of the Pontifical States by the Piedmontese, and seven corps of Zouaves were spontaneously formed to hasten to the defence of the common father of the faithful (1868–1870). The division of Montreal into parishes should be mentioned as belonging to this period. Until then the Sulpicians had been able to minister to the city. But in 1866 an

Apostolic decree authorized Bishop Bourget to divide the city into as many parishes as he thought proper. Montreal contained 100,000 Catholics. By 1908 Montreal had more than trebled its population of 1866, and there were over forty parishes in addition to the mother-parish of Notre Dame, of which the Sulpicians have had charge for over two hundred and fifty years. New sees were created: Rimouski (1867), Sherbrooke (1874), Chicoutimi (1878), and Nicolet (1885). In 1870 Toronto was made an archdiocese, with Kingston (1826) and Hamilton (1856) as suffragan sees. In 1889 Kingston was erected into an archdiocese, with Peterborough (1882) as suffragan. Alexandria (1890) and Sault Sainte Marie (1904) were erected and added later. London (1855) was made suffragan to Toronto. In 1886 Montreal was made an archiepiscopal see under Archbishop Fabre, successor of Bishop Bourget, and given as suffragan sees St. Hyacinthe, Sherbrooke, and later Valleyfield (1892) and Joliette (1905). In 1886 Ottawa was made an archdiocese, and assigned as suffragan the Vicariate Apostolic of Pontiac, which since 1898 has been the See of Pembroke, and finally Leo XIII honoured Archbishop Taschereau of Quebec with the cardinal's hat (1886).

A few special points deserve a brief separate treatment. (1) *The Restoration of the Acadians.*—At the time of Lawrence's violent dispersion of the Acadians (1755) 1268 of them had escaped, and by 1815 formed a nucleus of 25,000 souls; in 1864 they numbered 80,000. A Canadian priest, Father Lefebvre, gathered them together, founded for them the college of Memramcook (New Brunswick), provided for them primary schools, organized them, and awoke in them a consciousness of their strength. In 1880 seventy Acadian delegates represented their compatriots at the great national reunion. The national society of the Acadians is called "The Society of the Assumption". By 1899 the Acadians amounted to 125,000; they had six deputies in the local legislatures of the Maritime Provinces and two in the Federal Parliament at Ottawa. According to the census of 1901, their proportion to the total population in the Maritime Provinces is as follows:—

Provinces	Total Population	Protestants	Catholics	Acadians	Total Acadian Population
New Brunswick	331,120	205,000	125,698	79,979	139,006
Nova Scotia	459,594	330,000	129,578	45,161	
Prince Edward Island	103,259	57,463	45,796	13,866	

If to the Acadian population of 139,006 be added the Catholic Acadians of the Gaspé coast and the Magdalen Islands, the total will easily reach 155,000, surely an element of Catholic strength for the future.

(2) *Schools of New Brunswick and Manitoba.*—Prior to the confederation of the Canadian Provinces (1867), New Brunswick legislation rendered possible the establishment of religious schools. This privilege was abolished in 1871 by the Provincial Legislature. The Catholics, thus forced either to send their children to public schools or to pay a double school tax, appealed to the Federal Parliament. Sir John MacDonald, who was all-powerful at the time, made promises, which, however, failed to satisfy Bishops Sweeney and Rogers, who organized for resistance and opposed the tax collectors. This convinced the Protestants that it was advisable to reach a satisfactory agreement. The unjust law was not repealed, but enough concessions were made to restore peace (1874). A parallel act of injustice was done against the rights of Manitoban Catholics in 1890. The British North America Act, which consolidated the Dominion of Canada, gave each province the right to exclusively make laws in relation to education, but safeguarded all rights or privileges granted by the law at the time of the legislative union to any class of persons enjoying denominational schools. Moreover, when Manitoba entered the confederation (1870) the Catholic delegates, guided by Archbishop Taché of St. Boniface, had taken steps to have the rights of their coreligionists respected. Despite these precautions, separate schools were abolished by an intolerant ministry (1890). In 1894 the bishops of the Dominion sent a petition to the Governor-General in Council. On appeal, the British Privy Council decided that this appeal was admissible, but referred its settlement to the Governor-General in Council. In 1896 a pastoral letter appeared, signed by Cardinal Taschereau and the bishops of the Quebec province, protesting against the injustice done their Manitoban coreligionists. The issue in the general elections of 1896 was whether the wrongs of the Manitoba Catholics should be removed by remedial legislation of the Dominion Parliament, as the Conservatives proposed, or by conciliation and compromise with the provincial authorities, as the Liberals suggested. The Liberal party came into power under Sir Wilfred Laurier, and a compromise was effected which, without repealing the law, lessened its disastrous results. The Catholic Liberal members of the Dominion Parliament petitioned the Holy See to send an Apostolic delegate, and Leo XIII confided the delicate mission of making a full investigation to Monsignor Merry del Val, after 1903 Cardinal Secretary of State. The first permanent Apostolic Delegate to Canada was Monsignor Diomede Falconio, later Apostolic Delegate at Washington, who was succeeded in turn by Monsignor Donato Sbaretti, former Bishop of Havana. The seat of the delegation is at Ottawa.

(3) *Foundation of the University of Laval at Montreal.*—The ever-increasing importance of Montreal made it desirable that the city should have a Catholic university. Bishop Bourget addressed a petition to the Propaganda, asking for its establishment. By a decree of 1 February, 1876, the Sacred Congregation gave permission to erect at Montreal a branch of the University of Laval of Quebec. In 1889 Leo XIII established the administrative autonomy of the new university by the decree "Jam dudum". M. Colin, superior of Saint-Sulpice (1880–1902) took the foremost part in the establishment and organization of the Laval University at Montreal. He even induced his society to give the site needed for the university buildings and to subscribe almost half of the sum considered necessary for their construction.

(4) *Colonization.*—The first colonists in Canada settled along the great rivers, especially the St. Lawrence. There each family was wont to clear a strip of land, quite narrow as compared with the extent of the country, leaving intact the interior forest. About 1835 all the cleared portions were occupied by the growing population, and the surplus was forced to migrate to the cities or the United States to find some readier means of subsistence. The emigration movement threatened to become general and disturbed the Canadian patriots. The clergy organized a veritable crusade to keep the people on their own soil. The colonizing priest is a type found only in Canada. None is better known than the Curé Labelle, who devoted his life to the work of colonization, founding by his own efforts more than thirty parishes in the Province of Quebec. Wherever the work of colonization has been carried on, at Temiscamingue, on the shores of Lake St. John or of the River Saguenay, in Gaspé, or north of Montreal, priests and religious are found, directing and helping the settlers. It is they who still form a majority of the deputies and members who attend the annual agricultural congresses at the Trappist monastery of Notre-Dame d'Oka, the colonization congresses and societies. We may add that the agricultural schools of Notre-Dame d'Oka, Sainte-

Anne de la Pocatière and the Assumption are conducted by ecclesiastics.

III. PRESENT CONDITIONS.—(1) *Ecclesiastical Provinces.*—Canada has eight ecclesiastical provinces: Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Kingston, Halifax, St. Boniface, and Victoria. To each archiepiscopal see are attached as suffragans one or more episcopal sees or vicariates Apostolic. There are twenty-three bishoprics and three vicariates Apostolic. Newfoundland, which has not yet joined the Dominion, has an archdiocese and two dioceses, and since 1904 has been an ecclesiastical province. The Catholic Church in Canada is immediately dependent on the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, and contains about 3500 priests and 2,400,000 faithful. On the death of a bishop his colleagues of the same ecclesiastical province send to Rome a list of three names, arranged in order of merit: *dignissimus, dignior, dignus*, together with a similar list left by the deceased prelate, if an archbishop, and it rests with the Holy See, after making inquiries, to name the bishop. It is different if during his lifetime the bishop is given a coadjutor *cum futurâ successione*. The coadjutor is chosen by the bishop, who proposes his name to the Holy See. The bishop is completely independent of the State. As soon as he receives the Apostolic Bull he enters upon his functions without any civil formality. The faithful render him homage and obedience at once. In the Province of Quebec the local government accords him recognition and grants him certain rights, e. g. a seat in the Superior Council of Public Instruction. In the other provinces in which Protestantism preponderates the bishop acts in his own sphere, side by side with the civil authority but independently.

Bishoprics may form civil corporations, recognized by the State, and thus acquire, possess, or alienate property. The bishop enjoys complete liberty in the nomination to spiritual offices, the erection of parishes, the building of churches and parochial residences. As soon as a parish priest is named he is installed and enters upon his duties. No parish priest is irremovable, except in the cathedral parish at Quebec. In the Province of Quebec the parish priest keeps the civil registers of baptisms, marriages, and deaths, which are accepted by the court. Outside the Province of Quebec the civil register of births, marriages, and deaths is kept by a lay official of the provincial government. The parish priest sends him, once a month or oftener, the parish record of births, marriages, and deaths on a printed form provided for that purpose. In the Province of Quebec the parish priest named by the bishop has a right to tithes, and this right is recognized by the civil authority. This tax tends to change from a tithe in kind to a tithe in money. Where tithes do not exist the support of the priest is provided for by an annual contribution, either voluntary or prescribed by the bishop, or else by church collections. Missions, properly so called, are supported by the Association for the Propagation of the Faith. In canonically established parishes a parochial council (*Conseil de fabrique*) made up of prominent citizens known as churchwardens (*marguilliers*) administer the church property, under the direction of the parish priest. Out-

ECCLESIASTICAL STATISTICS

ARCHDIOCESES DIOCESES VICARIATES APOSTOLIC	Date of erection	Catholic Population	Secular Priests	Regular Priests	Communities of men	Communities of women	Parishes	Churches and Chapels	Convents and Academies	Charitable Institutions	Colleges and Seminaries
QUEBEC { Vic. Ap. / Bishopric / Archbishopric	1657 / 1674 / 1844	376,000	190	87	15	24	227	243	80	22	4
Three Rivers	1852	80,110	107	78	6	10	43	72	16	4	2
Rimouski	1867	111,200	124	72	3	7	81	117	28	3	2
Chicoutimi	1878	69,000	108	17	5	9	54	62	12	2	2
Nicolet	1885	89,565	123		3	8	65	65	24	2	2
Gulf of St. Lawrence, Vic. Ap.	1905	9,650	1	19	2	2	12	29	1	1	
MONTREAL { Bishopric / Archbishopric	1836 / 1886	397,624	470	199	18	17	133	158	84	70	8
St. Hyacinthe	1852	115,000	189	22	9	10	73	69	52	9	2
Sherbrooke	1874	76,500	102		2	8	67	40	19	1	1
Valleyfield	1892	55,259	85	12	3	6	36	40	19	4	1
Joliette	1904	60,842	91	18	4	7	40	48	21	11	1
OTTAWA { Bishopric / Archbishopric	1847 / 1886	151,000	123	129	11	14	95	133	20	12	2
Pembroke	1898	48,956	40	16	1	4	30	82	4	4	
TORONTO { Bishopric / Archbishopric	1841 / 1870	65,000	54	39	3	4	48	88	19	8	1
Hamilton	1856	52,000	51	16	3	3	42	69	19	7	1
London	1855	60,000	66	18	1	4	51	78	16	3	1
KINGSTON { Bishopric / Archbishopric	1826 / 1889	43,000	62			5	41	69	7	5	
Peterborough	1882	24,000	26	3	1	1	21	43		1	
Alexandria	1890	24,000	20			3	14	21	4	1	
Sault Sainte Marie	1904	35,000	13	28	1	5	20	43		3	
HALIFAX { Bishopric / Archbishopric	1842 / 1852	55,000	50	26	2	3	37	86	16		2
Charlottetown	1829	50,000	45			1	35	45	8	1	1
St. John	1842	58,000	40	23	2	3	38	93	9		1
Antigonish	1844	75,000	100	8	1	4	66	95	19		1
Chatham	1860	66,000	65	26	2	5	54	77	13		1
ST. BONIFACE { Bishopric / Archbishopric	1847 / 1871	97,000	83	129	10	9	98	218	30	9	1
St. Albert	1871	52,000	19	71	5	10	45	85	12	7	1
Prince Albert	1908	44,000	11	52	3	6	35	80	10	3	
Athabaska, Vic. Ap.	1862	5,500		26	1	2	10	16	2		
VICTORIA { Bishopric / Archbishopric	1847 / 1903	14,500	14	6	2	1	13	24	4		1
New Westminster	1890	22,000	4	33	1	5	18	38	4	5	1
Mackenzie and Yukon, Vic. Ap.	1901	12,000		21	1	2	13	16		2	
ST. JOHN'S, Newfoundland { Bishopric / Archbishopric	1847 / 1904	45,000	34		1	2	21	55	14	5	1
Harbour Grace	1856	32,000	22			2	20	60	5		
St. George	1904	8,500	9			2	7	36	2		



THE EIGHT ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCES OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF

NEWFOUNDLAND

Provinces and Dioceses.	Seat of Bishopric and Vicariate Apostolic.
I. Prov. of Quebec.	
1 Archdiocese of Quebec	Quebec.
2 Diocese of Three Rivers	Three Rivers.
3 Diocese of Rimouski	Rimouski.
4 Diocese of Chicoutimi	Chicoutimi.
5 Diocese of Nicolet	Nicolet.
6 Vic. Ap. Gulf of St. Lawrence	
II. Prov. of Montreal.	
1 Archdiocese of Montreal	Montreal.
2 Diocese of Saint Hyacinth	St. Hyacinth.
3 Diocese of Sherbrooke	Sherbrooke.
4 Diocese of Valleyfield	Valleyfield.
5 Diocese of Joliette	Joliette.
III. Prov. of Ottawa.	
1 Archdiocese of Ottawa	Ottawa
2 Diocese of Pembroke	Pembroke.
IV. Prov. of Toronto.	
1 Archdiocese of Toronto	Toronto.
2 Diocese of Hamilton	Hamilton.
3 Diocese of London	London.

Provinces and Dioceses.	Seat of Bishopric and Vicariate Apostolic.
V. Prov. of Kingston.	
1 Archdiocese of Kingston	Kingston.
2 Diocese of Peterborough	Peterborough.
3 Diocese of Sault Sainte Marie	North Bay.
4 Diocese of Alexandria	Alexandria.
VI. Prov. of Halifax.	
1 Archdiocese of Halifax, N. S.	Halifax.
2 Diocese of Antigonish, N. S.	Antigonish, N. S.
3 Diocese of Charlottetown, P. E. I.	Charlottetown, P. E. I.
4 Diocese of St. John, N. B.	St. John, N. B.
5 Diocese of Chatham, N. B.	Chatham, N. B.
VII. Prov. of St. Boniface.	
1 Archdiocese of Saint Boniface	St. Boniface.
2 Diocese of Saint Albert	St. Albert.
3 Diocese of Prince Albert	Prince Albert.
4 Vic. Ap. of Athabaska	Athabasca Landing (Alberta).

Provinces and Dioceses.	Seat of Bishopric and Vicariate Apostolic.
VIII. Prov. of Victoria.	
1 Archdiocese of Victoria	Victoria (Vancouver).
2 Diocese of New Westminster	New Westminster, Br. C.
3 Vic. Ap. Makenzie-Yukon	
IX. Prov. of St. John, Newfoundland.	
1 Archdiocese of Saint John	Saint John.
2 Diocese of Harbor Grace	Harbor Grace.
3 Diocese of Saint George	St. George.

COPYRIGHT, 1908, BY ROBERT APPLETON CO.


Seat of Archbishopric:
Seat of Bishopric:
Seat of Vicariate Apostolic:
Capitals of Political Provinces:
Scales
0 100 200 300 400 500
English Statute Miles
0 100 200 400 600
Kilometers
NOTE:
For Map showing Diocesan Boundaries of the Provinces of Montreal, Kingston and Toronto, see Montreal.
DISTANCES
Stat. Miles.
Montreal to
Halifax, ... 756
St. John..... 481
Quebec..... 172
Toronto..... 333
Hamilton..... 372
London..... 448
Ottawa..... 111
Port Arthur..... 993
Fort William..... 997
St. Boniface, Winnipeg..... 1424
Brandon..... 1556
Prince Albert... 1965
Saskatoon..... 1929
Edmonton..... 2251
Regina..... 1780
Medicine Hat.... 2084
Calgary..... 2264
Vancouver..... 2905
Lethbridge..... 2186
Baffin Island
Davis Strait
Hudson Strait
Hudson Bay
Ungava Bay
LABRADOR
ESKIMOS
NUGUMIUT
KEEWATIN
ATHABASCA
MACKENZIE
ALBERTA
SASKATCHEWAN
MANITOBA
ONTARIO
QUEBEC
KEEWATIN
NEW BRUNSWICK
NOVA SCOTIA
PRINCE EDWARD I.
THE BERMUDAS
to Province of Halifax
Statute Miles
Chicago
Milwaukee
Detroit
Cleveland
Buffalo
Pittsburg
Rochester
Syracuse
Albany
Boston
New York
Philadelphia
Baltimore
Washington
Columbus
Portland
Montreal
Ottawa
Quebec
Toronto
Kingston
Hamilton
London
Halifax
St. John
Fredericton
Charlottetown
Winnipeg
Regina
Calgary
Edmonton
Vancouver
Victoria
Prince Albert
Saskatoon
Medicine Hat
Lethbridge
Port Arthur
Fort William
Brandon
THE MATTHEWS-NORTHRUP WORKS, BUFFALO, N. Y.
Greenwich 90 86 82 78 74

side the Province of Quebec the parish priest alone takes charge of the goods of his church. These, including church-buildings, cemeteries, parochial residences, etc., belong to the episcopal corporation, and it is the bishop who is responsible for them in the eyes of the Government. Members of religious orders are under the same ruling as secular priests, and have no need for property requiring special incorporation; they are always in charge of parishes or missions.

(2) *Religious Orders and Congregations.*—There are now in Canada more than twenty communities of priests, about ten of brothers, and more than seventy of sisters. The Sulpicians are not the oldest community, but they have been in the country continually since 1657. They have two large parishes in Montreal, Notre Dame and Saint-Jacques, several chaplaincies, and the management of a college, a seminary, and a school of philosophy, all flourishing institutions, with a total of 800 students. The Sulpicians number eighty-four, and support a number of schools, protectories, asylums, and hospitals. The Jesuits, who returned in 1842, have 25 houses in Canada, 7 in Alaska, and 309 religious, including 125 priests, 96 scholastics, 88 lay brothers, engaged in various colleges (Montreal and St. Boniface), parishes, and missions (Quebec, Sault Sainte Marie, Peterborough, and Hamilton). The Oblates of Mary Immaculate are the apostles of the North-West. The Archbishop of St. Boniface and five bishops of the North-West are members of this congregation, which has about 265 priests and 96 lay brothers, with houses in Quebec, Montreal, and Ottawa, and in the last named city a university, a scholasticate, a juniorate, and several parishes. The Dominican Fathers are located in St. Hyacinthe, Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec; the Clerics of St. Viator in Montreal, Joliette, Valleyfield, Quebec, St. Hyacinthe, Ottawa, and St. Boniface; the Fathers of the Holy Cross, with the colleges of Saint-Laurent (Montreal), Memramcook (St. John), and other houses in the dioceses of St. Hyacinthe and Quebec; Basilians, Toronto, Sandwich, London, and Hamilton; Redemptorists, Quebec, Ste. Anne de Beaupré, Montreal, Toronto, St. John, St. Boniface, and Ottawa; Eudists, Halifax, Vicariate Apostolic of the Gulf of Saint Lawrence, Chatham (N. B.), Rimouski, Chicoutimi, and Valleyfield; Capuchins, Ottawa, Rimouski, and Quebec; Franciscans, Montreal, London, Quebec, and Three Rivers; Trappists, Montreal, Notre-Dame d'Oka, Notre-Dame de Mistassini, Chicoutimi, Notre-Dame des Prairies, St. Boniface, Notre-Dame du Calvaire, Chatham (N. B.), and Notre-Dame de Petit Clairveaux, Antigonish; Fathers of the Company of Mary, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, and Victoria; Canons Regular of the Immaculate Conception, St. Boniface, St. Albert, Prince Albert, and Ottawa; Fathers of St. Vincent de Paul, Quebec and St. Hyacinthe; Fathers of the Holy Ghost, Ottawa; White Fathers of Our Lady of Algiers, Quebec; Fathers of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun, Quebec; Fathers of the Most Holy Sacrament, Montreal; Fathers of Chavagnes in the North-West Territory; Carmelites, Toronto; Missionaries of La Salette, St. Boniface, Sherbrooke, and Quebec; Benedictines, Prince Albert; Fathers of the Resurrection, Hamilton. The Brothers of the Christian Schools number nearly 800, with 60 houses, 49 of which are in the province of Quebec, and teach about 30,000 children in 6 dioceses. Other institutes from France share this task of education: Brothers of the Sacred Heart, 8 dioceses, 21 houses, 326 religious; Marist Brothers, 5 dioceses, 24 houses, 205 religious; Brothers of Christian Instruction, 8 dioceses, 26 houses, 240 religious; and Brothers of St. Gabriel, 5 dioceses, 19 houses, 120 religious. Mention should also be made of the Brothers of the Cross of Jesus, of St. Francis Xavier, of St. Francis Regis, of Charity, and of the Congregation of Mary.

The oldest communities of women are the Sisters of the Order of Saint Augustine of the Hôtel-Dieu (1639) and the Ursulines (1639), Quebec; then come the Sisters of the Congregation of Notre Dame, founded at Montreal (1657) by Venerable Mother Marguerite Bourgeoys, the Hospitalers of St. Joseph (1659), Montreal, and the Hospitalers of the Mercy of Jesus (General Hospital of Quebec, 1693). The eighteenth century saw the foundation of the Grey Nuns (*Sœurs Grises*) of Montreal by Venerable Madame Marguerite Marie d'Youville (1740). The other communities came from France or arose in Canada during the nineteenth century. The following is a list of the principal congregations founded in Canada:—

Name	Diocese of Foundation	Date	Number of Religious	Novices and Postulants	Houses	Pupils	Dioceses
Cong. of Notre Dame	Montreal	1657	1,351	161	127	31,555	21
Grey Nuns, divided since 1854	Montreal	1740	950	164	56		17
	Quebec	1849	779	110	40		6
	St. Hyacinth	1840	114	57	14		6
	Ottawa	1845	602	77	46		8
Sisters of Providence	Montreal	1843	1,668	160	83		17
Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary	Montreal	1843	1,081	193	70	20,671	14
Sisters of the Holy Cross	Montreal	1847	470	110	37	12,581	12
Sisters of Mercy	Montreal	1848	144	42	8		6
Sisters of St. Anne	Montreal	1850	818	105	56	16,789	11
Servants of the Heart of Mary	Quebec	1850	320	59	26	5,489	7
Sisters of St. Joseph	Hamilton	1851	132	19	12	1,700	1
Sisters of the Assumption	Nicolet	1853	367	53	41	5,300	7
Religious of Jesus and Mary	Quebec	1855	292	41	12	4,722	6
Sisters of the Precious Blood (contemplative)	St. Hyacinthe	1861	240	120	12		12
Little Sisters of the Holy Family	St. John	1874	296	192	32		15

There are also the Little Daughters of St. Joseph (Montreal); the Sisters of Charity of Providence (Kingston); the Sisters of Charity (St. John, N. B.); the Sisters of St. Joseph (St. Hyacinthe); the Sisters of our Lady of the Holy Rosary (Rimouski); the Sisters of Perpetual Help (Quebec); the Sisters of Good Counsel (Chicoutimi); Servants of Jesus and Mary (Ottawa). For further information refer to "Le Canada Ecclésiastique", Montreal, 1908. Many orders have come from France in times past, several as the result of recent persecutions. Among those coming from France, we should mention the Ursulines (Quebec, Three Rivers, Chicoutimi, Sherbrooke, Chatham); Hospitalers of the Mercy of Jesus (Quebec); Hospitalers of St. Joseph (Montreal, Nicolet, Kingston, Chatham, London, Alexandria); Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (Montreal, Halifax, London); Sisters of the Good Shepherd of Angers (3 dioceses); Sisters of Loreto (Toronto, Hamilton, London); Sisters of the Holy Cross and the Seven Dolours (Montreal, Joliette, Alexandria, Sherbrooke, Pembroke, Ottawa); Sisters of the Congregation of St. Joseph (Toronto); Sisters of the Presentation (St. Hyacinthe, Nicolet, Sherbrooke, Prince Albert); Sisters of Jesus and Mary (Quebec, Rimouski); Sisters of our Lady of Charity of Refuge (Toronto, New Westminster); School Sisters of Notre Dame (Hamilton); Carmelites (Montreal); Daughters of Wisdom (Ottawa, Peterborough, Chatham); Faithful Companions of Jesus

(St Albert); Little Servants of the Poor (Montreal); Servants of the Sacred Heart of Mary (Quebec); Regular Canonesses of the Five Wounds of Our Saviour (Ottawa, St. Boniface); Trappistines of Our Lady of Good Counsel (Quebec); Sisters of "l'Espérance" (Montreal); Daughters of Jesus (Three Rivers, Antigonish, Charlottetown, Chatham, St. Albert, Rimouski); Servants of the Blessed Sacrament (Chicoutimi); Sisters of Charity of St. Louis (Quebec); Missionary Sisters of Our Lady of Africa (Quebec). All of these religious orders, whether founded on Canadian soil or elsewhere (chiefly France), are engaged in all works which call for zeal and devotedness. Nor is it education, prayer, and penance only which have led many devout souls into the religious life, but charity also in all its forms: hospitals, orphanages, kindergartens, cribs, refuges, work-rooms, hospices, asylums, housekeeping in colleges, find at all times an army of willing servants and helpers.

(3) *Universities and Colleges.*—Higher education is entirely in the hands of the clergy. (See table below.) Besides the Laval University at Quebec and Montreal, endowed with the four faculties, Theology, Arts, Medicine, and Law, and having also a scientific department at Montreal, mention should be made of the University of Ottawa, opened and conducted by the Oblate Fathers. Certain colleges, as that of Memramcook (N. B.) and St. Francis Xavier's at Antigonish (N. S.), are known as universities, which means that they can confer the degree of Bachelor of Arts. The Jesuit Colleges of St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Mary at Montreal are affiliated to Laval University, by which the degrees are granted. Those of St. Boniface (Jesuit) and of St. Michael (Basilian) are affiliated to neighbouring State universities. In the Province of Quebec each college conducted by secular priests forms a corporation. The priests who constitute its staff receive from it their board, lodging, and a modest stipend. If they give up teaching the bishop assigns them a position in the diocese, and they cease to belong to the corporation. They may, however, remain in the college, rendering such services as their years and health permit. Some idea of the devoted zeal of the priests may be gathered from the fact that for a long time their stipend was only forty dollars a year, and at present it never exceeds one hundred dollars. Religious do not receive any pecuniary compensation.

Other leading educational institutions are: College of St. Michael, Toronto, 1851, under the Basilian Fathers; of St. Jerome, Berlin (Hamilton), Fathers of the Resurrection; of St. Mary (Halifax), priests of the diocese; of St. Joseph, St. Boniface (1855), Jesuit Fathers; of St. Mary, Victoria (1903); of St. Albert, Oblate Fathers (1900). It may be added that in many colleges there is a course in theology, which is followed by seminarians, who act as disciplinarians in the college.

The four principal centres of theological studies in Canada are: the seminary (*grand séminaire*) at Montreal (1840) and those of Quebec, Ottawa, and Halifax. The first two seminaries constitute the theological faculty of Laval University, and can confer any theological degree, even that of Doctor of Theology. The Seminary of Quebec has 150 students in theology; that of Montreal about 300. The former goes back to Bishop Laval; the latter was founded in 1840 by the Sulpicians. It is attended by aspirants to the priesthood from more than forty dioceses of Canada and the United States, and has given more than thirty bishops to the Church of America. The Sulpicians have also founded a philosophical seminary which has 130 students, and have opened the Canadian College in Rome, to which the most intelligent of the young clergy of the Dominion are sent. These two houses were the work of M. Colin (d. 1902), superior of Saint-Sulpice at Montreal, who asked his community for $400,000 to build them. The seminary of Ottawa is under the Oblate Fathers, and that of Halifax under the Eudists.

Primary instruction is given by religious and secular teachers of both sexes. In the Province of Quebec Catholic primary instruction is under the control of a committee composed of the bishops of the province and an equal number of Catholic laymen; the Protestant Committee exercises similar functions with regard to school matters in which Protestants are exclusively concerned. The two committees united form the Council of Public Instruction, which has charge of questions in which Catholics and Protestants are collectively concerned. The Superintendent of Education is president of this council *ex officio*. The control and regulation of primary education in the Quebec province is outside of politics. In that province the normal schools for the training of teachers are also in the hands of the clergy. In the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan (created in 1905), the Catholics in each school district have also the right of separate schools, i. e. they have the legal guaranteed right of separating from the majority, setting up a school district of their own, electing their own trustees, levying their own taxes, and of hiring their own teacher, a religious if they desire, but one who has undergone examination in the regular way and received a licence from the Board of Education. The school thus constituted must be conducted according to the regulations of the Board of Education, and be subject to Government inspection. In the other provinces separate schools are not recognized by law, although in New Brunswick the Catholic schools are practically separate. In Manitoba the school question has been regulated, though unsatisfactorily, by the Laurier-Greenway Compromise already mentioned. In the North-West Territories separate schools are supported by the State.

Missions.—Some traces of the Indian missions of the seventeenth century still exist. In the ecclesiastical province of Halifax are to be found several groups of Catholic Micmac and Abnaki; in the Diocese of Quebec, a Huron parish, Our Lady of Loreto; in that of Montreal, two Iroquois parishes, Caughnawaga (2060 Indians) and Oka, or the Lake of the

Classical Colleges of the Dominion

Name	Founded	Pupils
Seminary of Quebec	1665	560
College of Montreal	1767	350
College of Nicolet	1803	305
College of St. Hyacinthe	1809	320
College of St. Theresa (Diocese of Montreal)	1825	350
College of the Assumption (Montreal)	1832	300
St. Anne de la Pocatière (Quebec)	1829	300
College of Joliette	1846	330
College of St. Laurent (Montreal)	1847	500
College of Ste. Marie (Montreal)	1848	400
College Bourget, at Rigaud (Valleyfield)	1850	310
College of Lévis (Quebec)	1853	500
College of St. Dunstan (Charlottetown)	1855	150
College of Ste. Marie de Monnoir (St. Hyacinthe)	1853	240
College of St. Francis Xavier (Antigonish)	1854	...
College of Three Rivers	1860	260
College of Rimouski	1867	150
College of Chicoutimi	1873	250
College of the Assumption (London)	1870	...
College of St. Joseph, Memramcook (St. John, N. B.)	1864	200
College of Sherbrooke	1875	245
College of St. Anne (Halifax) at Church-Point	1891	...
College of Valleyfield	1893	150
College of Loyola (Montreal)	1897	160
College of Sacred Heart (Chatham), Caraquet	1899	130

Two Mountains (75 families); in the Diocese of Valleyfield, the Iroquois Catholic centre of Saint Régis. These, however, are exceptions. The real missions of Canada at present are in the North-East, along the coast of Labrador; in the North on the shores of Hudson Bay; and especially in the North-West, in the immense territories which stretch from Ontario to the Lower Mackenzie and Alaska. In the North-East the vicariate Apostolic of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, confided to the Eudist Fathers, contains 12,000 Catholics: among them some Eskimo, Nascapi, and Montagnais, ministered to by twenty missionaries. To the West there are a number of missions in the Dioceses of Pembroke, Peterborough and Sault Sainte Marie. The Oblate Fathers, the Jesuits, and secular priests rival one another in their efforts to preserve and extend the Faith in the region between the Great Lakes and James Bay.

Lastly there are the missions of the North-West and British Columbia, the most important of all. They comprise the ecclesiastical province of St. Boniface, and, with the exception of Vancouver, that of Victoria, in both of which the Oblate Fathers have many prosperous missions. The secular clergy, the pioneer missionaries of British Columbia, are still in charge of most of the inhabitants of Vancouver Island; as the country is becoming more thickly populated, the number of secular priests is increasing in British Columbia and in the province of St. Boniface. These provinces include the Dioceses of St. Albert, New Westminster, and Prince Albert, and two vicariates Apostolic: Athabasca and Mackenzie-Yukon. Most of these ecclesiastical divisions are under Oblate bishops, with about 230 Oblate Fathers, assisted by lay brothers of the same congregation. A hundred secular priests and a large number of religious of both sexes are scattered throughout the North-West, their numbers having been considerably augmented by the latest persecutions in France. The Christian Indians belong to the Algonquin race, and are commonly known as Kristinous or Cree, though they call themselves Nehivourik. According to a recent estimate they number 45,000. British Columbia contains 26,000 Indians, but of a different race. The devotion of the missionaries also extends to the numerous half-breeds in the "Far West", and to the settlers of every race and nationality. In these immense regions, which in 1845 had only one bishop and six priests, there was in 1908 a hierarchy of seven bishops and nearly 400 priests, regular and secular. There are over 150,000 Catholics, with more than 420 churches, 150 schools, and many charitable institutions. This wonderful progress is due chiefly to the work of the Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate. The history of the evangelization of the North-West is one of the most interesting in the annals of Catholic missions, and its final page has not yet been written. (See OBLATES.)

Conclusion.—Of the tables given below, Table I will enable the reader to form an estimate of the progress

TABLE I

	1851	1861	1871	1881	1891	1901
			ONTARIO			
Catholics	167,695	258,151	274,166	320,839	358,300	390,304
Anglicans	223,365	311,559	330,995	366,539	385,999	367,937
Presbyterians	204,148	303,374	356,442	417,749	453,147	477,386
Methodists	213,365	350,373	462,264	591,503	654,033	666,388
Baptists	45,353	61,539	86,630	106,680	106,047	116,281
			QUEBEC			
Catholics	746,854	943,253	1,019,850	1,170,718	1,291,709	1,429,260
Anglicans	44,682	63,487	62,449	68,797	75,472	81,563
Presbyterians	38,470	43,735	46,165	50,287	52,673	58,013
Methodists	21,199	30,844	34,100	39,221	39,544	42,014
Baptists	4,403	7,751	8,686	8,853	7,901	8,393
			NOVA SCOTIA			
Catholics	69,131	86,281	102,001	117,487	122,452	129,578
Anglicans	36,115	47,744	55,143	60,255	64,410	66,107
Presbyterians	72,924	88,755	103,539	112,488	108,952	106,381
Methodists	23,593	34,167	40,871	50,811	54,192	57,490
Baptists	42,643	62,941	73,430	83,761	83,122	74,869
			NEW BRUNSWICK			
Catholics	.....	82,283	96,016	109,091	115,961	125,698
Anglicans	.....	42,776	45,481	46,768	43,095	41,767
Presbyterians	.....	36,652	38,852	42,888	40,639	39,496
Methodists	.....	25,636	29,856	34,514	35,504	35,973
Baptists	.....	57,730	70,597	81,662	79,649	80,808
			PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND			
Catholics	27,147	35,852	40,442	47,115	47,837	45,796
Anglicans	6,530	6,785	7,220	7,192	6,646	5,976
Presbyterians	20,402	25,862	29,579	33,835	33,072	30,750
Methodists	4,934	7,865	11,070	13,485	13,596	13,402
Baptists	2,900	3,450	4,371	6,226	6,265	5,898

	MANITOBA			BRITISH COLUMBIA			NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES		
	1881	1891	1901	1881	1891	1901	1881	1891	1901
Catholics	12,246	20,572	35,672	10,043	20,843	33,639	4,443	13,008	39,653
Anglicans	14,297	30,852	44,922	7,804	23,619	40,689	3,166	14,166	31,659
Presbyterians	14,292	38,977	65,348	4,095	15,284	34,081	591	12,507	30,987
Methodists	9,470	28,427	49,936	3,516	14,298	25,047	461	7,980	26,636
Baptists	9,449	16,112	9,148	434	3,098	6,471	29	1,555	5,926

TABLE II

	Quebec	Ontario	Nova Scotia	New Brunswick	Manitoba	Columbia	Prince Edward Island
Catholics	1,429,260	390,304	129,578	125,698	35,672	33,639	45,796
Anglicans	81,563	367,937	66,107	41,767	44,922	40,689	5,976
Presbyterians	58,013	477,386	106,381	39,496	65,348	34,081	30,750
Methodists	42,014	666,388	57,490	35,973	49,936	25,047	13,402

	North-West Territories					
	Alberta	Saskatchewan	Assiniboia	Yukon	Others	Grand Total
Catholics	12,957	6,453	10,663	4,453	5,127	2,229,600
Anglicans	8,888	6,392	10,086	2,632	3,661	680,620
Presbyterians	10,655	2,136	15,015	3,130	51	842,442
Methodists	9,623	969	11,559	1,864	2,621	916,886

of the Catholic population in the several provinces of the Dominion of Canada during the latter half of the nineteenth century; the object of Table II is to present at a glance a comparison between Catholicism and the more numerous of the Protestant sects in each province. He will see that the Catholics of Canada, 2,229,600 faithful (census of 1901), form 42 per cent of the total population of 5,371,315. Of these Catholics, 1,430,000, viz. about three-fifths, are in the province of Quebec, the remaining 800,000 being scattered throughout the different parts of the Dominion, more or less intermingled with the Protestants. Catholicism gains chiefly by the birth-rate. Its numbers were thus increased during the last ten years by 250,000, a gain which exceeds that of all the Protestant sects combined. In the ordinary intercourse of life Catholics and Protestants live in concord and work together harmoniously for the common welfare of Canada. See the articles British Columbia; New Brunswick; Manitoba; Nova Scotia; Ontario; Quebec; Prince Edward Island; Saskatchewan (Alberta); North-West Territories; Keewatin; Yukon; Athabasca; Mackenzie; Ungava.

General History of Canada.—Charlevoix, *Histoire et description générale de la Nouvelle-France* (13 vols., Paris, 1744); *Relations des Jésuites* (3 vols., Quebec, 1858); these two works, as well as the *Relations inédites de la Nouvelle-France* (1672–1779) (2 vols., Paris, 1861), and other documents, have been collected and published with an English tr. by Thwaites, *The Jesuit Relations* (1610–1791) (73 vols., Cleveland, Ohio, 1896–1901); Sagard, *Histoire du Canada et Voyages que les Pères récollets y ont faits* (3 vols., Paris, 1636); Sixtus le Tac, *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle-France ou Canada*, ed. Réveillaud (Paris, 1888); Leclerc, *Etablissement de la foi dans la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1690); Hennepin, *Nouvelle découverte d'un très grand pays situé dans l'Amérique* (1697–98); Bressani, *Relation abrégée de quelques missions des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus*, tr. from the Italian by Martin (Montreal, 1852); Dionne, *La Nouvelle-France de Cartier à Champlain* (1540–1603) (Quebec, 1891); Faillon, *Histoire de la Colonie française en Canada* (3 vols., Montreal, 1865); Ferland, *Cours d'histoire du Canada* (from the beginning to 1760) (Quebec, 1861–1865); Garneau, *Histoire du Canada* (to 1841) (3 vols., Quebec, 1845–48); Turcotte, *Le Canada sous l'Union* (1841–1867) (2 vols., Quebec); Rameau, *La France aux Colonies* (Paris, 1859); de Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France* (3 vols., Paris, 1896); Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America* (Boston, 1880); *Pioneers of France in the New World*; Guénin, *La Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1900); Ragey, *Une nouvelle France* (Paris, 1902); Têtu, *Les évêques de Québec* (Quebec, 1889); Pagnuelo, *Études historiques et légales sur la liberté religieuse en Canada* (Montreal, 1872); Christie, *History of the late Province of Lower Canada, parliamentary and political* (6 vols., Quebec, 1842); Tanguay, *Répertoire du clergé canadien* (Quebec, 1868–69); Margry, *Mémoires et documents pour servir à l'histoire des origines françaises des pays d'Outre-Mer* (Paris, 1879–88); Guérard, *La France canadienne, situation religieuse* in *Le Correspondant*, 1877; Gosselin, *L'Eglise du Canada*, in *Revue du clergé français* (1895); *Mandements et Lettres des évêques de Québec* (6 vols., Quebec, 1888–89); Meilleur, *Mémorial de l'Education du Bas-Canada* (Quebec, 1876); Chapais, *Jean Talon, intendant de la Nouvelle-France* (Quebec, 1904); Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVIII^e Siècle* (1906); Ewart, *The Manitoba School Question;* Howley, *Canadian Sketches* in *Ir. Ec. Rec.*, XI (1890), 43–53; Hughes, *Quebec and the French Canadians* in *The Messenger* (New York), 1898, 1122–26; *The Separate School Question in Canada, ibid.*, 1905, 477–92; McKenna, *A Century of Catholicity in Canada* in *The Catholic World* (New York), L., 229–39; Elliott, *The Missionary Outlook in Canada, ibid.*, LXIII, 391–96; Shea, *Why is Canada not a Part of the U. S.* in *U. S. Cath. Hist. Mag.*, III (1890), 113–27; Griffin, *Father Lotbinière, a Canadian Patriot of the Eighteenth Cent.* in *Am. Cath. Hist. Soc. Res.*, XV (1903), 69–82.

II. Special Works.—(1) Quebec: Casgrain, *Hist. de la Mère Marie de l'Incarnation*, preceded by a sketch of the religious history of the early years of this colony (Quebec, 1878); *Lettres de Mère Marie de l'Incarnation* (Paris, 1684); Gosselin, *Vie de Mgr. de Laval, premier évêque de Québec* (1622–1708) (2 vols., Quebec, 1882); Têtu, *Histoire du palais épiscopal de Québec* (1896); Roy, *L'Université Laval et les fêtes du cinquantenaire* (Quebec, 1903). (2) Montreal: Casson, *Histoire de Montréal* (Montreal, 1869); Faillon, *Vie de la Mère Bourgeoys* (Paris, 1853); *Vie de Mlle Mance, fondatrice de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Ville-Marie* (Paris, 1854); *Vie de Mme d'Youville, fondatrice des Sœurs Grises* (Paris, 1852); Brumath, *Histoire populaire de Montréal* (Montreal, 1890); *Mandements et circulaires des évêques de Montréal* (10 vols., Montreal, 1887); *Mémoires et documents relatifs à l'histoire du Canada* (9 vols., Historical Society of Montreal, 1859–80); *Le diocèse de Montréal à la fin du XIX^e siècle* (Montreal, 1900); *L'organisation de l'Eglise au Canada*, in *Le Correspondant* (October, 1906). (3) Acadia: Rameau de Saint-Père, *Une colonie féodale en Amérique, l'Acadie* (2 vols., Paris, 1889); Casgrain, *Un pèlerinage au pays d'Evangéline* (Quebec, 1888); Idem, *Les Sulpiciens et les prêtres des Missions Etrangères en Acadie* (1676–1762) (Quebec, 1897); Richard, *Acadia, Missing links of a lost chapter of American story* (2 vols., Montreal, 1895); Poirier, *Le P. Lefebvre et l'Acadie* (Montreal, 1898); Maurault, *Histoire de l'Acadie française* (1598–1755), (Paris, 1873). (4) The North-West: *Les missions catholiques* (Lyons); *Annales de la propagation de la Foi* (Lyons); Piolet, *La France au dehors* (Paris, 1903), VI, *Amérique;* Dom Benedict, *Vie de Mgr. Taché, archevêque de Saint-Boniface* (St. Boniface, 1905); Jonquet, *Vie de Mgr. Grandin, évêque de Saint-Albert* (Montreal, 1904); Tassé, *Les Canadiens de l'Ouest* (2 vols., Montreal, 1878); Taché, *Vingt années de missions dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Amérique* (Montreal, 1866); *Esquisse sur le Nord-Ouest de l'Amérique* (Montreal, 1869); Dugas, *Mgr. Provencher et les Missions de la Rivière Rouge* (Montreal, 1889); Cooke, *Sketches of the Life of Mgr. de Mazenod* (2 vols., London, 1879); Arnould, *La vie religieuse au Canada*, in *Le Correspondant* (Oct., 1906); *Le Canada ecclésiastique* (Montreal, 1908).

A. Fournet.

Canal, José de la, ecclesiastical historian, b. of poor parents, at Ucieda, a village in the province of Santander, 11 Jan., 1768; d. at Madrid, 17 April, 1845. Under the care of an uncle, an Augustinian friar, he studied in the Dominican and Augustinian convents of Burgos; at Burgos, in 1785, he was formally received into the Augustinian Order. Subsequently he became professor of philosophy, first at the convent of his order at Salamanca, and then at Burgos. Returning from the latter place to Salamanca he was librarian of the university, from 1789 to 1800. After passing four years at Toledo, he came to Madrid, where he taught philosophy in the College of San Isidro. On account of certain articles in a paper of liberal tendencies called "El Universal" he was, on the return to Spain of King Ferdinand VII, confined for one year in a convent near Avila. At

the end of this period he returned to Madrid and with his brother Augustinian, Fr. Antolin Merino, was appointed by the King to continue the monumental "España Sagrada" (Holy Spain), begun in 1743 by the Augustinians Henrique Flórez and Manuel Risco. This valuable collection of documents and researches relating to Spanish ecclesiastical history had already reached its forty-second volume. The work embraces an account of the foundation and vicissitudes of all Spanish dioceses, the succession of the Spanish hierarchy, the most important monasteries, and other matters of interest to the Spanish Church studied in their original sources and by the most severe critical methods. From the time of his appointment Canal devoted himself with ardour and perseverance to his task. In order to collect material for the publication, he undertook two journeys into Catalonia, making his headquarters at Barcelona and Gerona, and working assiduously in the archives of these cities. In conjunction with Father Merino he published vols. XLIII–XLIV of the "España Sagrada" at Madrid in 1819; vols. XLV–XLVI (Madrid, 1826–32) were due to Father Canal alone. These volumes treat of the churches and monasteries of the diocese of Gerona, and are remarkable for the number and importance of hitherto unpublished documents, and for the critical accuracy of the investigations. To his collaborator Father Canal dedicated an interesting biographical study in his "Ensayo histórico de la vida literaria del Maestro Fr. Antolin Merino" (Madrid, 1830); he also published a second edition, greatly enlarged by himself, of the "Clave historial" (Key to History) by Father Flórez (Madrid, 1817) and a "Manual del Santo Sacrificio de la Misa" (Madrid, 1817, 1819). He translated from the French various theological and historical works, and was successively corresponding member, treasurer, censor, and director of the Royal Academy of History. He belonged to the Academy of Natural Science of Madrid, to the Academy of Belles-Lettres of Barcelona, and to the Antiquarian Society of Normandy. Father Canal was an exemplary ecclesiastic, distinguished for charity to the poor. He refused the See of Gerona in 1836 notwithstanding the entreaties of Queen Isabella II, excusing himself on the score of age and ill health, and declaring he believed he could better serve God and his country if he continued to devote the remainder of his life to historical research.

Sainz de Baranda, *Ensayo histórico de la vida literaria del Maestro Fray José de la Canal, de la Orden de San Agustín, Director de la Academia de la Historia y continuador de la España Sagrada* (Madrid, 1850).

Eduardo de Hinojosa.

Canara, Diocese of. See Mangalore.

Canary Islands, The, form an archipelago in the North Atlantic Ocean facing the western coast of Africa, between the parallels of 27° 4′ and 29° 3′ N. lat., and the meridians of 13° 3′ and 18° 2′ W. long. They consist of seven important islands and some islets. From east to west the first encountered are Lanzarote and Fuerteventura, the nearest to the African continent; then come Tenerife and Gran Canaria, while farther westward are Palma, Gomera, and Hierro (or Ferro). The total area of the islands is about 3256 square miles; their population, according to the census of 1900, was 358,564. The country in general is mountainous and volcanic; in Tenerife the Pico de Teyde, or Peak of Tenerife, reaches the height of 12,200 feet, and towers above the other mountains which extend throughout the islands, generally from north-east to south-west. Natural caverns abound, some of them very extensive. There is no great river, but there are numerous springs and torrents. The fauna differs little from that of Europe, with the exception of the dromedary and the thistle-finch, or canary-bird. There are extensive forests of pine and laurel, and some stems reach a gigantic height. The climate of the islands is mild and salubrious; hence they are much frequented as winter resorts. The Canary Islands are essentially agricultural. Their soil, usually fertile, though subject to frequent droughts, produces an abundance of fruits, sugar-cane, and tobacco. The wines are exquisite, and together with the fruits, tobacco, and fish, which is good and plentiful, form the principal articles of commerce for export. Much cochineal, also, is manufactured in the islands. The most important centres of population are: Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Orotava, and La Laguna in the island of Tenerife; Las Palmas and Arracife in Gran Canaria; Santa Cruz de la Palma in the island of Palma; Quia and Valverde in that of Hierro.

Civil and Ecclesiastical Divisions.—The Canary Islands constitute a civil province, a judicial district (*audiencia*), with its seat at Palmas, for the administration of justice, and a military governorship (captaincy-general). Ecclesiastically they are divided

The Cathedral, Las Palmas

into two dioceses, suffragan of Seville, that of Tenerife, with episcopal residence at Santa Cruz, and that of Canaries, with residence at Las Palmas. In 1906 the Diocese of Tenerife, which comprises the islands of Tenerife, Gomera, Palma, and Hierro, had a Catholic population of 171,045, with 62 parishes, 86 priests, 60 churches, and 167 chapels; while the Diocese of Canaries had a Catholic population of 83,378, 50 Protestants, 42 parishes, 103 priests, 42 churches, and 113 chapels, and comprises the Grand Canary, Fuerteventura, and Lanzarote. The courts are held at Santa Cruz de Tenerife. All ports are free, i. e. merchandise entering them is exempt from duty. The inhabitants satisfy the obligation of military service, not in the ranks of the peninsular army, but in the local territorial militia.

History.—The primitive populations of the Canary Islands were the Guanches, a white race, vigorous, of high stature, fair-haired and blue-eyed, and leading mostly a pastoral life. At the time of their conquest by the Europeans they used weapons and utensils of wood and stone, were clothed in skins of animals, and lived in the numerous natural grottos. Their ornaments were of bone, sea-shells, and baked clay. They were hospitable and deeply attached to their independence. Each island was divided into separate states, ruled over by kings, who were assisted by the chiefs of the noble families and the most esteemed priests or soothsayers. They held their meetings in the open air in places specially intended for this purpose. They were monotheists and made offerings of domestic animals, milk, and fruit to the Supreme Being. At some early date Old World peoples from Africa and Asia reached these islands and founded there permanent colonies, blending with the aboriginal stock. Their invasions are attested by archæological remains and inscriptions; certain Numidian

inscriptions on the rocks of Gran Canaria and Hierro are similar to those discovered in Africa. An Aragonese fleet explored the islands in 1330. Another Castilian coasting expedition, sent forth by merchants of Seville and Biscay, disembarked, in 1385, in Lanzarote and vanquished the aborigines, but did not found any lasting settlement. This was not accomplished until the expedition of Jean de Béthencourt, a French nobleman, who in virtue of a mission confided to him by the King of Castile, Henry III, conquered, from 1402 to 1405, the islands of Lanzarote, Fuerteventura, Gomera, and Hierro. The conquest of Gran Canaria, Palma, and Tenerife was effected during the reign of the Catholic sovereigns, from 1478 to 1495, by Diego Garcia de Herrera, Pedro de Vera, and Alonso Fernandez de Lugo, but not without heroic resistance on the part of the Guanches.

Combined action on the part of Church and State helped to Christianize and civilize the Guanches, and gave excellent results. The people abandoned their heathen practices and willingly embraced Christianity. The Catholic priest was always a brave protector of the natives against the vexations to which, in the early days of the conquest, they were occasionally exposed at the hands of their conquerors. Among the most deserving ecclesiastics in this respect is Don Juan de Frias, Bishop of Gran Canaria at the close of the fifteenth century. The Catholic sovereigns dictated wise provisional measures in order to protect the lives and farms of the aborigines, and after the conclusion of the war gave them the right to participate in the government of the islands. Owing to frequent marriages between Spaniards and Guanches, the fusion of both races was finally accomplished, and this community of affection and interest became a powerful factor in the economic prosperity of the islands.

The Canarian, or Book of the Conquest and Conversion of the Canarians in the year 1402, by Messire Jean de Béthencourt, composed by Pierre Bontier, Monk, and Jean Le Verrier, Priest, tr. and ed. with notes and introduction, RICHARD HENRY MAJOR (London, 1872); VIERA Y CLAVIJO, *Noticias de la historia general de las Islas Canarias* (Madrid, 1772–1773); BERTHELOT, *Antiquités canariennes* (Paris, 1879); CHIL Y NARANJO, *Estudios históricos, climatológicos y patológicos de las Islas Canarias* (Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 1879–1891); MILLARES, *Historia general de las Islas Canarias* (Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 1893); VERNEAU, *Rapport sur une mission scientifique dans l'Archipel Canarien* (Paris, 1887); IDEM, *Cinq années de séjour aux Iles Canaries* (Paris, 1899); TORRES CAMPOS, *Carácter de la conquista y colonización de las Islas Canarias* (Madrid, 1901).

EDUARDO DE HINOJOSA.

Canatha, a titular see of Arabia. According to inscriptions on coins and geographical documents, its name was Kanatha, Kanotha, or even Kenetha. The city had its own era and inscriptions found in Algeria have made known the existence of a *cohors prima Flavia Canathenorum* (Renier, Inscript. Alger., 1534, 1535). It is surely distinct from Kanata, another city that struck coins and is now the little village of Kerak, north-east of Edraï or Derat, also in Arabia. Moreover, it is not Maximianopolis, because Severus, bishop of that see, and Theodosius, Bishop of Kenatha, were together present at Chalcedon in 451. Finally, it is not certain that it can be identified with Canath (Num., xxxii, 42; I Par., ii, 23), which stood, probably, farther south. The city is first mentioned by Josephus (Bel. jud., I, xix, 2; Ant. jud., XV, v, 1) apropos of a defeat of Herod by the Arabs. Pliny and Ptolemy rank it among the towns of Decapolis; Eusebius of Cæsarea and Stephanus Byzantius say it was near Bostra. It figures in older "Notitiæ episcopatuum" as a suffragan of Bostra; one bishop is known, Theodosius, 449–458 (Lequien, II, 867). Canatha is to-day El-Qanawat; this village, north-east of Bostra, in the vilayet of Syria, stands at a height of about 4100 feet, near a river and surrounded by woods. The magnificent ruins are 4800 feet in length and 2400 in breadth. Among them are a Roman bridge and a rock-hewn theatre, with nine tiers of seats and an orchestra fifty-seven feet in diameter, also a nymphæum, an aqueduct, a large prostyle temple with portico and colonnades, and a peripteral temple preceded by a double colonnade. The monument known as Es-Seraï dates from the fourth century and was originally a temple, afterwards a Christian basilica. It is seventy-two feet long, and was preceded by an outside portico and an atrium with eighteen columns.

BURCKHARDT, *Travels in Syria and the Holy Land* (London, 1822), 83–86; PORTER, *Five Years in Damascus*, II, 90–115; *The Giant Cities of Bashan* (London, 1871), 39–46; REY, *Voyage dans le Haouran*, 128–151, pl. V–VIII; WADDINGTON, *Inscript. grecques et latines*, 533–540; DE VOGÜÉ, *Syrie centrale*, 59, pl. 19 sqq.; DARD, *Chez les ennemis d'Israël* (Paris, 1906), 109–131.

S. VAILHÉ.

Cancer de Barbastro, LUIS, one of the first Dominicans who followed Las Casas to Guatemala, b. in Aragon, Spain, date uncertain; d. at Tampa Bay, Florida, U. S. A., c. 1549. He worked as a missionary among the Indians of Vera Paz with great zeal and fortitude and composed in the Zapotecan idiom the "Varias Canciones en verso zapoteco sobre los Misterios de la Religion para uso de los Neófitos de la Vera Paz", a manuscript not now accessible. He was an ardent adherent of Las Casas and sided with him at the gathering of prelates and theologians convoked by the visitor Tello de Sandoval at Mexico in 1546. Anxious to prove the efficacy of the methods proposed by Las Casas, he went to Spain and obtained there the direction of the conversion of the Indians of Florida. Upon his return to Mexico he sailed for Florida from Vera Cruz in 1549 with two other Dominicans. Their interpreter was an Indian woman called Magdalen who had embraced Christianity. Upon reaching the shores of Florida, however, this woman betrayed them, and the three priests were killed by the Indians.

BÉRISTAIN DE SOUZA, *Bibliotheca hispano-americana* (Mexico, 1816–1818 and 1883); SQUIER, *Monograph of Authors Who Have Written on the Languages of Central America* (New York, 1861): he merely translates Béristain and almost literally; DÁVILA PADILLA, *Historia de la Fundación y Discurso & ca* (Madrid, 1597, Brussels, 1625); LOWERY, *The Spanish Settlements within the United States* (New York, 1901); SHEA, *Cath. Ch. in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886), 123–26; IDEM in *Am. Eccl. Rev.*, XXVII, 1902.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Candace, name of the Ethiopian queen whose eunuch was baptized by St. Philip (Acts, viii, 27 sqq.). The name occurs in a ruined pyramid near ancient Meroe (Lipsius, Denkmäler, V, 47). Another queen of the same name is mentioned by Strabo (XVII, i, 54), and after him by Dion Cassius (Hist. Rom., LIV, v); she revolted and waged war against the Romans and was overpowered by Petronius in her capital of Napata, 22 B. C. Pliny (Hist. Nat., VI, 35) informs us that at the time when Nero's explorers passed through Nubia, a Queen Candace was reigning over the island of Meroe, and adds that this name was a title common to all the queens of that country. ". . . quod nomen multis jam annis ad reginas transiit". The Ethiopia over which Candace reigned, according to Hebrew usage and our authorities, was not the present Abyssinia, as is often claimed, but is to be looked for in the region called by the ancients the island of Meroe, at the confluence of the Nile and the Taccasi. The Queen Candace of the Acts may be, and probably is, the same as the one mentioned by Pliny, but we have no direct evidence to assert it as a fact. (See ETHIOPIA.)

MÉCHINEAU in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v., and commentaries on Acts, viii, 27 sqq.

R. BUTIN.

Candia, DIOCESE OF.—On the north shore of Crete was an ancient city called Heracleion. Lequien (II, 269) mentions among those present at the Seventh General Council (Nicæa, 787) Theodorus,

Bishop of Heracleiopolis, by which he understands Heracleion; the latter title, however, does not figure in the Greek "Notitiæ episcopatuum". The Greeks still give the name of Heracleion to a city built by the Arabs in 825 near the site of the ancient city; the Arabian name was Khandak, whence the Italian name Candia is used also for the whole island. In 960 Candia was taken by Nicephorus Phocas. In 1204 it passed to the Venetians and in 1669 to the Turks. It has now about 25,000 inhabitants (8000 Greeks, 100 Latins). There are remains of its ancient walls and aqueduct, also a museum of antiquities. Under the Venetian occupation Crete was divided into eleven Latin sees, Candia being the seat of an archbishopric. Lequien (III, 907–916) cites twenty-seven archbishops, from 1213 to 1645; Eubel (I, 223, II, 156) has thirty, from the thirteenth century to 1493. Among the latter are the famous Carmelite, St. Peter Thomas (1363), and Blessed Francis Quirini (1364). The hierarchy disappeared with the Turkish conquest. In 1874 Pius IX re-established the See of Candia, as a suffragan of Smyrna; the bishop has until now resided at Canea. The diocese has only about 300 Catholics. The Capuchins have parishes at Candia (Megalokastro), Canea (Khania), Retimo, and a station at Sitia; 4 schools for boys and 2 for girls (Sisters of St. Joseph de l'Apparition). Candia is the residence of the Greek Metropolitan of Crete, who has seven suffragan sees, Khania, Kisamos, Rethymnon (Retimo), Sitia, Lampa, Arkadia, and Chersonesos.

LEQUIEN, *Oriens christ.* (1740), II, 256–74; CORNELIUS, *Creta sacra sive de episcopis utriusque ritus*, etc. (Venice, 1755); E. MILLER in *Journal des savants* (1879), 412–28; BÆDEKER'S *Greece* (3d ed., Leipzig, 1905); *Statesman's Year-Book* (1907), 1553–56; J. H. FREESE, *A Short Popular History of Crete* (London, 1897).

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Candidus, the name of two scholars of the Carlovingian revival of letters in the ninth century. (1) The Benedictine Candidus Bruun of Fulda received his first instruction from the learned Aegil (Abbot of Fulda, 817–822); Abbot Ratger (802–817) sent the gifted scholar to Einhard at the court of Charlemagne, where he most probably learned the art he employed later in decorating with pictures the apse to which, in 819, the remains of St. Boniface were transferred. When Rabanus Maurus was made abbot (822) Candidus succeeded him as head of the monastic school of Fulda. As a philosopher Candidus is known by his "Dicta de imagine mundi" or "Dei" (the question of authorship is decided by the Cod. Wirciburg.), twelve aphoristic sayings strung together without logical sequence. The doctrine is taken from the works of St. Augustine, but the frequent use of the syllogism marks the border of the age of scholasticism. In his last saying Candidus makes somewhat timidly the first attempt in the Middle Ages at a proof of God's existence. This has a striking similarity to the ontological argument of St. Anselm (q. v.—Man, by intellect a better and more powerful being than the rest, is not almighty; therefore a superior and almighty being—God—must exist). The third saying, which denies that bodies are true, since truth is a quality of immortal beings only, is based on that excessive realism which led his contemporary, Fredegisus, to invest even nothingness with being. The other sayings deal with God's image in man's soul, the concepts of existence, substance, time, etc. The philosophy of Candidus marks a progress over Alcuin and gives him rank with Fredegisus, from whom he differs by rarely referring to the Bible in philosophical questions, thus keeping apart the domains of theology and philosophy. The only complete edition of the "Dicta Candidi" is in Hauréau (p. 134–137); a more critical edition of part in Richter (p. 34 sq.). Candidus also wrote an "Expositio Passionis D. N. J. Chr." (in Pez, Thes. anec., Augsburg, 1721, I, 241 sq.); a "Life" of his teacher Ægil in prose and in verse (Brouwer, "Sidera ill. vir.", Mainz, 1616, p. 19–44, Dümmler, "Poetæ lat. ævi caroling.", Berlin, 1884, II, 94–117); and a "Life" of Abbot Baugolf of Fulda (d. 802).

(2) Candidus, name given to the Anglo-Saxon Wizo by Alcuin, whose scholar he was and with whom he went in 782 to Gaul. At the palace school he was tutor to Gisla, the sister, and Rodtruda, the daughter of Charlemagne. When Alcuin went to Tours (796), Candidus was his successor as master of the palace school. Alcuin's esteem for Candidus is shown by his dedicating his commentary on Ecclesiastes to his friends Onias, Fredegisus, and Candidus.

HAURÉAU, *Histoire de la philos. scol.* (Paris, 1872), I, 131–38; RICHTER, *Wizo und Bruunn, zwei Gelehrte im Zeitalter Karls den Grossen* (Leipzig, 1890); ENDRES, *Fredegisus und Candidus* in *Philos. Jahrb.* (Fulda, 1906), XIX, 446–50; WERNER, *Alcuin und sein Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1881), 389.

JOHN M. LENHART.

Candle and Lights. See ALTAR s.v. *Altar-Candles.*

Candlemas.—Purification of the Blessed Virgin (Gr. Ὑπαπάντη), feast of the presentation of Christ in the temple, 2 February. According to the Mosaic law a mother who had given birth to a man-child was considered unclean for seven days; moreover she was to remain three and thirty days "in the blood of her purification"; for a maid-child the time which excluded the mother from the sanctuary was even doubled. When the time (forty or eighty days) was over the mother was to "bring to the temple a lamb for a holocaust and a young pigeon or turtle dove for sin"; if she was not able to offer a lamb, she was to take two turtle doves or two pigeons; the priest prayed for her and so she was cleansed. (Lev., xii, 2–8.)

DISTRIBUTION OF CANDLES BY THE POPE (MS. ON THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE, UNIVERSITY OF PRAGUE)

Forty days after the birth of Christ Mary complied with this precept of the law, she redeemed her first-born from the temple (Num., xviii, 15), and was purified by the prayer of Simeon the just, in the presence of Anna the prophetess (Luke ii, 22 sqq.). No doubt this event, the first solemn introduction of Christ into the house of God, was in the earliest times celebrated in the Church of Jerusalem. We find it attested for the first half of the fourth century by the pilgrim of Bordeaux, Egeria or Silvia. The day (14 Feb.) was solemnly kept by a procession to the Constantinian basilica of the Resurrection, a homily on Luke ii, 22 sqq., and the Holy Sacrifice. But the feast then had no proper name; it was simply called the fortieth day after Epiphany. This latter circumstance proves that in Jerusalem Epiphany was then the feast of Christ's birth. From Jerusalem the feast of the fortieth day spread over the entire Church, and later on was kept on the 2nd of February, since within the last twenty-five years of the fourth century the Roman feast of Christ's nativity (25 Dec.) was introduced. In Antioch it is attested in 526 (Cedrenus); in the entire Eastern Empire it was introduced by the Emperor Justinian I (542) in thanksgiving for the cessation of the great pestilence which had depopu-

lated the city of Constantinople. In the Greek Church it was called Ὑπαπάντη τοῦ Κυρίου, the meeting (*occursus*) of the Lord and His mother with Simeon and Anna. The Armenians call it: "The Coming of the Son of God into the Temple", and still keep it on the 14th of February (Tondini di Quaracchi, Calendrier de la Nation Arménienne, 1906, 48); the Copts term it "Presentation of the Lord in the Temple" (Nilles, Kal. man., II, 571, 643). Perhaps the decree of Justinian gave occasion also to the Roman Church (to Gregory I?) to introduce this feast, but definite information is wanting on this point. The feast appears in the Gelasianum (manuscript tradition of the seventh century) under the new title of Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The procession is not mentioned. Pope Sergius I (687–701) introduced a procession for this day. The Gregorianum (tradition of the eighth century) does not speak of this procession, which fact proves that the procession of Sergius was the ordinary "station", not the liturgical act of to-day. The feast was certainly not introduced by Pope Gelasius to suppress the excesses of the Lupercalia (Migne, Missale Gothicum, 691), and it spread slowly in the West; it is not found in the "Lectionary" of Silos (650) nor in the "Calendar" (731–741) of Sainte-Geneviève of Paris. In the East it was celebrated as a feast of the Lord; in the West as a feast of Mary; although the "Invitatorium" (Gaude et lætare, Jerusalem, occurrens Deo tuo), the antiphons and responsories remind us of its original conception as a feast of the Lord. The blessing of the candles did not enter into common use before the eleventh century; it has nothing in common with the procession of the Lupercalia. In the Latin Church this feast (*Purificatio B.M.V.*) is a double of the second class. In the Middle Ages it had an octave in the larger number of dioceses; also to-day the religious orders whose special object is the veneration of the Mother of God (Carmelites, Servites) and many dioceses (Loreto, the Province of Siena, etc.) celebrate the octave.

CANDLES LEFT AT THE HOUSES OF DISTINGUISHED VISITORS (MS. ON THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE, UNIVERSITY OF PRAGUE)

KELLNER, *Heortologie* (Freiburg, 1906), 128; DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship*, tr. (London, 1904); PROBST, *Sacramentarien* (Münster, 1892); HOLWECK, *Fasti Mariani* (Freiburg, 1892), 18.

BLESSING OF CANDLES AND PROCESSION.—According to the Roman Missal the celebrant after Tierce, in stole and cope of purple colour, standing at the epistle side of the altar, blesses the candles (which must be of beeswax). Having sung or recited the five orations prescribed, he sprinkles and incenses the candles. Then he distributes them to the clergy and laity, whilst the choir sings the canticle of Simeon, "Nunc dimittis". The antiphon "Lumen ad revelationem gentium et gloriam plebis tuæ Israel" is repeated after every verse, according to the medieval custom of singing the antiphons. During the procession which now follows, and at which all the partakers carry lighted candles in their hands, the choir sings the antiphon "Adorna thalamum tuum, Sion", composed by St. John of Damascus, one of the few pieces which, text and music, have been borrowed by the Roman Church from the Greeks. The other antiphons are of Roman origin. The solemn procession represents the entry of Christ, who is the Light of the World, into the Temple of Jerusalem. It forms an essential part of the liturgical services of the day, and must be held in every parochial church where the required ministers can be had. The procession is always kept on 2 February even when the office and Mass of the feast is transferred to 3 February. Before the reform of the Latin liturgy by St. Pius V (1568), in the churches north and west of the Alps this ceremony was more solemn. After the fifth oration a preface was sung. The "Adorna" was preceded by the antiphon "Ave Maria". While now the procession is held inside the church, during the Middle Ages the clergy left the church and visited the cemetery surrounding it. Upon the return of the procession a priest, carrying an image of the Holy Child, met it at the door and entered the church with the clergy, who sang the canticle of Zachary, "Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel". At the conclusion, entering the sanctuary, the choir sang the responsory, "Gaude Maria Virgo" or the prose, "Inviolata" or some other antiphon in honour of the Blessed Virgin.

CHEVALIER, *Ordinaires de Laon* (Paris, 1897); P.L., CXLVII, 185; HOEYNCK, *Liturgie von Augsburg* (Augsburg, 1899); FREISEN, *Liber Agendarum eccl. Sleszwicensis* (Paderborn, 1898); SCHÖNFELDER, *Ritualbücher* (Paderborn, 1904).

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

Candles.—The word candle (*candela*, from *candeo*, to burn) was introduced into the English language as an ecclesiastical term, probably as early as the eighth century. It was known in classical times and denoted any kind of taper in which a wick, not uncommonly made of a strip of papyrus, was encased in wax or animal fat. We need not shrink from admitting that candles, like incense and lustral water, were commonly employed in pagan worship and in the rites paid to the dead. But the Church from a very early period took them into her service, just as she adopted many other things indifferent in themselves, which seemed proper to enhance the splendour of religious ceremonial. We must not forget that most of these adjuncts to worship, like music, lights, perfumes, ablutions, floral decorations, canopies, fans, screens, bells, vestments, etc. were not identified with any idolatrous cult in particular; they were common to almost all cults. They are, in fact, part of the natural language of mystical expression, and such things belong quite as much to secular ceremonial as they do to religion. The salute of an assigned number of guns, a tribute which is paid by a warship to the flag of a foreign power, is just as much or as little worthy to be described as superstitious as the display of an assigned number of candles upon the altar at high Mass. The carrying of tapers figures among the marks of respect prescribed to be shown to the highest dignitaries of the Roman Empire in the "Notitia Dignitatum Imperii". It is highly probable that the candles which were borne from a very early period before the pope or the bishop when he went in procession to the sanctuary, or which attended the transport of the book of the Gospels to the *ambo* or pulpit from which the deacon read, were nothing more than an adaptation of this secular practice.

The use of a multitude of candles and lamps was undoubtedly a prominent feature of the celebration of the Easter vigil, dating, we may believe, almost from Apostolic times. Eusebius (Vita Constant., IV, xxii) speaks of the "pillars of wax" with which Constantine transformed night into day, and Prudentius and other authors have left eloquent descriptions of the brilliance within the churches. Neither was the use of candles in the basilicas confined to those hours at which artificial light was necessary. Not to speak of the decree of the Spanish council at Elvira (c. 300),

which seems to condemn as an abuse some superstitious burning of candles during the daytime in cemeteries, we know that the heretic Vigilantius towards the close of the same century made it a reproach against the orthodox that while the sun was still shining they lighted great piles of candles (*moles cereorum accendi faciunt*), and St. Jerome in answer declared that the candles were lighted when the Gospel was read, not indeed to put darkness to flight, but as a sign of joy. (Migne, P. L., XXIII, 345.) This remark and the close association of lighted candles with the baptismal ceremony, which took place on Easter Eve and which no doubt occasioned the description of that sacrament as φωτισμός (illumination), shows that the Christian symbolism of blessed candles was already making itself felt at that early date. This conclusion is further confirmed by the language of the *Exultet*, still used in our day on Holy Saturday (q. v.) for the blessing of the paschal candle. It is highly probable that St. Jerome himself composed such a *præconium paschale* (see Morin in Revue Bénédictine, Jan., 1891), and in this the idea of the supposed virginity of bees is insisted on, and the wax is therefore regarded as typifying in a most appropriate way the flesh of Jesus Christ born of a virgin mother. From this has sprung the further conception that the wick symbolizes more particularly the soul of Jesus Christ and the flame the Divinity which absorbs and dominates both. Thus the great paschal candle represents Christ, "the true light", and the smaller candles are typical of each individual Christian who strives to reproduce Christ in his life. This symbolism we may say is still accepted in the Church at large.

Besides the use at baptism and at funerals (St. Cyprian in 258 was buried *prælucentibus cereis*), we learn from the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage, really a synod held in Southern Gaul (c. 514), that in conferring the minor order of acolyte (q. v.) the candidate had delivered to him "a candlestick with a candle". The usage is observed to the present day. Such candles as these when carried by acolytes, as we learn from the Gregorian Sacramentary and the "Ordines Romani", were constantly used in the Roman Ceremonial from the seventh century and probably still earlier. These candles were placed upon the pavement of the sanctuary and not until much later upon the altars. Still the practice of setting candles upon the table of the altar itself seems to be somewhat older than the twelfth century. As the Roman pontiff, according to the "Ordines", was preceded by seven acolytes carrying candles, and as these candles at a later period were placed upon the altar and no longer upon the pavement, it is a tempting hypothesis to identify the six altar-candlesticks of an ordinary high Mass (there are seven when the bishop of the diocese pontificates) with the acolytes' candlesticks of the Roman "Ordines". But on this, see Edmund Bishop in the "Downside Review", 1906. The lighting of six candles upon the altar is now enjoined for every high Mass, four at every *Missa Cantata*, or for the private Mass of a bishop on festivals, and two for all other Masses. Still a certain freedom is left of lighting more candles on occasions of solemnity. Six candles should also be lighted at Vespers and Lauds when the Office is sung on great feasts, but on less solemn occasions two or four suffice. The rubrics also prescribe that two acolytes with candles should walk at the head of the procession to the sanctuary, and these two candles are also carried to do honour to the chanting of the Gospel at high Mass, as well as to the singing of the little chapter and the collects at Vespers, etc. Similarly the bishop when he makes his entry into a church is received and escorted by the acolytes with their candles. Again a bishop when taking part in any ecclesiastical function in the sanctuary has a little candlestick of his own, known as the *bugia*, which is held beside him by a chaplain or cleric. Candles are also used in excommunications, the reconciling of penitents, and other exceptional functions. They play a conspicuous part in the rite of the dedication of a church and the blessing of cemeteries, and an offering of candles is also made at the Offertory of an ordination Mass by those who have just been ordained. In the conferring of all the sacraments except that of penance, it is enjoined that candles should be lighted. At a baptism a burning candle is put into the hand of the catechumen or of the godfather as representing the infant. It is not lawful to say Mass without lighted candles, and if the candles are in danger of being blown out by the wind they must be protected by lanterns. The rubrics of the "Roman Missal" direct that at the Sanctus, even of any private Mass, an additional candle should be lighted and should burn until after the Communion of the priest. This rubric however is much neglected in practice even in Rome itself.

As regards material, the candles used for liturgical purposes should be of beeswax. This is adhered to on account probably of its symbolic reference to the flesh of Christ, as already explained. In the case of the paschal candle and the two candles which are of obligation at Mass, a recent decree of the Congregation of Rites (14 Dec., 1904) has decided that they must be of beeswax in *maxima parte*, which commentators have interpreted as meaning not less than 75 per cent. For other purposes the candles placed upon the altar, e. g. at Benediction, ought to be made of wax "in great part" or at any rate "in some considerable part". Of such candles a minimum of twelve is prescribed for any public exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, though six will suffice in a poor church or for a private exposition. As a rule the colour of candles should be white, though gilded and painted candles are permitted under certain restrictions. In Masses for the dead however and in Holy Week yellow or unbleached wax is used. It is also fitting that the candles for liturgical purposes should be blessed, but this is not prescribed as of obligation. An elaborate blessing for candles is provided on the feast of the Purification on 2 Feb., otherwise known as Candlemas Day, and this is followed by a distribution of candles and a procession. In former ages this function was performed by the sovereign pontiff wherever he was resident; and of the candles so blessed some were scattered among the crowd and others sent as presents to persons of note. A less elaborate form of blessing for candles on ordinary occasions is given in the Missal as well as in the Ritual.

Candles were, and are, commonly used to burn before shrines towards which the faithful wish to show special devotion. The candle burning its life out before a statue is no doubt felt in some ill-defined way to be symbolical of prayer and sacrifice. A curious medieval practice was that of offering at any favoured shrine a candle or a number of candles equalling in measurement the height of the person for whom some favour was asked. This was called "measuring to" such or such a saint. The practice can be traced back to the time of St. Radegund (d. 587) and later right through the Middle Ages. It was especially common in England and the North of France in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. For many other uses of candles, e. g. in the service of Tenebræ, in the hands of the dying, at First Communion, etc., the reader must be referred to the respective articles. (See ALTAR, subtitle *Altar-Candles*.)

BÄUMER in the *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v. *Kerze*, Vol. VII, 395–402; see also MÜHLBAUER, *Geschichte und Bedeutung der Wachslichter bei den kirchlichen Funktionen* (Augsburg, 1874), a most satisfactory monograph; THALHOFER, *Liturgik* (Freiburg, 1893), I, 666–82; MARTIN AND CAHIER, *Mélanges d'Archéologie* (Paris, 1853), III, 1–51; BISHOP, *Of six candles on the Altar* in

the *Downside Review*, July, 1906, 188–203. For recent decisions see S. L. T., *The Furniture of the Altar* in *The Ecclesiastical Review* (July, 1904), 60–64; VAN DER STAPPEN, *Sacra Liturgia* (Mechlin, 1902), III, 74–85; *Collationes Brugenses* (Bruges, 1905), X, 398–400; *Ephemerides Liturgicæ*, XV, 379–88.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Candlesticks.—Of the earliest form of candlesticks used in Christian churches we know but little. Such records as we possess of the magnificent presents made by Constantine to the basilica of the Lateran and to St. Peter's seem from the descriptions to refer principally to the stands and the hanging chandeliers destined for lamps. We hear also of two sets of seven bronze candelabra, each ten feet high, placed before the altars, but we cannot assume that these *candelabra aurichalca* were necessarily used for wax tapers (Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I, 173–176). Some of these great *fari* must have been magnificent pieces of metal-work, being made of gold and silver with fifty, eighty, or one hundred and twenty "dolphins", i. e. little branches wrought in this form and supporting each of them one or more lamps. This extraordinary profusion of lights, indirectly corroborated by Prudentius (Migne, P. L. LIX, 820, 829) and St. Paulinus of Nola (Migne, P.L. LXI, 467 and 535), was such that Rohault de Fleury (La Messe, VI, 5) estimates at 8730 the number of lights which Constantine destined for the Lateran basilica. This practice of providing immense hanging *coronæ* to be lighted on the great festivals seems to have lasted throughout the Middle Ages and to have extended to every part of Christendom, both East and West. (Cf. e. g. Venantius Fortunatus, Migne, LXXXVIII, 127.) We, in these days of brilliant artificial light, cannot easily realize what unwonted splendour such displays imparted to worship in a comparatively rude and barbarous age. To these magnificent chandeliers various names are given in the Liber Pontificalis, e. g. *cantharus*, *corona*, *stantareum*, *pharus*, *cicindele*, etc. Such works of art were often presented by emperors or royal personages to the basilicas of Rome, and though no specimens of any great size survive from this early period, various smaller objects have been found, one a bronze chandelier representing a basilica and providing accommodation for a dozen lights (Leclercq, Manuel d'archéologie, II, 561), which give a sufficient idea of their construction.

THE GLOUCESTER CANDLESTICK. GIFT OF THE ABBOT PETER, 1107–1113

Besides these, simple candlesticks (*cereostata*) were also undoubtedly in use from a very early date. The reference in the Apocalypse to the seven candlesticks of the Churches of Asia (i, 12 sq.) was probably derived from some feature already familiar in Christian worship. Of the lights carried before certain Roman officials, and of the acolyte's candlestick and candle referred to in the so-called Fourth Council of Carthage, mention is made in the article CANDLES (q. v.). The well-known medal of Gaudentianus of the fifth or sixth century seemingly shows candles burning upon a ciborium over an altar. Less open to dispute are the candlesticks seen in various mosaics and carved sarcophagi of the same period. The long shafts are evidently made of alternating spindles and knobs, and they are supported on a three-clawed base of simple form. There was a pricket at the top upon which the candle was stuck, and so St. Paulinus speaks of the candlesticks "which carry painted candles on their protruding spikes" (*Depictas exstante gerunt quæ cuspide ceras*). Of the Merovingian and Carolingian candelabra we have no trustworthy surviving examples, but we read of the exquisite workmanship lavished upon such objects in the time of Benedict of Aniane (750–821), who presented a set of seven to the church over which he ruled. A remarkable candlestick of bronze is still preserved at Kremsmünster, and is believed by some to be coeval with the chalice of Tassilo, c. 810, belonging to the same treasury; but other authorities assign the candlestick to a date at least two centuries later. The design shows a good deal of boldness and grace, but the execution of the metal work is not of a very high order. Of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries sundry candlesticks are preserved to us of a Byzantine type, squat and grotesque in form, which, if destined for ecclesiastical purposes at all, seem rather to have been intended to stand upon the surface of the altar than to be carried by acolytes or placed upon the ground. There are also other reasons, derived in part from the miniatures of manuscripts, which suggest that the use of lighted candles upon the altar itself is to be traced to this period. Much more remarkable, however, are the remains of some magnificent metal-work on a more vast scale. The great candelabrum of Reims was preserved until the French Revolution. It was constructed by instruction of the treasurer Wido between 1076 and 1097, and was no doubt meant to stand before the high altar in imita-

CANDLESTICK BY BENVENUTO CELLINI, VATICAN

tion of the great seven-branch candlestick of the temple of Jerusalem. Its height was over eighteen feet and its width fifteen. At present we have to judge of its workmanship from a small portion of the pedestal, which has alone escaped destruction and is now preserved in the public library of Reims.

Not less wonderful and happily still entire is the great candelabrum of Milan commonly known as "the Virgin's Tree". This *chef-d'œuvre* of twelfth-century art is also a seven-branch candlestick, and over eighteen feet in height. If the general effect, owing to the nature of the subject, is rather gaunt and straggling, the beauty of detail in the sculptured base and the bosses which adorn the stem can hardly be exceeded. With such great standing candelabra as those of Reims and Milan, neither of which could be described as precisely liturgical in purpose, we may associate certain large chandeliers still preserved from the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. Those of Reims and Toul perished in the French Revolution. But at Hildesheim we have a circular *corona* of gilt copper suspended from the roof, and dating from about 1050, twenty feet in circumference and bearing seventy-two candles. That at Aix-la-Chapelle, the gift of Frederick Barbarossa, whose name is inscribed upon it, is still larger and still more remarkable for the artistic beauty of its details, especially the medallions depicting scenes in the life of Christ, engraved upon copper and painted. More strictly destined for the service of the altar are a few surviving specimens of twelfth-century candlesticks, the most famous of which (here reproduced) is now in the South Kensington Museum, London, and, as the following inscription shows, was originally made for Gloucester Abbey in the time of Abbot Peter (1104–12):

Abbatis Petri gregis et devotio mitis
Me dedit Ecclesie Sci Petri Gloecestre.

The grace and elaboration of the interlacing grotesques are very characteristic of the period. Nearly a century older, but less artistic, are the two candlesticks of Bernward now at Hildesheim; while as a specimen of later medieval work it will be sufficient to mention two very beautiful candlesticks, about five feet in height, preserved at present in the Cathedral of Ghent, but believed to have belonged before the Reformation to St. Paul's Cathedral, London.

The practice of retaining six great candlesticks permanently upon the high altar seems only to date from the sixteenth century. At a somewhat earlier period we occasionally read of five, seven, or nine, according to the grade of the feast. However, since the publication of the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" in 1600, the presence of three such candlesticks on either side of the central crucifix is a matter of rubrical law. The "Cæremoniale" further directs that they should correspond to the crucifix in pattern and should be of graduated heights, the tallest next to the crucifix. This last direction, however, may be considered to have fallen into abeyance. (See CANDLES; ALTAR, under *Altar Candlesticks*.)

Besides the works already mentioned in the article *Candles* and the archæological manuals of OTTE, BERGNER, and REUSENS, the reader may consult D'ALLEMAGNE, *Histoire du luminaire* (Paris, 1891); DIDRON, *Annales archéologiques*, especially vols. XII, XIII, and XXI; CORBLET, *Les chandeliers de l'église au moyen âge*, in *Revue de l'art chrétien*, III; BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *traité pratique de l'ameublement des églises*, I, bk. III, and II, bk. XII; MARTIN AND CAHER, *Mélanges d'archéologie* (Paris, 1856), I, 93–104; III, 1–62; IV, 276–281; and more particularly ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *La Messe*, VI, 1–56, and corresponding plates, which last supply the best available pictorial illustration of the subject.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Canea, formerly a titular see of Crete, suppressed by a decree of 1894. Canea is the Italian name of Cydonia. Both names, however, were used simultaneously as separate titles. (See CYDONIA.)

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Canelos and Macas, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF, in Ecuador, South America, separated in 1886 from the Vicariate Apostolic of Napo, until then administered by the Jesuits, and since 3 Feb., 1893, one of the four missionary vicariates created by the concordat of Leo XIII with Ecuador (Battandier). This vicariate is now in charge of the Dominicans, who sent thither the first missionaries shortly after the Spanish conquest; it is not subject to Propaganda, but to the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. The vicariate is bounded on the west by the province of Chimborazo and the River Morona, on the south by the Amazon (Marañon), on the east by the Tigre, and on the north by the Curaray; the entire territory is divided lengthwise by the Pastaza. The city of Canelos is situated in the foothills of the Andes, not far from the sources of the Bobonaza, and takes its name (identical with that of a very ferocious tribe of Indians) from the cinnamon plant which grows very abundantly in these regions. It dates from the first period of the Spanish conquest, but was often destroyed by the savages. The city of Macas lies farther south on the Upano, and was once a centre of great wealth, owing to the neighbouring gold mines; it was known as Sevilla del Oro, or "Golden Seville". Owing to the attacks of the savages it became necessary to abandon these mines, whereupon Macas fell into decay. The Indians who dwell in this vast vicariate are partly Christians (a remnant of the converts made by the earlier missionaries) and partly pagan. Robust and intelligent, but passionately devoted to their freedom, they are very widely scattered, and the tribes are frequently at war with one another. The missionaries gather the orphans of the Indians killed in these wars and instruct them in various trades and industries; in this way they have established a fairly large number of Christian settlements. Other important cities of the vicariate are Mendoza and Gualaquiza. Canelos is also the name of the river that flows through the territory of the Canelos Indians.

Gerarchia Cattolica (Rome, 1907), 327; BATTANDIER, *Ann. Pont. Cath.* (Paris, 1907), 341; STREIT, *Kathol. Missionsatlas* (Steyl, 1906), 27 and map 28.

U. BENIGNI.

Canes, VINCENT (JOHN BAPTIST), Friar Minor and controversialist, b. on the borders of Nottingham and Leicestershire, date uncertain; d. in London, June, 1672. Though brought up a Protestant, he embraced the Catholic Faith at the age of twenty, and shortly afterwards went from England to Douai. Here he was received into the Franciscan Order and became lector of philosophy and later professor of theology in the convent of the Friars Minor. Having returned to England, he laboured strenuously for the spread of the Catholic Faith and was chosen by the Catholics to defend their cause against Dr. Stillingfleet. Canes' well-known ability as a controversialist was strengthened by the absence of bitterness or animosity towards his opponents, while his elegant and graceful style made his writings effective. His works are: (1) "The Reclaimed Papist: or a Dialogue between a Popish Knight, a Protestant Lady, a Parson and his Wife" (1655); (2) "Fiat Lux: or a General conduct to a right understanding and charity in the great Combustions and Broils about Religion here in England, betwixt Papist and Protestant, Presbyterian and Independent. To the end that Moderation and Quietness may at length happily ensue after so serious Tumults in the Kingdom" (1662). This work was dedicated to Elizabeth, Countess of Arundel and Surrey, the mother of Cardinal Howard, and is admirably calculated to inspire sentiments of moderation and peace; (3) "Infallibility" (1665), an appendix to the preceding work; (4) "An Epistle to the Author of Animadversion on Fiat Lux" (1664); (5) "Diaphanta, or Three Attendants on Fiat Lux,

wherein Catholik Religion is further excused against the opposition of several Adversaries" (1665); (6) "Three Letters declaring the strange, odd Proceedings of Protestant Divines when they write against Catholics," etc. (1671); (7) "Τῷ Καθολικῷ Stillingfleeto; being an account given to a Catholik friend of Dr. Stillingfleet's late book against the Church of Rome" (1672).

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. of Eng. Cath.* (London, 1885), I, 392–93; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II, 96–97; THADDEUS, *The Franciscans in England* (London, 1898), xiii, 109–10.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Canice (or KENNY), SAINT, commemorated on 11 October, b. in 515 or 516, at Glengiven, in what is now County Derry, Ireland; d. at Aghaboe in 600. He was descended from Ui-Dalainn, a Waterford tribe which dwelt on an island now identified as Inis-Doimhle in the Suir. The father of the saint was a distinguished bard who found his way to the North and settled at Glengiven in Cinachta under its chief. His mother was called Maul; her name is commemorated in the church of Thomplamaul, Kilkenny, dedicated to God under her invocation. The early years of Canice were spent in watching his chieftain's flocks, but, God calling him to higher aims, we find him in 543 at Clonard, under St. Finian, where he was a fellow-pupil of St. Columba. In 544 he was studying in the school of Glasnevin, with St. Kieran of Clonmacnoise and St. Comgall of Bangor, under the tuition of St. Mobhi. He was ordained priest in 545 in the monastery of Llancarvan in Glamorganshire, and set out for Rome to obtain the blessing of the reigning pontiff. In 550 we find him again at Glengiven, where he converted his foster-brother, Geal-Breagach, who afterwards assisted him in founding Drumachose. In 565 he passed over to Scotland, where his name is recalled in the ruins of an ancient church, Kil-Chainnech on Tiree Island, and in a burial ground, Kil-Chainnech, in Iona. He built cells on the islands of Ibdon and Eninis, an oratory called Lagan-Kenny on the shores of Loch Lagan, and a monastery in Fifeshire on the banks of the Eden. He is known in Scotland as St. Kenneth, was closely associated with St. Columba in the latter's missionary work, and, next to him and St. Bridget, is the favourite Irish saint in Scotland (*Eammack*). See Reeve's "Adamnàn" (Dublin, 1857, xxvi, xxxi); also the ancient lives in the "Codex Solmanticensis" edited by De Smedt and Backer (see below), and the "Liber Kilkenniensis" in Marsh's Library, Dublin. His Irish foundations were Drumachose, two miles southeast of Limavady, Kilkenny West, in County Westmeath, and the great Abbey of Aghaboe in Ossory, Queens County. Tradition asserts that he founded a monastery in Kilkenny by the round tower and cathedral which bear his name. A man of great eloquence and learning, he wrote a commentary on the Gospels, known for centuries as Glas-Chainnigh.

CARRIGAN, *History and Antiquities of Ossory*, IV, ii, 26; MORAN, *Ossory Archæol. Soc. Inaugural Address; Acta SS.*, Oct., V, 642–46; DE SMEDT-BACKER, *Acta SS. Hib.* (1888), 361–92; FORBES, *Kalendar of Scottish Saints*, 295.

MICHAEL M. O'KANE.

Canisius, HENRICUS (DE HONDT), canonist and historian, b. at Nymwegen in Geldern and belonged to the same distinguished family as Saint Peter Canisius, who was his uncle; d. 2 Sept., 1610, at Ingolstadt. He studied at the University of Louvain, and in 1590 was appointed professor of canon law at Ingolstadt. He was the author of "Summa Juris Canonici" (Ingolstadt, 1594); "Prælectiones Academicæ" (ib., 1609); "Comment. in lib. III decretalium" (ib., 1629); "De Sponsalibus et Matrimonio" (ib., 1613). A complete edition of his canonical writings appeared at Louvain in 1649 and at Cologne in 1662. The fruits of his labours in the historical field appeared in a work entitled, "Antiquæ Lectiones, seu antiqua monumenta ad historiam mediæ ætatis illustrandam" (6 vols., Ingolstadt, 1601–1604). In 1608 a seventh volume, a "Promptuarium Ecclesiasticum" was added by way of supplement. The work lacked systematic arrangement, and included much matter of minor value. It was afterwards entirely recast and critically sifted by Basnage, under the title "Thesaurus Monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et historicorum" (7 vols., Antwerp, 1725). Canisius edited for the first time the "Chronica Victoris Episcop. Tunnunensis et Joannis Episcop. Biclariensis", and the "Legatio Luitprandi" (Ingolstadt, 1600). We are likewise indebted to him for an edition of the "Historiæ miscellæ Pauli Diaconi" (ib., 1603).

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, I, 203 sq.; SCHULTE, *Gesch. der Quellen u. Litt. des Canon. Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1875–80), III, 130.

THOMAS OESTREICH.

Canisius, PETER. See PETER CANISIUS, SAINT.

Canisius, THEODORICH, b. at Nimwegen, Holland, 1532; d. 27 Sept., 1606, at Ingolstadt. He was a half-brother on his mother's side to St. Peter Canisius. After winning, at the age of twenty-two, the highest academic distinctions at Louvain, he decided to follow his stepbrother and enter the Society of Jesus, and was sent to St. Ignatius in Rome, who received him into the Society. On the completion of his novitiate, Theodorich was appointed professor of theology in Vienna, but was soon after appointed rector of the Jesuit College at Munich. Here, in 1562, one of the first productions in Germany of the morality play "Homulus" (Everyman) was given in Latin by the students under his direction. From Munich, where he was succeeded in 1565 by the celebrated Paul Hoffæus, he was transferred to Dillingen, where for twenty years he presided over the college and the academy and laboured with zeal and success for the improvement of studies and for the religious training of the students. From 1565 to 1582 he held the office of chancellor of the university. In company with his distinguished brother, he attended the first provincial congregation of the Society of Jesus in Upper Germany, and furthered important reforms in the teaching of philosophy. In 1585 he was made rector of the college of Ingolstadt, and in this capacity became a member of the German commission which tested in practice the first draft of the Ratio Studiorum. At length, having spent thirty years at the head of three of the foremost colleges of Germany, he was sent to Lucerne in Switzerland to enjoy a period of rest; but soon again, at the age of sixty-three, he had to undertake the government of the college of Ingolstadt. Two years later, on the advice of his physician, he was relieved of the burden and allowed to return to Lucerne. A fortnight after his arrival the death of St. Peter Canisius was announced. The shock deprived Theodorich of memory and speech, an affliction which he bore with exemplary patience for seven years. For his amiable disposition and spotless purity of life he deservedly received the surname of Angelus. In 1604, he was transferred again to Ingolstadt, where he died, and was laid to rest in the church of the Holy Cross.

Imago Primi Sæculi Societatis Jesu (Antwerp, 1640), 863; SPECHT, *Geschichte der ehemaligen Universität Dillingen* (Freiburg im Br., 1902), 265; PACHTLER, *Mon. Germ. Pæd.*, I, 357; *Ratio Studiorum*, II, 5, 482; KOBLER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; DUHR, *Gesch. der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge* (Freiburg im Br., 1907), passim.

GEORGE H. DERRY.

Cano, ALONSO (or ALEXIS), a Spanish painter, architect, and sculptor, b. at Granada, 19 March, 1601; d. there 3 or 5 October, 1667. He received his first lessons in art from his father, Miguel Cano, an architect. Later he studied sculpture under Juan Montañes, and painting under Pacheco and Juan del

Castillo. In 1625, when Herrera, the sculptor, was his teacher, he attained great fame by producing three coloured statues, now in the church at Lebrija: "The Virgin and Child", "St. Peter", and "St. Paul". They are all superb pieces of statuary, but the first is a masterpiece, conceived and executed in a noble, classical, simple style that rightly earned for Cano the title of the "Michelangelo of Spain". Besides his single figures in marble, he chiselled many beautiful retables, or monumental altar-pieces.

Cano went to Madrid in 1637, and through the influence of the Duke of Olivarez and of Velasquez, but chiefly because of his own merit, was made Master of the Royal Works, Painter to the King, and first in rank among the instructors of Don Balthasar Carlos. In Madrid he contributed plans for several palaces, city gates, and a triumphal arch for the entrance of Maria Anna of Austria, wife of Philip IV. In 1650 he became architect of the cathedral of Toledo. Cano was suspected of having murdered his wife, and was unjustly condemned and ordered to leave Madrid. He took refuge in Valencia, attained marked success there, painted a "Nativity", and a "St. John" for the city's great church, and entered the Carthusian convent, so as to be able to devote himself wholly to painting, which henceforth occupied him to the exclusion of sculpture. Tardy justice was done him when he returned to Madrid. He was restored to royal favour, but Cano felt that his only surety was in the Church; therefore he took orders and became a resident of Granada. In 1652 Philip IV appointed him a canon in the cathedral of Granada. To the churches of Granada and Malaga he presented many pictures and statues. A councillor of the former city, having ordered a statue of St. Anthony of Padua from Cano, was charged one hundred doubloons, whereat he demurred, saying that the artist was demanding four pistoles per day for twenty-five days' work, which was more than he, Cano's superior, could earn. "It has taken fifty years of study to produce this!" cried Cano, hurling the statue to the pavement. For this indignity to a saint he was suspended by the Chapter of Granada. In 1658 the king restored Cano, and required him to complete a crucifix which the queen had ordered.

Madonna by Alonso Cano (Prado, Madrid)

Cano was a greater sculptor than painter, but he would have attained fame as a painter even had he never worked in marble. His earlier work in colour was tentative, eclectic, and of little originality, but his later pictures, which fill the churches of Granada and Malaga, are splendid in drawing, brilliant in a colouring that vividly recalls Van Dyck's, full of imagination, and bold in design. His flesh tints are pure, the pose of his figures is statuesque, the lines are sharp, vigorous, and classical, and he had a profound knowledge of chiaroscuro. Cano led an exemplary life, his great fault being his ungovernable temper; he was industrious, studious, and very generous. It is related of him that, often, when he had no money for alms he would make a drawing for the beggar to sell. His abnormal antipathy to Jews was exemplified on his death-bed when he refused the Sacrament from a priest who had given it to converted Jews. Among his works mention may be made of: "St. Agnes" (Berlin); "The Dead Christ" (Madrid); "Virgin and Child" (St. Petersburg); "St. Anthony of Padua" (Munich); "Madonna and Child", sculpture, in the church of Lebrija (the ancient city of Nebrissa).

Huard, *Vie des peintres espagnols* (Paris, 1839–1841); Tubino, *El Arte y los Artistas contemporaneos en la peninsula* (Madrid, 1871); Head, *Handbook of Painting* (London, 1854); Madrazo, *Catalogo de los cuadros del Museo del Prado de Madrid* (Madrid, 1882).

Leigh Hunt.

Cano, Melchior, Dominican bishop and theologian, b. 1 Jan., 1509, at Tarancón, Province of Cuenca, Spain; d. 30 Sept., 1560, at Toledo. His father, Ferdinand Cano, a learned jurist, sent him at an early age to the University of Salamanca. There in 1523 he entered the Dominican Order, and was professed at St. Stephen's convent, 12 Aug., 1524. Francis de Victoria, who held the first chair of theology, was his professor from 1527 to 1531. Cano was then sent to St. Gregory's College at Valladolid, where, with Louis of Granada among others, he heard the lectures of Bartholomew of Carranza. After teaching philosophy for a time he became master of students, 1534, and was promoted to the second chair of theology, 1536. The same year the baccalaureate was conferred upon him by a general chapter of the order at Rome. In 1542, while attending another general chapter, he was made master of sacred theology, and on his return to Spain obtained the first chair at Alcalá. After the death of Victoria, 17 Aug., 1546, Cano was a successful competitor for his chair at Salamanca, and he held the title until 1552. Early in 1551 he was sent by the emperor to the Council of Trent. He was accompanied by Dominic Soto, and, like other members of the order, was enabled by his historical erudition and his mastery of scholastic and positive theology to render important service in the deliberations and achievements of the council. The following year Charles V presented him for the bishopric of the Canary Islands; but a month after he was preconized he resigned. In 1553 he returned to St. Gregory's College at Valladolid as rector, but was not charged with active professorial duties. In 1557, after being elected prior of St. Stephen's at Salamanca, he was made provincial. This election was contested, and among those who opposed Cano was Carranza, who had become Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain. Another provincial chapter renewed and confirmed the proceedings of the former, but the re-election was annulled by Pope Paul IV, who regarded Cano with disfavour for supporting the Spanish Court in some of its disagreements with the Holy See. On this pontiff's death Cano personally repaired to Rome, and obtained the approbation of his election from the new pope, Pius IV. He returned to Toledo in the spring of 1560, and died there the same year.

The character of Cano has been assailed by some writers, who represent him as a man of immoderate zeal and sometimes of intemperate action. He is charged among other things with having been a party to the misfortunes of Don Carlos and to the persecutions of Carranza. Against these accusations he is ably defended by Father Touron, the learned Dominican historian and biographer. Cano undoubtedly displayed great energy, vehemence, and determination in the pursuit of his aims. Early in his career at Valladolid he became involved in scholastic controversy with Carranza, and their continuous disputes, besides placing them at the head of rival schools of thought, cast a shadow over all their subsequent rela-

tions. Cano is also said to have for some time defeated the wish of the Jesuits to establish themselves in Salamanca. His strictures, which made a great stir, were published about the time of the suppression of the Society, but were withdrawn from publication in 1777. They were republished in "Crisis de la Compañía de Jesús" (Barcelona, 1900), 152–159. Cano's advice in important affairs of Church and State was often sought. Though possessing the full confidence of Philip II, he declined in 1554 the position of confessor to the king.

In whatever light his personal traits may appear, Cano made an imperishable name for himself in his work, "De Locis Theologicis" (Salamanca, 1563), which in classic elegance and purity of style approaches the great didactic treatises of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintillian. It certainly ranks with the most lauded productions of the Renaissance, not only on account of its fluency and freedom, but also for its lucid judgment and profound erudition. In the estimation of some critics this work, marking a new epoch in the history of theology, has made its author worthy of a place next to St. Thomas Aquinas. The "De Locis" was the outcome of a movement inaugurated by Francis de Victoria to restore the best patristic learning and to give to theological science a purer diction and an improved literary form. Cano took up the work of his master, and after years of labour gave out the production that was worthy of their united aspirations and endeavours. It was Cano's idea to establish scientifically the foundations of theological science, and therefore the "De Locis" is a treatise on theòlogical method. After elucidating the distinction between arguments based on authority and arguments from reason, the author enumerates ten *loci*, or sources of theology, each the subject of a book. With admirable precision and clearness he treats successively the authority of Holy Writ, oral tradition, the Catholic Church, the Councils, the Fathers, the Roman Church, the Scholastic theologians, the value of natural reason as manifested in science, the authority of philosophers, and the authority of history. The twelfth and last book treats of the use and application of these *loci*, or sources, in scholastic debate or theological polemics. Two further books on the *loci* as applicable to Scriptural exposition and as employed against various classes of adversaries of the Catholic Church were contemplated by Cano, but he was overtaken by death before he completed his work. A standard quarto edition of the "De Locis Theologicis" (Padua, 1714) was edited by Hyacinth Serry, with a "Prologus Galeatus" defending Cano against his critics. This is followed by most of the subsequent editions, some twenty in all. Two other treatises, "De Sacramentis" and "De Pœnitentiâ", are not so well known, but they show the same character of solidity and clearness of method, and the same elegant Latinity.

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *Scriptores Ord. Præd.*, II, 176; MANDONNET in VACANT, *Dict. de théologie catholique* (Paris, 1904), col. 1537; TOURON, *Hist. des hommes illust. de l'ordre de S. Dominique*, IV; CABALLERO, *Conquenses illustres*, II: *Melchior Cano* (1871); WERNER, *Gesch. d. apolog. u. polem. Litteratur* (1889), IV.

JOHN R. VOLZ.

Canon (an ecclesiastical person, Lat. *Canonicus*), a member of a chapter or body of clerics living according to rule and presided over by one of their number. Whether the title as applied to persons is derived from *canon* (Gk. κανών) a rule, or from the same term meaning a list of those who served a particular church, is much discussed. As however there are various kinds of chapters, each having its own specific rule, rights, and privileges, the most accurate definition of a canon is "a member of a chapter". Some writers have derived the title from the canon or rule of community life that was followed by certain clerics and which distinguished them from others who did not live in community. "A canon is so called from the canon, that is from the regularity of the life which he leads" (Scarfantoni, ed. Lucca, 1723, I, 5). Opposed to this is the opinion that canons were so called from the fact that their names were inscribed on the lists of those who served particular churches for which they were ordained. (For the medieval use of the term see Ducange, Glossar. med et infimæ Latinitatis, s.v. Canonicus.) The latter appears to be the more logical derivation and is in accord with the arguments of Thomassinus and most other writers, who agree that our present cathedral chapters are the modern form of the ancient bodies of presbyters who in each particular church formed with the bishop the senate of that church [Thomassinus, "Vetus ac nova disciplina", pt. I, bk. III, cc. vii-xi, and lxiii-lxx; Binterim, "Denkwürdigkeiten" (1826), III (2), 317–84].

Historical Origin.—It is not possible to say exactly when canons first had recognition as a body distinct from the rest of the clergy (cf. Amort, Vetus disciplina canonicorum regularium et sæcularium, Venice, 1747). In the very first ages of Christianity there is evidence that many churches had their own proper bodies of clergy, although it is not so clear that these clerics kept to any common rule of life (see CANONS AND CANONESSES REGULAR). At the same time there were many clerics who did live in common, e. g. the cenobites, and the term *canon* was applied to them as early as the fourth century; but it must not be inferred from this fact that the office of canon has its origin in those who followed the cenobitical Rule of St. Augustine (see AUGUSTINE, RULE OF SAINT). So far as the Western Church is concerned the first certain evidence is contained in the famous ecclesiastical constitution or ordinance of the Benedictine monk Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz (763). His "Regula vitæ communis" (rule of common life) was at once a restoration and an adaptation of the Rule of St. Augustine, and its chief provisions were that the ecclesiastics who adopted it had to live in common under the episcopal roof, recite common prayers, perform a certain amount of manual labour, keep silence at certain times, and go to confession twice a year. They did not take the vow of poverty and they could hold a life interest in property. For the text of the Rule of Chrodegang see Mansi, "Coll. Conc.", XIV, 313; also Walter, "Fontes Jur. eccl.", n. 6, and the edition of W. Schmitz (Hanover, 1891); cf. Ebner, in "Röm. Quartalschrift" (1891) v, 81–86. Twice a day they met to hear a chapter from the rule of their founder (see "Vita Chrodegangi", in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.", X, 552), hence the meeting itself was soon called chapter (*capitulum*) and the members capitularies (*capitulares*). The canons then as now formed the council of the bishop and assisted him in the ruling of his diocese. Those attached to the cathedral churches, being regularly models of the *vita canonica*, were soon known as *canonici* par excellence, and in time formed a special corporation, with all the rights proper to such bodies. From this period dates the daily recitation by the canons of the Divine Office or canonical hours (see BREVIARY). The Councils of Aachen (783) and Mainz (813) contain provisions regarding canons, and in 816 the Council of Aachen drew up a rule of 147 articles for the whole body of canons (Hergenröther-Kirsch, "Kirchengesch.", 4th ed., Freiburg, 1904, II, 170–74; Heimbucher, "Orden und Kongregationen", 2d ed., Freiburg, 1907, 3–21). In the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, laxity crept in; community life was no longer strictly observed; the sources of revenue were divided, and the portions allocated to the individual canons. This soon led to differences of income, consequently to avarice, covetousness, and the partial destruction of the canonical life (*vita canonica*). Various reforms were instituted by Nicholas II (1059)

and Alexander II (1063). There were also reforms by Innocent II and the Council of Lateran (1139), and by Benedict XII (1339). [On the ruin of the earlier *vita canonica* see the complaints of Anselm of Havelberg (d. 1155), in P. L., CLXXXVIII, 1093, and of Gerhoh of Reichersberg (d. 1169), in the fifth volume of Baluze's "Miscellanea", ed. Mansi (Lucca, 1761).] The development of the Church and the increase in the number of the faithful had rendered the one church of the bishop and his canons insufficient for the needs of the people; accordingly, side by side with those who followed the community life there were other clergy who served the filial churches and fulfilled the ordinary parochial duties. The bishops gradually derived greater assistance from these parochial clergy in the management of their dioceses, and such secular coadjutors were formally constituted as canons by the Council of Trent. (See "Analecta Jur. Pontif.", 1863, VI, pp. 1657, 1795, 1978; "Les chapîtres des cathédrales dans le Concile de Trente".) The legislation of the Council of Trent (Sess. V, XXII, XXIV) brought into uniformity the varying customs regarding the appointment, tenure, duties, etc., of canons; it also regulated their relations to the bishop in diocesan administration, and wherever the Catholic Church is now in full vigour the Tridentine constitutions are observed. In countries like England, Ireland, Canada, Australia, and the United States, ecclesiastical government does not conform strictly to the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent; hence, though in such countries canons may be appointed, they have not the canonical rights or status that belongs to a canon in the full sense of the word. In England before the Reformation, many of the chapters were composed of Benedictine monks or of canons regular, but these were all secularized at the Reformation. At present the Protestant canons in the Church of England have little to do with the ruling of the diocese, and their chief obligation is that of residence.

As the canons regular became separated into different congregations they took their names from the locality in which they lived, or from the distinctive habit they wore, or from the one who led the way in remodelling their lives. Hence we have the White Canons of Prémontré; the White Canons of St. John Lateran; the Black Canons of St. Augustine; the Canons of St. Victor at Paris and also at Marseilles (Muratori, "Diss. de Canonicis", in "Antiq. Ital. medii ævi", V, 163; G. Pennoti, "Gen. hist. totius s. ord. clericor. canonicorum", Rome, 1624; Ginzel, "Die canonische Lebensweise der Geistlichen", Ratisbon, 1851).

Kinds of Canons.—Canons are divided in the following manner: (1) Cathedral canons, who, attached to the cathedral church, form the senate or council of the bishop; collegiate canons, who perform the canonical office in the church to which they are attached, but are not connected by reason of their office with the government of the diocese. (2) Prebendary canons, who have a prebend or fixed income attached to the canonry; simple canons, who have no prebend. (3) Canons *de numero*, i. e. those of a church the number of whose canons can neither be diminished nor increased; (4) supernumerary canons, who are assistants to the canons *de numero*. The supernumerary canons are subdivided into three classes, viz. (a) those whom the Holy Father appoints and who will receive the first vacant prebend (expectant canons); (b) honorary canons (for these see the Constitution of Leo XIII "Illud est proprium", 21 Jan., 1894, and the recent decree of the Congr. of Rites, 14 Nov., 1902), and (c) canons who are added on the founding of a new prebend. Formerly the chief distinction was that made between the secular and regular canons. Regular canons, as forming the council of the bishop, are now almost obsolete, and the special regulations by which they are bound, their rights, privileges, and duties, are treated fully in works on canon law. The special status of canons in English-speaking countries will be considered later.

Manner of appointment.—As only the Holy Father can erect a chapter, so also he alone has power to appoint the individual members of a chapter. This power may be, and in fact is delegated, and hence canons are appointed sometimes by the pope, sometimes by the bishop or the capitular body, sometimes by others to whom the right has been given. By the rules of the Roman Chancery all prebends which become vacant *in curia* (i. e. when one who holds a benefice dies in Rome) are reserved to the Holy See, also the appointment to a vacant prebend the former holder of which has been deprived of it by an act of the Holy See, the appointment of the first dignitary of each chapter, and to all other prebends which become vacant during the months of January, February, April, May, July, August, October, and November. Beyond this the law does not expressly state in whom resides the power to collate to cathedral canonries and prebends, but the general opinion is that the right is invested simultaneously in the bishop and chapter; therefore for a valid election the majority of the canons must agree with the bishop when a new appointment is made. Exceptions are made in the following cases: if from the foundation of the church or benefice the appointment belongs to a particular person; if there is an immemorial custom to the contrary; the appointment of the canon theologian and the canon penitentiary; the canons in France (Deshayes, Memento Juris Eccl., 3d ed., Paris, 1903). Appointment is practically always made by letter, and possession of a canonry cannot be obtained until the nominee presents his letter of appointment. The Council of Trent orders that on the day of taking possession, or at least within two months, the new canon is to make his profession of faith and also obedience to the bishop. This profession of faith is made to the bishop himself or, if he be absent, to the vicar-general or another delegated for this purpose. The profession of faith must be made in presence of the chapter, otherwise the new canon may be deprived of possession and the prebendal fruits and daily distributions.

Qualifications.—The Council of Trent says (Sess. XXIII, XXIV) that since the dignitaries of the cathedral were instituted to preserve and increase ecclesiastical discipline it is necessary that those who are appointed should excel in piety and be an example to others; likewise, as they are to assist the bishop in his office and work, only those should be appointed who are able to fulfil the canonical duties. The requisite qualifications are: legitimate birth, proper age, Sacred orders, fitting education, skill in Gregorian chant, known good character and repute. Moreover the council lays down that without these qualifications the appointment is of no effect. Before the candidate is admitted to his canonry not only the one who appoints but also the chapter has the right to examine and inquire whether the necessary qualities are present in the candidate.

Duties.—The canon as a member of the chapter owes the bishop reverence in three ways: by conceding him the first place; by giving him assistance; by affording him escort. Conceding the bishop the first place has reference to chapter choir-processions and other public acts. The bishop also has the right to the assistance of two canons in the government of his diocese, and all canons are bound to be present when he celebrates pontifically in the cathedral church; on such occasions they must meet him at an appointed place, not, however, more than 160 yards from the church; and after the service they must conduct him to the church door. The obligation of a canon with regard to choir service consists in the public recitation of the Divine Office and being

present at the Chapter Masses unless legitimately excused. There is the further obligation of residence by which no canon may be absent from his choir duties for more than three months in any year. As mentioned above, the canon must make his profession of faith within two months of his appointment; he is likewise bound, and may be compelled by penalties, to attend the regular meetings of the chapter, and, finally, he must attend the Advent and Lenten sermons under penalty of losing his distributions or that portion of his revenues dependent on his personal presence at the church offices.

Rights (*General*).—The rights of the canons independently of the bishops are mainly concerned with matters that have reference to the administration of the chapter itself, e. g., the way in which the daily stipend is to be distributed; the order in which the canons are to be summoned to choir and chapter, etc., but they can do nothing to the disadvantage of the cathedral church or in contravention of ancient customs without the consent of the bishop. They could not, e. g., allow a canon more than three months' non-residence, or exercise ownership over the property of the cathedral, or receive foundation Masses. There are, however, some things which, according to the canon law, the bishop cannot do without the consent of the chapter, and other things which he cannot do without the counsel of the canons. Consent means the approval by the *major et sanior pars* (a majority, provided it be made up of the more prudent members). Counsel means consultation with the chapter before action, to prevent precipitation on the part of the bishop. When this consultation is necessary (i. e. provided for by the law), the act would be invalid without it, but the bishop is not bound to follow the counsel of the chapter. The consent of the chapter is required in the following cases: for the alienation of immovable property of value belonging to the cathedral, the chapter, or the *mensa* of the bishop, i. e. his endowment; for conferring benefices the collation of which belongs to the bishop and chapter conjointly; for the suppression of canonries and the uniting of simple benefices on account of the smallness of the prebends; for uniting benefices for any other reason; for the increase or decrease of the number of the canons; for any proceedings seriously prejudicial to the canons or their successors; for the ordering of a special feast; for the surrogation of examiners or similar officers outside the time of synod. The counsel of the canons is required: when the bishop has to make pecuniary provision out of the income of the diocese in order to provide lectures in Scripture, theology, or grammar for the clergy; for dividing the prebends of the canons into subdiaconal, diaconal, and sacerdotal prebends; for decreeing processions; in making synodal decrees. It may be noted that lawful custom makes the bishop independent of the advice of his canons in the matter of synodal decrees (Ferraris, Bibl. Prompta, s. v. Capitulum., art. 2, n. 9). The special rights of canons are chiefly concerned with the government of the diocese on the death or translation of the bishop. As soon as the see becomes vacant all the ordinary episcopal jurisdiction passes to the chapter, and also all that by custom belongs to the bishop. The *real* privileges belong to the canons, but not the *personal* privileges. They also succeed to those powers which have been perpetually delegated. If the chapter be reduced to one, that one can elect a vicar capitular, but he cannot elect himself. While the see is vacant the canons cannot make any innovations, but within eight days of the vacancy they must meet for the purpose of electing one who is to rule the diocese in the name of the chapter. The election is secret and a bare majority suffices.

Insignia.—Canons when present in choir for the Divine Office must wear the canonical dress. The choir or canonical dress consists of a black cassock (without train) and the cotta or surplice. Additional articles of dress, e. g. the cappa or hooded cape and a cassock of different colour, e. g. purple, are not to be worn unless specially granted by the Holy See. If the canon be a bishop he should wear the rochet and mantelletta over his purple cassock. Special privileges of dress have been granted to many chapters by the Holy See either when the chapter was erected or afterwards by particular indult. In all cases the terms of the indult must be carefully observed. It is to be noted that canons are never allowed to wear over the cassock the rochet only. Generally speaking, the canonical dress may be worn at functions for which the surplice is not prescribed, but only in the cathedral church or when in another church the canons are present as a body (*capitulariter*), three canons being sufficient to represent the chapter in this way. Consequently the canons may not wear the choral dress in a diocese other than their own, nor may an individual canon wear his habit in a church which he is serving either permanently or for a time. The *pileolus* (skull cap) and biretta are not, strictly speaking, part of choir dress.

Precedence.—If, as in many instances is the case, the prebends are distinct, the order of precedence is: dignitaries, canons of sacerdotal order, canons of diaconal order, and canons of subdiaconal order. The dignitaries take precedence among themselves according to statutes or well-established custom. If the remainder of the prebends are all of the sacerdotal order and all the holders are priests, they take precedence according to priority of taking possession of their canonries. The offices of canon theologian, canon penitentiary, etc., do not entitle the holders to any precedence. The precedence given to a vicar-general, if a canon, only belongs to him when wearing the dress proper to his office.

Status of Canons in England.—The following is a summary of the legislation of the synods of Westminster. The chapter consists of ten canons and one dignitary who is called the provost. (In some dioceses the number of canons has been increased.) A canon theologian and a canon penitentiary must be appointed, by concursus, for each chapter, but there is no distinction into sacerdotal, diaconal, and subdiaconal canons. The pope appoints the provost, and he also nominates to canonries becoming vacant in January and the alternate months of the year. In February and the other alternate months the appointments belong in turn to the bishop and the chapter. The canons do not actually make the appointment, but they send in to the bishop a list of three names and the bishop may choose one of three. By a recent decree of Propaganda (2 April, 1903) three honorary canons are allowed to each diocese, and in certain dioceses special indults have been granted with regard to the choir dress and the times when it may be worn. The canons meet once a month, and their choir obligations are limited to a portion of the Office on the day of meeting. Regarding the election to a vacant bishopric, the canons in England have only the right to make a recommendation of three candidates whom they deem to be suitable (cf. decrees of Cong. of Propaganda, 5 Apr., 1851; 21 Apr., 1852; 21 Jan., 1855, and "Collect. S. Cong. de Prop. Fide", Rome, 1906). In Ireland, as in Scotland and other countries where the law of the Church is not in full vigour, the powers and duties of canons are much restricted, in fact their status is mainly honorific, although in some isolated dioceses a near approach is made to the legislation which governs canons in England. For the status of canons in the ecclesiastical province of Quebec, see Gignac, "Compendium juris. eccl. ad usum cleri Canadensis" (Quebec, 1901), De Personis, Nos. 493–94.

In addition to the special members of a chapter

already mentioned there are usually appointed the following, in order to secure well-ordered services: precentor, sacristan, cancellor, succentor, punctator, hebdomadarian. All these are not necessarily included in every chapter; the actual arrangement is a matter for local convenience and custom. (See CHAPTER; VICAR CAPITULAR; CANONS AND CANONESSES REGULAR.)

The Synods of Westminster (1852, 55, 59, 73; cf. *Coll. Lacensis*, III, 895); TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1906), s. v. *Chapter;* BARBOSA, *De canonicis et dignitatibus* (Lyons, 1700); DE HERDT, *Praxis capitularis* (Louvain, 1895); BOUIX, *De capitulis* (Paris, 1862); FAGNANI, *Jus canonicum* (Rome, 1659); FERRARIS, *Prompta Biblioth.* (Paris, 1884), s. v. *Capitulum;* IDEM, *Theoria et praxis regiminis diœcesani, præsertim sede vacante* (Paris, 1876); VAN ESPEN, *Jus eccl. univ.*, Pt. I, tit. vii-xii, *De instituto et off. canonicorum* (Cologne, 1748), II, 103–60; REIFFENSTÜL, *Jus canonicum universum* (Munich, 1702); ZITELLI, *Apparatus juris ecclesiastici* (Rome, 1903); SCHNEIDER, *Die bischöflichen Domkapitel, ihre Entwicklung und rechtliche Stellung im Organismus der Kirche* (Mainz, 1885); HERGENRÖTHER-HOLLWECK, *Lehrbuch d. can. Rechts* (Freiburg, 1905), 323 sqq.; LAURENTIUS, *Inst. jur. eccl.* (ibid., 1903), 145 sqq.

DAVID DUNFORD.

Canon (Gr. *κανών*, rule, law, guide), in music, the strictest of all contrapuntal forms. It consists in the imitation or repetition of a given melody or theme in its exact melodic progression and in the same rhythmical form by one or more voices, not simultaneously, but one after another, at a half, whole, or two, measure distance, on any of its intervals. The word *canon* was originally applied to the law according to which the various voices were expected to imitate the typical melody (*proposta, guida*), these imitations not being written out in notes. It was during the great period of the Netherlands School (1450–1550) that the canon as a contrapuntal art-form received its greatest development and perfection, but it remained for the Roman, or Palestrina, School to give it its most complete application—to make it the vehicle for the highest ideals. On account of the placidity and repose resulting from its extreme regularity, this form was employed by predilection in the finales of compositions for the Ordinary of the Mass. There are also instances, however, where the canon form is made use of throughout all the five numbers of the mass. Examples of this will be found in Palestrina's mass, "Ad cœnam Agni providi" (Complete Works, X), and in the same master's five-part mass, "Repleatur os meum laude" (op. cit., XVII, 17, p. 105).

HALLER, *Kompositionslehre* (Ratisbon, 1891); PIEL, *Harmonielehre* (Düsseldorf, 1890).

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Canon Penitentiary. See PENITENTIARY.

Canoness. The assistance of women in the work of the Church goes back to the earliest times, and their uniting together for community exercises was a natural development of religious worship (Paulowski, De diaconissis comment., Ratisbon, 1866; J. Réville, Le rôle des veuves dans les communautés chrét. primitives, in Bibl. de l'Ecole des hautes études: Sciences relig. I, 231–51, Paris, 1890; Goltz, Der Dienst der Frau in den ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten, Leipzig, 1905). Rules were laid down for their guidance, but it was left for St. Augustine of Hippo to draw up the first general rule for such communities of women. It was written in the year 423 and was addressed to Felicitas, Superioress of the Monastery of Hippo, and to Rusticus, the priest whom St. Augustine had appointed to have charge of the nuns (Migne, P. L., XXXIII, 958–65). Towards the close of the eighth century the title of canoness is found for the first time, and it was given to those communities of women who, while they professed a common life, yet did not carry out to its full extent the original Rule of St. Augustine (sanctimoniales quæ se canonicas vocant, Council of Châlons, 813, can. 53; see the second book of De Institutione sanctimonialium, Council of Aachen, 816 or 817, and Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, IV, 17 sqq.). These canonesses were practically an imitation of the chapters of canons regular which had then recently been revived through the introduction of the "Regula vitæ communis" of St. Chrodegang of Metz. The canonesses took but two vows, chastity and obedience. Their superiors were known as abbesses, often held princely rank and had feudal jurisdiction. The occupations of the canonesses consisted in the recitation of the Divine Office, the care of the church vestments, and the education of the young, particularly the daughters of the nobility. The number of these communities multiplied very rapidly; but as all who entered did not do so from a spirit that was entirely religious, there soon came differences in the observance of the rule, whence the distinction between regular canonesses and secular canonesses. (See Ducange, Glossarium med. et infimæ Latinitatis, s.v. Canonicæ; Jacques de Vitry, Hist. Occid. II, 31; Bonif. VIII, in Lib. Sext. C. 43, § 5 de elect. I, 6; Extrav. Comm. III, 9 de relig. dom.) Some abbeys of these latter still exist, a few Catholic and several Protestant establishments (in Hanover alone there are seventeen), and many of them hold large properties. This is explained by the fact that the secular canonesses were mainly recruited from noble families, particularly in Germany, and, when the Reformation passed over the land, gave up the Catholic Faith. The regular canonesses, for the most part, follow the Rule of St. Augustine, but local circumstances have been the means of introducing various changes in details. Formerly all houses of a particular observance were united under and governed by one head. At the present day each convent is governed by a distinct superioress. The canonesses regular best known in English speaking countries are the Canonesses Regular of St. Augustine, and the Canonesses Regular of the Holy Sepulchre. They are strictly enclosed, take the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and are bound to the daily choral recitation of the Divine Office.

Constitutions of the Regular Canonesses of the Order of St. Augustine (London, 1879); DOM HAMILTON, *Chronicle of the English Augustinian Canonesses Regular* (London, 1904); DUCAS, *Les chapitres nobles de dames, recherches historiques généal., hérald., etc., sur les chanoinesses régulières et séculières dans les chapitres nobles de France et des Pays Bas* (Paris, 1843): HELYOT, *Dict. des ordres religieux* (Paris, 1847) I, 789–90; HEUSER, in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1842–45; VAN ESPEN, *Jus eccl.* I, tit. 33, c. ii; THOMASSIN, *Vetus ac nova ecc. disciplina*, I (iii), c. li.

DAVID DUNFORD.

Canonical Age. See AGE, CANONICAL.

Canonical Choir. See CHOIR.

Canonical Commentary. See COMMENTARY.

Canonical Hours. See BREVIARY.

Canonists. See LAW.

Canonization. See BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION.

Canon Law. See LAW.

Canon of the Mass.—This article will be divided into four sections: (I) Name and place of the Canon; (II) History of the Canon; (III) The text and rubrics of the Canon; (IV) Mystical interpretations.

I. NAME AND PLACE OF THE CANON.—Canon (*Canon Missæ, Canon Actionis*) is the name used in the Roman Missal for the fundamental part of the Mass that comes after the Offertory and before the Communion. The old distinction, in all liturgies, is between the Mass of the Catechumens (the litanies, lessons from the Bible, and collects) and the Mass of the Faithful (the Offertory of the gifts to be consecrated, Consecration prayer, Communion, and dismissal). Our Canon is the Consecration prayer, the great Eucharistic prayer in the Mass of the Faithful. The name *Canon* (*κανών*) means a norm or rule; and it is

used for various objects, such as the Canon of Holy Scripture, canons of Councils, the official list of saints' names (whence "canonization"), and the canon or list of clerks who serve a certain church, from which they themselves are called canons (*canonici*). Liturgically it occurs in three senses: (1) The κανών in the Byzantine Rite is the arrangement of the nine odes according to the order in which they are to be sung (Nilles, Kalendarium Manuale, 2nd ed., Innsbruck, 1896, I, LVIII). (2) Like the word *Mass* it has occasionally been used as a general name for the canonical Hours, or Divine Office (St. Benedict's Rule, cap. xvii; Cassian, II, 13). (3) Chiefly, and now universally in the West, it is the name for the Eucharistic prayer in the Holy Liturgy. In this sense it occurs in the letters of St. Gregory I (Epp., Lib. VII, lxiv, Lib. XI, lix); the Gelasian Sacramentary puts the heading "Incipit Canon Actionis" before the Sursum Corda (ed. Wilson, 234), the word occurs several times in the first Roman Ordo ("quando inchoat canonem", "finito vero canone", ed. Atchley, 138, etc.); since the seventh century it has been the usual name for this part of the Mass. One can only conjecture the original reason for its use. Walafrid Strabo says: "This action is called the Canon because it is the lawful and regular confection of the Sacrament" (De reb. eccl., xxii); Benedict XIV says: "Canon is the same word as rule, the Church uses this name to mean that the Canon of the Mass is the firm rule according to which the Sacrifice of the New Testament is to be celebrated" (De SS. Missæ Sacr., Lib. II, xii). It has been suggested that our present Canon was a compromise between the older Greek Anaphoras and variable Latin Eucharistic prayers formerly used in Rome, and that it was ordered in the fourth century, possibly by Pope Damasus (366–84). The name *Canon* would then mean a fixed standard to which all must henceforth conform, as opposed to the different and changeable prayers used before (E. Burbridge in Atchley, "Ordo Rom. Primus", 96). In any case it is noticeable that whereas the lessons, collects and Preface of the Mass constantly vary, the Canon is almost unchangeable in every Mass. Another name for the Canon is *Actio*. *Agere*, like the Greek δρᾶν, is often used as meaning to sacrifice. Leo I, in writing to Dioscurus of Alexandria, uses the expression "in qua [sc. basilica] agitur", meaning "in which Mass is said". Other names are *Legitimum*, *Prex*, *Agenda*, *Regula*, *Secretum Missæ*.

The rubrics of our present Missal leave no doubt as to the limits of the Canon in modern times. It begins at the "Te Igitur" and ends with the Amen before the Embolism of the Pater Noster (omnis honor et gloria, per omnia sæcula sæculorum, Amen). The Missal has the title "Canon Missæ" printed after the Sanctus, and the Rubrics say: "After the Preface the Canon of the Mass begins secretly" (Rubr. Gen., XII, 6). The ninth title of the "Ritus cel. Missam" is headed: "Of the Canon from the Consecration to the Lord's Prayer". The next title is: "Of the Lord's Prayer and the rest to the Communion." Neither of these limits, however, was always so fixed. The whole Canon is essentially one long prayer, the Eucharistic prayer that the Eastern rites call the Anaphora. And the Preface is part of this prayer. Introduced in Rome as everywhere by the little dialogue "Sursum corda" and so on, it begins with the words "Vere dignum et justum est". Interrupted for a moment by the people, who take up the angels' words: "Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus", etc., the priest goes on with the same prayer, obviously joining the next part to the beginning by the word *igitur*. It is not then surprising that we find in the oldest sacramentary that contains a Canon, the Gelasian, the heading "Incipit Canon Actionis" placed before the Sursum Corda; so that the preface was then still looked upon as part of the Canon. However, by the seventh century or so the Canon was considered as beginning with the secret prayers after the Sanctus (Ord. Rom. I: "When they have finished the Sanctus the pontiff rises alone and enters into the Canon", ed. Atchley, 138). The point at which it may be considered as ending was equally uncertain at one time. There has never been any sort of point or indication in the text of the Missal to close the period begun by the heading "Canon Missæ", so that from looking at the text we should conclude that the Canon goes on to the end of the Mass. Even as late as Benedict XIV there were "those who think that the Lord's Prayer makes up part of the Canon" (De SS. Miss Sacr., ed. cit., 228). On the other hand the "Ordo Rom. I" (ed. cit. infra, p. 138), implies that it ends before the Pater Noster. The two views are reconciled by the distinction between the "Canon Consecrationis" and the "Canon Communionis" that occurs constantly in the Middle Ages (Gihr, Das heilige Messopfer, 540). The "Canon Communionis" then would begin with the Pater Noster and go on to the end of the people's Communion. The Post-Communion to the Blessing, or now to the end of the last Gospel, forms the last division of the Mass, the thanksgiving and dismissal. It must then be added that in modern times by Canon we mean only the "Canon Consecrationis". The Canon, together with the rest of the "Ordo Missæ", is now printed in the middle of the Missal, between the propers for Holy Saturday and Easter Day. Till about the ninth century it stood towards the end of the sacramentary, among the "Missæ quotidianæ" and after the Proper Masses (so in the Gelasian book). Thence it moved to the very beginning. From the eleventh century it was constantly placed in the middle, where it is now, and since the use of complete Missals "according to the use of the Roman Curia" (from the thirteenth century) that has been its place invariably. It is the part of the book that is used far more than any other, so it is obviously convenient that it should occur where a book lies open best—in the middle. No doubt a symbolic reason, the connexion between the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the mysteries of Holy Week, helped to make this place seem the most suitable one. The same reason of practical use that gave it this place led to the common custom of printing the Canon on vellum, even when the rest of the Missal was on paper—vellum stands wear much better than paper.

II. History of the Canon.—Since the seventh century our Canon has remained unchanged. It is to St. Gregory I (590–604), the great organizer of all the Roman Liturgy, that tradition ascribes its final revision and arrangement. His reign then makes the best division in its history.

Before St. Gregory I (to 590).—St. Gregory certainly found the Canon that has been already discussed, arranged in the same order, and in possession for centuries. When was it put together? It is certainly not the work of one man, nor was it all composed at one time. Gregory himself thought that the Canon had been composed by "a certain Scholasticus (Epp., lib. VII, no. lxiv, or lib. IX, no. xii), and Benedict XIV discusses whether he meant some person so named or merely "a certain learned man" (De SS. Missæ sacr., 157). But our Canon represents rather the last stage of a development that had been going on gradually ever since the first days when the Roman Christians met together to obey Christ's command and celebrate the Eucharist in memory of Him. Here a distinction must be made between the prayers of the Canon itself and the order in which they are now found. The prayers, or at least some of them, can be traced back to a very early date from occasional references in letters of Fathers. From this it does not follow that they always stood in the same order as now. Their arrangement in our present Missal presents certain difficulties and has long been a much-disputed point.

It is very possible that at some unknown period—perhaps in the fifth century—the Canon went through a complete alteration in its order and that its component prayers, without being changed in themselves, were turned round and re-arranged. This theory, as will be seen, would account for many difficulties.

In the first century, as known, the Church of Rome, like all other Christian Churches, celebrated the Holy Eucharist by obeying Christ's direction and doing as He had done the night before He died. There were the bread and wine brought up at the Offertory and consecrated by the words of Institution and by an invocation of the Holy Ghost; the bread was broken and Communion was given to the faithful. Undoubtedly, too, before this service lessons were read from the Bible, litanies and prayers were said. It is also known that this Mass was said in Greek. Hellenistic Greek was the common tongue of Christians, at any rate outside Palestine, and it was spoken by them in Rome as well as everywhere else, at the time when it was understood and used as a sort of international language throughout the empire. This is shown by the facts that the inscriptions in the catacombs are in Greek, and that Christian writers at Rome (I Ep. Clem., etc.) use that language (cf. de Rossi, Roma sott., II, 237). Of the liturgical formulas of this first period little is known. The First Epistle of St. Clement contains a prayer that is generally considered liturgical (lix–lxi), though it contains no reference to the Eucharist, also the statement that "the Lord commanded offerings and holy offices to be made carefully, not rashly nor without order, but at fixed times and hours". It says further: "The high-priest [i. e. bishop] has his duties, a special place is appointed to the priests, and the Levites have their ministry" (xl). From this it is evident that at Rome the liturgy was celebrated according to fixed rules and a definite order. Chap. xxxiv tells us that the Romans "gathered together in concord, and as it were with one mouth", said the Sanctus from Is., vi, 3, as we do. St. Justin Martyr (died c. 167) spent part of his life at Rome and died there. It is possible that his "First Apology" was written in that city (Bardenhewer, Altkirchl. Litt., I, 206), and that the liturgy he describes in it (lxv–lxvi) was that which he frequented at Rome. From this we learn that the Christians first prayed for themselves and for all manner of persons. Then follows the kiss of peace, and "he who presides over the brethren" is given bread and a cup of wine and water, having received which he gives thanks to God, celebrates the Eucharist, and all the people answer "Amen." The deacons then give out Holy Communion (loc. cit.). Here is found the outline of our liturgy: the Preface (giving thanks), to which may be added from I Clem. the Sanctus, a celebration of the Eucharist, not described, but which contains the words of Institution (c. lxvi, "by His prayer"), and which corresponds to our Canon, and the final Amen that still keeps its place at the end of the Eucharistic prayer. Perhaps a likeness may be seen between the Roman use and those of the Eastern Churches in the fact that when St. Polycarp came to Rome in 155, Pope Anicetus allowed him to celebrate, just like one of his own bishops (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., V, xxiv). The canons of Hippolytus of Rome (in the beginning of the third century, if they are genuine; cf. Bardenhewer, op. cit., I, 541–3) allude to a Eucharistic celebration that follows the order of St. Justin, and they add the universal introduction to the Preface, "Sursum corda", etc.

The first great turning-point in the history of the Roman Canon is the exclusive use of the Latin language. Latin had been used side by side with Greek, apparently for some time. It occurs first as a Christian language, not in Rome, but in Africa. Pope Victor I (190–202), an African, seems to have been the first Roman bishop who used it (supposing that the Ps.-Cyprian, "De Aleatoribus", is by him; Harnack, "Der Ps.-Cypr. Tractat. de Aleatoribus", Leipzig, 1888). After this time it soon becomes the only language used by popes; Cornelius (251–53) and Stephen (254–57) write in Latin. Greek seems to have disappeared at Rome as a liturgical language in the second half of the third century (Kattenbusch, Symbolik, II, 331), though parts of the Liturgy were left in Greek. The Creed was sometimes said in Greek down to Byzantine times (Duchesne, Origines, 290). The "Ordo Rom. I" says that certain psalms were still said in Greek (Mabillon, Mus. Ital., II, 37–40); and of this liturgical use of Greek there are still remnants in our Kyrie Eleison and the "Agios o Theos.", etc., on Good Friday. Very soon after the acceptance of Latin as the only liturgical language we find allusions to parts of the Eucharistic prayer, that are the same as parts of our present Canon. In the time of Pope Damasus (366–84) a Roman writer who was guilty of the surprising error of identifying Melchisedech with the Holy Ghost writes, "The Holy Ghost being a bishop is called Priest of the most high God, but not high priest" (Sacerdos appellatus est excelsi Dei, non summus) "as our people presume to say in the Oblation" ("Quæstiones V et N. Test." in P. L., XXXV, 2329; Duchesne, op. cit., 169). These words evidently allude to the form "thy high priest Melchisedech" (summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech) in the Canon. Pseudo-Ambrose in "De Sacramentis" (probably about 400 or later; cf. Bardenhewer, "Patrologie", 407) quotes the prayers said by the priest in the Canon: "Fac nos hanc oblationem adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Iesu Christi. Qui pridie quam pateretur, in sanctis manibus suis accepit panem, respexit in cœlum ad te, sancte Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus, gratias agens, benedixit, fregit fractumque apostolis suis et discipulis suis tradidit, dicens: Accipite et edite ex hoc omnes: hoc est enim corpus meum quod pro multis confringetur. Similiter etiam calicem, postquam cœnatum est, pridie quam pateretur accepit, respexit in cœlum ad te, sancte Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus, gratias agens, benedixit, apostolis suis et discipulis suis tradidit dicens: Accipite et bibite ex hoc omnes: hic est enim sanguis meus." "And the priest says", continues the author, "Ergo memores gloriosissimæ eius passionis et ab inferis resurrectionis et in cœlum adscensionis, offerimus tibi hanc immaculatam hostiam, hanc panem sanctum et calicem vitæ æternæ; et petimus et precamur, ut hanc oblationem suscipias in sublimi altari tuo per manus angelorum tuorum, sicut suscipere dignatus es munera pueri tui iusti Abel et sacrificium patriarchæ nostri Abrahæ et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos Melchisedech" (quoted by Duchesne, op. cit., 170; P. L., XVI, 443). It will be seen that the whole of this prayer, but for a few unimportant modifications, is that of our Canon. Pope Damasus has been considered one of the chief compilers of the Roman Liturgy. Probst thinks that he ordained the changes in the Mass that occur because of the calendar of seasons and feasts, and attributes to him the oldest part of the Leonine Sacramentary (Lit. des IV. Jahrhunderts und deren Reform, 455 sqq.). Funk in the "Tübinger Quartalschrift" (1894, 683) denies this. One liturgical change made by this pope is certain. He introduced the word *Alleluia* at Rome (Greg. I, Epp. IX, xii, in P L., LXXVII, 956). Innocent I (401–17) refers to the Canon as being a matter he ought not to describe—an apparent survival of the idea of the *Disciplina arcani*—and says it is ended with the kiss of peace (Ep. ad Decentium in P. L., XX, 553): "After all the things that I may not reveal the Peace is given, by which it is shown that the people have consented to all that was done in the holy mysteries and was celebrated in the church". He also says that at

Rome the names of persons for whom the celebrant prays are read in the Canon: "first the offertory should be made, and after that the names of the givers read out, so that they should be named during the holy mysteries, not during the parts that precede" (ib.). That is all that can be known for certain about our Canon before Gregory I. The earliest books that contain its text were written after his time and show it as approved by him.

A question that can only be answered by conjecture is that of the relation between the Roman Canon and any of the other ancient liturgical Anaphoras. There are undoubtedly very striking parallels between it and both of the original Eastern rites, those of Alexandria and Antioch. Mgr. Duchesne is inclined to connect the Roman use with that of Alexandria, and the other great Western liturgy, the Gallican Rite, with that of Antioch (Origines, 54). But the Roman Canon shows perhaps more likeness to that of Antioch in its formulæ. These parallel passages have been collected and printed side by side by Dr. Drews in his "Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in der römischen Messe", in order to prove a thesis which will be referred to later. Meanwhile, whatever may be thought of Drew's theory, the likeness of the prayers cannot be denied. For instance, the Intercession in the Syrian Liturgy of St. James begins with the prayer (Brightman, East. Lit., 89–90): "Wherefore we offer unto Thee, O Lord, this same fearful and unbloody sacrifice for thy holy places . . . . and especially for holy Sion . . . . and for thy holy church which is in all the world . . . . Remember also, O Lord, our pious bishops . . . especially the fathers, our Patriarch Mar N. and our Bishop" ["and all the bishops throughout the world who preach the word of thy truth in Orthodoxy", Greek Lit. of St. James]. The whole of this prayer suggests our "Imprimis quæ tibi offerimus", etc., and certain words exactly correspond to "toto orbe terrarum" and "orthodoxis", as does "especially" to "imprimis", and so on. Again the Syrian Anaphora continues: "Remember also, O Lord, those who have offered the offerings at thine holy altar and those for whom each has offered [cf. "pro quibus tibi offerimus vel qui tibi offerunt"]. . . . Remember, O Lord, all those whom we have mentioned and those whom we have not mentioned" (ib., p. 92). "Again vouchsafe to remember those who stand with us and pray with us ["et omnium circumstantium", ib., 92]; Remembering . . . . especially our all-holy, unspotted, most glorious lady, Mother of God and ever Virgin, Mary, St. John the illustrious prophet, forerunner and baptist, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, Andrew . . . . [the names of the Apostles follow] . . . . and of all thy Saints for ever . . . . that we may receive thy help" ["ut in omnibus protectionis tuæ muniamur auxilio", Greek St. James, ib., 56–57]. The words of Institution occur in a form that is almost identical with our "Pridie quam pateretur" (ib., 86–87). The Anamnesis (p. 89) begins: "Commemorating therefore ["Unde et memores"] O Lord, thy death and resurrection on the third day from the tomb and thy ascension into heaven . . . . we offer thee this dread and unbloody sacrifice ["offerimus . . . . hostiam puram," etc.].

It is true that these general ideas occur in all the old liturgies; but in this case a remarkable identity is found even in the words. Some allusions to what were probably older forms in our Canon make the similarity still more striking. Thus Optatus of Mileve says that Mass is offered "pro ecclesiâ, quæ una est et toto orbe terrarum diffusa" (Adv. Parm., II, xii). This represents exactly a Latin version of the "holy Church which is in all the world" that we have seen in the Syrian Anaphora above. The Syrian use adds a prayer for "our religious kings and queens" after that for the patriarch and bishop. So our Missal long contained the words "et pro rege nostro N." after "et Antistite nostro N." (see below). It has a prayer for the celebrant himself (Brightman, 90), where our Missal once contained just such a prayer (below). The treatise "De Sacramentis" gives the words of Institution for the Chalice as "Hic est sanguis meus", just as does the Syrian Liturgy. There are other striking resemblances that may be seen in Drews. But the other Eastern liturgy, the Alexandrine use, also shows very striking parallels. The prayer for the celebrant, of which the form was "Mihi quoque indignissimo famulo tuo propitius esse digneris, et ab omnibus me peccatorum offensionibus emundare" (Ebner, Miss. Rom., 401), is an almost exact translation of the corresponding Alexandrine text: "Remember me also, O Lord, thy humble and unworthy servant, and forgive my sins" (Brightman, 130). The author of "De Sacr." quotes the Roman Canon as saying "quod est figura corporis et sanguinis domini nostri Iesu Christi", and the Egyptian Prayer Book of Serapion uses exactly the same expression, "the figure of thy body and blood" (Texte u. Unt., II, 3, p. 5). In the West the words "our God" are not often applied to Christ in liturgies. In the Gelasian Sacramentary they occur ("ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui Domini Dei nostri Iesu Christi", ed. Wilson, 235), just where they come in the same context in St. Mark's Liturgy (Brightman, 126). Our Mass refers to the oblation as "thy gifts and favours" (de tuis donis ac datis); so does St. Mark (ib., 133). But the most striking parallel between Rome and Alexandria is in the order of the Canon. The Antiochene Liturgy puts the whole of the Intercession after the words of Institution and the Epiklesis; in Alexandria it comes before. And in our Canon the greater part of this intercession ("imprimis quæ tibi offerimus", "Commemoratio pro vivis", "Communicantes") also comes before the Consecration, leaving only as a curious anomaly the "Commemoratio pro defunctis" and the "Nobis quoque peccatoribus" to follow after the Anamnesis (Unde et memores).

Although, then, it is impossible to establish any sort of mutual dependence, it is evident that the Roman Canon contains likenesses to the two Eastern rites too exact to be accidental; in its forms it most resembles the Antiochene Anaphora, but in its arrangement it follows, or guides, Alexandria. Before coming to the final definition of the Canon at about the time of St. Gregory, it will be convenient here to consider what is a very important question, namely that of the order of the different prayers. It has been seen that the prayers themselves can be traced back a very long way. Is their arrangement among themselves as old as they are, or is our present Canon a re-arrangement of parts that once stood in another order? Every one who has studied its text has noticed certain grave difficulties in this arrangement. The division of the Intercession, to which reference has been made, is unique among liturgies and is difficult to account for. Again, one little word, the second word in the Canon, has caused much questioning; and many not very successful attempts have been made to account for it. The Canon begins "Te igitur". To what does that "igitur" refer? From the sense of the whole passage it should follow some reference to the sacrifice. One would expect some prayer that God may accept our offering, perhaps some reference such as is found in the Eastern liturgies to the sacrifices of Abraham, Melchisedech, etc. It should then be natural to continue: "And *therefore* we humbly pray thee, most merciful Father", etc. But there is no hint of such an allusion in what goes before. No preface has any word to which the "igitur" could naturally refer. Probst suggests that some such clause may have dropped out of the Preface (Lit. der drei ersten Jahrhunderten, 349). At any rate there is no trace of it, either

in our preface or in any of the other rites. Thalhofer (Kath. Liturgik, II, 199) tries to explain the "igitur" by a very forced connexion of ideas with the Sanctus. Gihr (Das heilige Messopfer, 550) hardly considers the difficulty, and is content with a vague allusion to the close connexion between Preface and Canon. Other difficulties are the reduplications between the ideas of the "Hanc igitur" and the "Nobis quoque peccatoribus". Various allusions to older forms of the Canon increase the number of these difficulties. Dr. Drews has suggested as the solution the following theory. He thinks that the Canon, while consisting of much the same prayers, was originally arranged in a different order, namely, in the same way as the Syrian Anaphora which it so closely resembles, and that in the fifth century, shortly before it became stereotyped in the time of St. Gregory the Great, its order was partly reversed, so as to make it correspond more to the Alexandrine Rite (Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in der römischen Messe). The original order suggested by him is this:—

(1) "Quam oblationem . . . ."; (2) "Qui pridie quam pateretur . . . ."; (3) "Unde et memores" (Anamnesis); (4) "Supplices te rogamus" (Epiklesis); (5) "Te igitur"; (6) "Commemoratio Vivorum"; (7) "Communicantes"; (8) "Commemoratio Defunctorum", the last three forming the Intercession.

The reasons for this suggestion are, first that in this way the logical connexion is much clearer, as well as the resemblance to the Syrian Anaphora. As in Syria, the great prayer of Intercession, with the diptychs for living and dead and the memory of the saints, would all come together *after* the Consecration. Moreover, the *igitur* would then refer naturally to the ideas of the "Supplices te rogamus" just before it. The "Quam oblationem" would form the short link between the Sanctus and the words of Institution, as in both Eastern rites, and would fill the place occupied by an exactly similar prayer in Serapion's Prayer Book (13). Moreover, the Greek translation of the Roman Canon called the "Liturgy of St. Peter", edited by William de Linden, Bishop of Ghent, in 1589 from a Rossano MS. (and published by Swainson in "The Greek Liturgies", Cambridge, 1884, 191–203) contains some variations that point in this direction. For instance, it gives a version of our "Supplices te rogamus", and then goes on: "Aloud. First remember, O Lord, the Archbishop. He then commemorates the living. And to us sinners", etc. This puts the Intercession after the "Supplices" prayer, and exactly corresponds to the order suggested above. Lastly, in 1557 Matthias Flacius published an "Ordo Missæ" (printed in Martène, "De antiquis eccl. ritibus", 1763, I, 176 sqq.) in which there are still traces of the old order of the prayers. It begins with the "Unde et memores" and the "Epiklesis; then come the "Te igitur", prayer for the pope, "Memento Domine famulorum famularumque tuarum", and eventually "Nobis quoque peccatoribus", in short, the whole Intercession after the Consecration. But this reconstruction would not leave the text entirely unchanged. The prayer "Hanc igitur" has some difficulties. The Greek version (Swainson, 197) adds a rubric before it: "Here he names the dead". What can the "Hanc igitur" have to do with the dead? Yet the Antiochene Liturgy, in which several parallel passages to our Canon have already been noticed, has a parallel to the second half of this prayer too, and that parallel occurs in its commemoration of the dead. There, following a prayer that the dead may rest "in the land of the living, in thy kingdom . . . in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob", etc., is found this continuation: "And keep for us in peace, O Lord, a Christian, well-pleasing and sinless end to our lives, gathering us under the feet of thy Elect, when Thou willest and as Thou willest, only without shame and offence; through thy only begotten Son our Lord and God and Saviour, Jesus Christ." (Brightman, 57.) We notice here the reference to the elect (in electorum tuorum grege), the prayer that we may be kept "in peace" [in tuâ pace disponas], the allusion to the "end of our lives" (diesque nostros) and the unusual "Per Christum Dominum nostrum", making a break in the middle of the Eucharistic prayer. The Syrian form with its plain reference to death ("the end of our lives") seems more clearly to be a continuation of a prayer for the faithful departed. But in the Roman form too is found such a reference in the words about hell (ab æterna damnatione) and heaven (in electorum tuorum grege). Drews then proposes to divide the "Hanc igitur" into two separate parts. The second half, beginning at the words "diesque nostros", would have originally been the end of the Commemoration of the Dead and would form a reduplication of the "Nobis quoque peccatoribus", where the same idea occurs ("partem aliquam et societatem donare digneris cum tuis sanctis Apostolis et Martyribus" being an echo of "in electorum tuorum iubeas grege numerari"). This second half, then, would belong to the Intercession after the Consecration, and would originally fall together with the "Nobis quoque". In any case, even in the present arrangement of the Canon the "Nobis quoque" following the "Commemoratio pro defunctis" shows that at Rome as in other liturgies the idea of adding a prayer for ourselves, that we too may find a peaceful and blessed death followed by a share in the company of the saints, after our prayer for the faithful departed was accepted as natural.

The first half of the "Hanc igitur" must now be accounted for down to "placatus accipias". This first half is a reduplication of the prayer "Quam oblationem". Both contain exactly the same idea—that God may graciously accept our offering. "Hanc oblationem" and "Quam oblationem" differ only in the relative construction of the second form. We know that the relative construction is not the original one. In the "De Sacramentis", to which reference has several times been made, the "Quam oblationem" occurs as an absolute sentence: "Fac nobis hanc oblationem adscriptam, rationabilem acceptabilemque, quod est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Iesu Christi" (IV, v). We also know that the "Igitur" in "Hanc igitur" is not original. The parallel passages in Serapion and St. Mark's Liturgy have simply *ταύτην τήν θυσίαν* (Drews, 16). Moreover, the place and object of this prayer have varied very much. It has been applied to all sorts of purposes, and it is significant that it occurs specially often in connexion with the dead (Ebner, Miss. Rom., 412). This would be a natural result, if we suppose it to be a compilation of two separate parts, both of which have lost their natural place in the Canon. Drews then proposes to supply the first words of the "Quam oblationem" that we have put in the first place of his reconstructed Canon (see above), by the first half of the "Hanc igitur", so that (leaving out the *igitur*) the Canon would once have begun: "Hanc oblationem servitutis nostræ, sed et cunctæ familiæ tuæ, quæsumus Domine, ut placatus accipias *ut* in omnibus benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilemque facere digneris, ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui Domini nostri Iesu Christi" (Drews, 30), and so on, according to the order suggested above. One word, *ut*, has been added to this compilation, to connect our "Hanc igitur" with the continuation of "Quam oblationem". This word is vouched for by the Greek version, which has *ἵνα* here (Swainson, 197). Drews further notes that such a change in the arrangement of the Canon is not inconceivable. Popes have modified its order on other occasions. Joannes Diaconus, the biographer of St. Gregory I,

tells us that he re-arranged a few parts of the Canon ("pauca convertens", Vita Greg., II, xvii).

When then may this change be supposed to have been made? It was not made in the time of Innocent I (401–417); it had already occurred when the Gelasian Sacramentary was written (seventh century); it may be taken for certain that in the time of St. Gregory I (590–604) the Canon already stood as it does now. The reason for believing that Innocent I still knew only the old arrangement is that in his letter to Decentius of Eugubium (P. L., XX, 553–554) he implies that the Intercession comes *after* the Consecration. He says that the people for whom we pray "should be named in the middle of the holy mysteries, not during the things that go before, that by the very mysteries we should open the way for the prayers that follow". If the diptychs are read after the way has been opened by the holy mysteries, the Roman Canon must follow the same order as the Church of Antioch, and at any rate place the "Commemoratio vivorum" after the Consecration. Supposing, then, that this re-arrangement really did take place, it must have been made in the course of the fifth century. Drews thinks that we can go farther and ascribe the change to Pope Gelasius I (492–96). A very old tradition connects his name with, at any rate, some important work about the Canon. The second oldest Roman sacramentary known, although it is really later than St. Gregory, has been called the "Sacramentarium Gelasianum" since the ninth century (Duchesne, Origines, 120). Gennadius says that he composed a sacramentary (De. vir. ill., c. xciv). Moreover, the "Liber Pontificalis" refers to his liturgical work (Origines, 122) and the Stowe Missal (seventh century) puts at the head of our Canon the title: "Canon dominicus Papæ Gelasi" (ed. Warren, 234). Bäumer has collected all the evidences for Gelasius's authorship of some important sacramentary (Histor. Jahrb., 1893, 244 sqq.). It is known that Gelasius did not compose the text of the Canon. Its component parts have been traced back to a far earlier date. But would not so vital a change in its arrangement best explain the tradition that persistently connects our present Canon with the name of Gelasius? There is even a further suggestion that Drews has noticed. Why was the reversal of the order made? Evidently to bring the Intercession *before* the Consecration. This means to change from the same order as Antioch to that of Alexandria. Is it too much to suppose that we have here a case of Alexandrine influence at Rome? Now it is noticeable that Gelasius personally had a great reverence for the venerable "second See" founded by St. Mark, and that since 482 Bishop John Talaia of Alexandria, being expelled from his own Church by the Monophysites, sought and found refuge in Rome. He would have celebrated his own liturgy in the pope's city, and was certainly greatly honoured as a confessor and exile for the Faith. May we then even go so far as to suggest that we owe the present certainly unusual order of our Canon to Gelasius and the influence of John Talaia? So far Drews (p. 38). His theory has not been unopposed. An argument against it may be found in the very treatise "De Sacramentis" from which he gathers some of his arguments. For this treatise says: "In all other things that are said praise is given to God, prayers are said for the people, for kings, for others, but when he comes to consecrate the holy Sacrament the priest no longer uses his own words, but takes those of Christ" (IV, iv). According to this author, then, the Intercession comes before the Consecration. On the other hand it will be noticed that the treatise is late. That it is not by St. Ambrose himself has long been admitted by every one. It is apparently an imitation of his work "De Mysteriis", and may have been composed in the fifth or sixth century (Bardenhewer, Patrologie, 407). Dom G. Morin thinks that Nicetas, Bishop of Romatiana in Dacia (d. 485), wrote it (Rev. Bénéd., 1890, 151–59). In any case it may be urged that whatever reasons there are for ascribing it to an early date, they show equally conclusively that, in spite of its claim to describe "the form of the Roman Church" (III, 1) it is Milanese. The very assurance is a proof that it was not composed at Rome, since in that case such a declaration would have been superfluous. An allusion occurring in a Milanese work is but a very doubtful guide for the Roman use. And its late date makes it worthless as a witness for our point. When it was written probably the change had already been made at Rome; so we are not much concerned by the question of how far it describes Roman or Milanese offices. So far the theory proposed by Drews, which seems in any case to deserve attention.

From the time of St. Gregory I (590–604).—Certainly when St. Gregory became pope our Canon was already fixed in its present order. There are scarcely any changes to note in its history since then. "No pope has added to or changed the Canon since St. Gregory", says Benedict XIV (De SS. Missæ Sacr., 162). We learn from Joannes Diaconus that St. Gregory "collected the Sacramentary of Gelasius in one book, leaving out much, changing little, adding something for the exposition of the Gospels" (II, xvii). These modifications seem to concern chiefly the parts of the Mass outside the Canon. We are told that Gregory added to the "Hanc igitur" the continuation "diesque nostros in tuâ pace disponas", etc. (ib.). We have already noticed that this second part was originally a fragment of a prayer for the dead. St. Gregory's addition may then very well mean, not that he composed it, but that he joined it to the "Hanc igitur", having removed it from its original place. From the time of Gregory the most important event in the history of the Roman Canon is, not any sort of change in it, but the rapid way in which it spread all over the West, displacing the Gallican Liturgy. Charlemagne (768–814) applied to Pope Adrian I (772–95) for a copy of the Roman Liturgy, that he might introduce it throughout the Frankish Kingdom. The text sent by the pope is the basis of what is called the "Sacramentarium Gregorianum", which therefore represents the Roman Rite at the end of the eighth century. But it is practically unchanged since St. Gregory's time. The Gelasian book, which is earlier than the so-called Gregorian one, is itself later than St. Gregory. It contains the same Canon (except that there are a few more saints' names in the "Communicantes") and has the continuation "diesque nostros in tuâ pace disponas", etc., joined to the "Hanc igitur", just as in our present Missal. The Stowe Missal, now in Dublin (a sixth or early seventh century MS.), is no longer a sacramentary, but contains already the complete text of a "Missa quotidiana", with collects for three other Masses, thus forming what we call a Missal. From this time convenience led more and more to writing out the whole text of the Mass in one book. By the tenth century the Missal, containing whole Masses and including Epistles and Gospels, takes the place of the separate books ("Sacramentarium" for the celebrant, "Lectionarium" for the deacon and subdeacon, and "Antiphonarium Missæ" for the choir). After the ninth century the Roman Mass, now quite fixed in all its essential parts (though the Proper Masses for various feasts constantly change), quickly became the universal use throughout the Western patriarchate. Except for three small exceptions, the Ambrosian Rite at Milan, the Mozarabic Rite at Toledo, and the Byzantine Rite among the Italo-Greeks in Calabria and Sicily, this has been the case ever since. The local medieval rites of which we hear, such as those of Lyons, Paris, Rouen, Salisbury, York, etc., are in no sense different liturgies. They

are all simply the Roman use with slight local variations—variations, moreover, that hardly ever affect the Canon. The Sarum Rite, for instance, which Anglicans have sometimes tried to set up as a sort of rival to the Roman Rite, does not contain in its Canon a single word that differs from the parent-rite as still used by us. But some changes were made in medieval times, changes that have since been removed by the conservative tendency of Roman legislation.

From the tenth century people took all manner of liberties with the text of the Missal. It was the time of farced Kyries and Glorias, of dramatic and even theatrical ritual, of endlessly varying and lengthy prefaces, into which interminable accounts of stories from Bible history and lives of saints were introduced. This tendency did not even spare the Canon; although the specially sacred character of this part tended to prevent people from tampering with it as recklessly as they did with other parts of the Missal. There were, however, additions made to the "Communicantes" so as to introduce special allusions on certain feasts; the two lists of saints, in the "Communicantes" and "Nobis quoque peccatoribus", were enlarged so as to include various local people, and even the "Hanc igitur" and the "Qui pridie" were modified on certain days. The Council of Trent (1545–63) restrained this tendency and ordered that "the holy Canon composed many centuries ago" should be kept pure and unchanged; it also condemned those who say that the "Canon of the Mass contains errors and should be abolished" (Sess. XXII., cap. iv, can. vi; Denzinger, 819, 830). Pope Pius V (1566–72) published an authentic edition of the Roman Missal in 1570, and accompanied it with a Bull forbidding anyone to either add, or in any way change any part of it. This Missal is to be the only one used in the West and everyone is to conform to it, except that local uses which can be proved to have existed for more than 200 years are to be kept. This exception saved the Ambrosian, Mozarabic, and Byzantine Rites, as well as a few ancient modified forms of the Roman Rite, such as the Dominican, Carmelite, and Carthusian Missals. The differences in these Missals, however, hardly affect the Canon, except in one or two unimportant rubrics. Since Pius V our Canon, then, has been brought back to its original simplicity and remains unchanged throughout the year, except that on a few of the very greatest feasts slight additions are made to the "Communicantes" and the "Hanc igitur", and on one day to the "Qui pridie quam pateretur" (see below). Clement VIII (1592–1605), Urban VIII (1623–44), and Leo XIII (1878–1903) have, each in his own time, re-edited the Missal, and a great number of additional Masses for new feasts or for local calendars have been added to it. But none of these changes have affected the part now under consideration. The Canon that we say is always the one finally restored by Pius V, that remains as it was in the days of Gregory I, and that goes back far behind his time till its origin is lost in the mists that hang over the first centuries when the Roman Christians met together to "do the things the Lord commanded at appointed times" (I Clem., xl). Through all the modifications and additions that, in recent years especially, have caused our Missal to grow in size, among all the later collects, lessons and antiphons, the Canon stands out firm and unchanging in the midst of an ever developing rite, the centre and nucleus of the whole liturgy, stretching back with its strange and archaic formulæ through all the centuries of church history, to the days when the great Roman Cæsar was lord of the world and the little community of Christians stood around their bishop while they "sang a hymn to Christ as to a God before day-break" (Pliny, Epp., X, xcvii). Then the bishop lifted up his hands over the bread and wine, "gave thanks and glory to the Father of all through his Son and the Holy Ghost, and made the Eucharist" (Just., Apol., III, lxv). So that of all liturgical prayers in the Christian world no one is more ancient nor more venerable than the Canon of the Roman Mass.

III. The Text and Rubrics of the Canon.—Following the order of our present text, some remarks will be added about its expression and the ceremonies that accompany it. The whole Canon is now said silently. The priest should just hear his own voice (this is especially important in the case of the words of Consecration, since the form of every sacrament must be sensible), but should not be heard by the bystanders. This law began with the reduplication of the parts of the celebrant and choir. For many centuries the celebrant has not waited till the choir have finished their part, but goes on at once with his prayers—except in the cases of the Gloria and Creed, where he has to sing aloud as soon as they have done. Mabillon quotes from the older Roman *ordines* that originally "the priest did not begin the Canon until the singing of the Sanctus was over" (In ord. Rom. comm., XXI). The singing of the Sanctus and Benedictus then made it necessary for the priest at the altar to speak the Canon in a low voice. How little this was ever considered really essential is shown by the fact that at an ordination, almost the only case of concelebration left in the West, all the concelebrants say the Canon together aloud. There are also mystic reasons for the silent prayers of the Canon. They are thus shown to be purely sacerdotal, belonging only to the priest, the silence increases our reverence at the most sacred moment of the Mass, removes the Consecration from ordinary vulgar use, and is a symbol of our Lord's silent prayer in the Garden and silence during his Passion (Suarez, disp. lxxxiii, I, 25). The celebrant lifts up his hands, joins them, also lifting up his eyes, and then bows deeply before the altar, resting his joined hands on it. This ceremony should come *before* the "Te igitur", so that he does not begin the prayer till he is bowing before the altar. It is an obvious gesture, a sort of mute invocation as the beginning of the Consecration prayer. The first three prayers are always noted as belonging together and making three parts of one prayer "Te igitur", "Memento Domine", "Communicantes"), which is closed for itself by the "Per Christum Dominum nostrum, Amen". It is now a law that a picture of the Crucifixion should be placed at the beginning of the Canon. Innocent III (1198–1216) notes that in his time this was already the custom. The crucifix grew out of the adornment of the letter T with which the Canon begins. Innocent thinks that the presence of the T at that place is a special work of Divine Providence (Inn. III, De Sacro altaris myst., I, 3, c. ii, P. L., CCXVII).

Te igitur.—We have already considered the "igitur". Unless some such theory as that of Drews be admitted, its presence will always be a difficulty. Gihr (Messopfer, 550), as we have said, thinks that it implies merely a general connexion with the Preface: "Because we have praised Thee and glorified Thee, therefore we now pray Thee to accept these gifts". The kiss of the altar after "petimus" is not mentioned by the earlier writers. It is noted by Sicardus (d. 1215, Mitrale, III, 6, P. L., CCXIII). At one time the celebrant kissed both the altar and the crucifix in the Missal at the beginning of the Canon (Ordo Rom. XIV, 53, fourteenth century). After kissing the altar the celebrant makes three signs of the cross over the bread and wine. It is the first of the many blessings of the gifts in the Canon and is joined to the kiss as one ceremony. He then stands erect and lifts up his hands, as at the collects (now they may not be lifted above the shoulders, Ritus cel., V, 1). This is the traditional attitude of prayer that may be seen in the pictures of *Orantes* in the catacombs. It is observed throughout the Canon. The

priest prays first for the Church, then for the pope and diocesan ordinary by name. *Antistes*, from *antisto* (προΐστημι), is one of the many older words for "bishop". At the pope's name a slight inclination is made. When the Roman See is vacant, the mention of the pope is left out. In Rome the bishop's name is left out; the pope is local bishop there. The bishop must be canonically appointed and confirmed, otherwise he is not mentioned. But he need not yet be consecrated. It is always the ordinary of the diocese, even in the case of regulars who are exempt. A diocesan bishop in saying Mass changes the form "et Antistite nostro N." into "et me indigno servo tuo". The pope naturally uses these words instead of "una cum famulo tuo Papa nostro N.", and omits the clause about the bishop. The mention of the pope always occurs at this place. Otherwise in the Middle Ages there was a great variety in the names. A very old custom was to name the sovereign after the bishop ("et pro rege nostro N." or "Imperatore nostro N."). Pope Celestine I (422–32) refers to it in a letter to Theodosius II. Boniface I (418–22) writes to Emperor Honorius: "Behold in the very mysteries, among the prayers which the bishop offers for your Empire . . ." (Drews, *Entstehungsgesch.*, 7). So also the "De Sacramentis" says: "Prayer is offered for the people, for the king, for the others" (IV, iv). Throughout the Middle Ages the sovereign was always named. Pius V removed the clause from the Missal. In the case of Catholic princes a privilege is given by which they are put in. In Austria the clause "et pro Imperatore nostro Francisco Josepho" is always added by the celebrant, and in Hungary it becomes of course "pro rege nostro". At one time the priest went on to pray for himself at this place (Bona, Rerum liturg., II, 11). Ebner quotes as the commonest form: "Mihi quoque indignissimo famulo tuo propitius esse digneris, et ab omnibus me peccatorum offensionibus emundare" (Miss. Rom., 401). We have already noted this as being almost exactly a version of the Alexandrine form. The word "orthodoxi" that follows is very rare in the West. It is a link between our Canon and the Antiochene Anaphora.

Commemoratio pro vivis.—The celebrant does not now name anyone aloud at the "N. et N." After "tuarum" he joins his hands and prays silently for anyone he likes. This is the place where the diptychs for the living were read. A diptych (δίπτυχος, from δίς and πτύσσω, twice-folded) was a table folding in two like a book, on which names were written and then read out. Some authorities admit and some deny that the priest in his silent prayer may name people who are outside the Church. As this prayer is a private one (as shown by the folding of the hands) there is no law to forbid him from so doing. He goes on to mention the bystanders, who are thus always specially prayed for at Mass. "Pro quibus tibi offerimus, vel qui tibi offerunt" is a reduplication. The first half ("pro quibus tibi offerimus") is missing in all early sacramentaries, also in the Greek version (Swainson, 196). It occurs, however, in the parallel text of the Syrian Liturgy. Both parts refer to the same persons, for whom the priests and his assistants offer the Sacrifice and who themselves also join in the offering by their presence. "Sacrifice of praise" (Ps. xlix, 23), "For the forgiveness of their sins" and "For the hope of their safety and health", are three expressions connoting the threefold character of the Mass as praise, atonement, and petition.

Communicantes.—This prayer is headed by the rubric "Infra Actionem". Why is it put here? The "Communicantes" has a small addition on the five chief days of the year, Christmas, the Epiphany, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, referring to the feast. The beginning of the text with these additions is placed among the prefaces, after the corresponding proper preface for each feast. Placed there, the rubric that heads it is obvious. For each feast there is the special preface and, moreover, "Infra Actionem", that is, "Within the Canon", a further change is made. From its place among the prefaces as a natural heading to the "Communicantes" this rubric has found its way into the Canon, when people had begun to look upon it as the title of that prayer. The Gelasian Sacramentary has it, when the "Communicantes" occurs with an addition among the Propers (e. g. Wilson, 89), but it has not yet found its way into the Ordinary (ib., 234). These five additions to the "Communicantes", all of them very beautiful and very ancient (they are all, with slight variations, in the Gelasian book), are the only ones left by Pius V, where at one time many more feasts had sometimes long references. "Communicantes" means simply "in union with". The participles here have given rise to much discussion; no finite verb follows, nor does any go before to which they can suitably refer. It is simply a case of late Latin that is not strictly grammatical. It must be understood as standing for a finite verb, as if it were "Communicamus cum eis et memoriam veneramus eorum". There are parallel examples in the Vulgate of a participle standing for a finite verb (e. g. Rom., ix, 6 sqq., where the Greek has the same anomaly). In the lists of saints that follows, Our Lady of course always holds the first place. She is here named very solemnly with her title of "Mother of God", as in the corresponding Eastern Anaphoras. It is strange that St. John the Baptist, who should come next, has been left out here. He is named in both the Eastern liturgies at this place (Brightman, 93 and 169), and finds his right place at the head of our other list (in the "Nobis quoque"). After Our Lady follow twelve Apostles and twelve martyrs. The Apostles are not arranged in quite the same order as in any of the Gospels. St. Paul at the head, with St. Peter, makes up the number for Judas. St. Matthias is not named here, but in the "Nobis quoque". The twelve martyrs are evidently arranged to balance the Apostles. First come five popes, then a bishop (St. Cyprian), and a deacon (St. Lawrence), then five laymen. All these saints, except St. Cyprian, are local Roman saints, as is natural in what was originally the local Roman Liturgy. It is noticeable that St. Cyprian (d. 258), who had a serious misunderstanding with a Roman pope, is the only foreigner honoured by the Roman Church by being named among her own martyrs. The fact has been quoted to show how completely his disagreement with Pope Stephen was forgotten, and how Stephen's successors remembered him only as one of the chief and most glorious martyrs of the West. The cult of saints was at first the cult of martyrs; all those in both lists in the Canon died for the Faith. Gregory III (731–41) added to the Vatican basilica a chapel containing a great number of relics and dedicated to All Saints. He ordered the monks who served this chapel to add to the "Communicantes" after the words "et omnium Sanctorum tuorum" the further clause: "quorum solemnitas hodie in conspectu tuo celebratur, Domine Deus noster, in toto orbe terrarum". The text is found in some medieval Missals. A certain number of Missals also contained additions about special patrons to be used on their feasts (Benedict XIV, De SS. Missæ sacr., 162). All these clauses disappeared at Pius V's reform, except that in some French churches the names of St. Hilary and St. Martin are still added to the list (Duchesne, Origines, 172). This first complex of prayers forms the chief part of the great Intercession that occurs in all liturgies. We notice again the strange fact that at Rome it is divided in two by the Consecration.

Hanc igitur.—This prayer has already been considered, the most remarkable of all in the Canon. Here it need only be added that the "Hanc igitur" receives an addition (after the words "familiæ tuæ")

on four occasions only, on Maundy Thursday, Easter, Whitsunday, and in the Mass at a bishop's consecration. The additions will be found on the feasts in the Missal, and in the Consecration service in the Pontifical. On Maundy Thursday an allusion is made to "the day on which our Lord Jesus Christ gave the mysteries of his Body and Blood to his disciples to be consecrated"; Easter and Whitsunday have an identical form (a prayer for the newly baptized), and the Consecration Mass has a clause "which we offer to Thee also for this Thy servant [the new bishop says: "for me Thy servant] whom Thou hast deigned to promote to the order of Episcopacy". The Gelasian Sacramentary has as many as thirty-eight special forms to be intercalated at this place, in which allusions are made to all kinds of special intentions. For instance, in a requiem Mass, "which we offer to Thee for the repose of the soul of thy servant N." (Wilson, 307); for a wedding, "This oblation of thy servants N. and N., which they offer to Thee for thy handmaid N., we beg Thee mercifully to accept, that as Thou hast allowed her to come to the fitting age for marriage, so Thou mayest allow her, being joined to her husband by thy grace, to rejoice in the offspring she desires and mayest mercifully bring her with her spouse to the desired length of years; and dispose our days in thy peace", etc. (ib., 265). During the "Hanc igitur" the priest, who has joined his hands at the preceding "Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen", spreads them over the offerings. This is a late ceremony. It occurs first in the fifteenth century. Formerly the celebrant lifted up his hands as before, but made a profound inclination (Durandus, VI, 39). This older rite is still used by the Dominicans and Carmelites. The imposition of hands seems to have been introduced merely as a way of practically touching the sacrifice at this point, at which it is so definitely named in the prayer. At the "Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen" following, the priest again (as always at these words) folds his hands. The "Hanc igitur", with the two following prayers, may be considered as forming a second member of the Canon, threefold like the first.

Quam oblationem.—This prayer has been noticed, as well as its echo of "Hanc oblationem". The offering is accompanied by five epithets. The "De Sacramentis" has only three, "adscriptam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque" (IV, v). The word "rationabilis" occurs in Rom., xii, 1. "In omnibus" means "thoroughly". There follows naturally a petition that the offering may "become to us the Body and Blood of thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ". "De Sacramentis" has: "which is a figure of the Body and Blood", as in Serapion's Prayer and in Tertullian, "Adv. Marc.", III, xix and IV, xl. During this prayer the sign of the cross is made five times over the offering—a further blessing of the bread and wine about to be consecrated.

Qui pridie.—Such a form is in all liturgies the connecting link between an allusion to Christ that has gone before and the words of Institution that follow immediately (Brightman, Antioch, 51, Alexandria, 132). The short form, "Who, the day before he died, took bread", is in other rites sometimes expanded into a longer account of the Passion (ib., 20, 87, 176, etc.). *Gratias agens.*—The word *Thanksgiving* (Eucharist) always occurs here. Benedict XIV notices that we do not read in the Gospels that Christ lifted up his eyes at the Last Supper, and he says it is a tradition that Christ did so, as He did at the miracle of the loaves and fishes (De SS. Missæ sacr., 160). The words of Institution for the bread are the same in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt., xxvi, 26, Mark, xiv, 22, Luke, xxii, 19) and in I Cor., xi, 23. The Church has added to this form (Hoc est corpus meum) the word *enim*, and she leaves out the continuation "which is given for you", that occurs in St. Luke and I Cor. The "enim" seems to have found its way here through analogy with the consecration of the chalice, where it occurs in St. Matthew. This prayer admits of one addition in the year; on Maundy Thursday the form is used: "Who the day before He suffered for our salvation and for that of all men, that is to-day, He took bread", etc. At the beginning of the "Qui pridie" the celebrant takes the bread (only the host that he himself will receive in Communion) between the forefingers and thumbs of both hands. These fingers are then not separated again, unless when he touches the Blessed Sacrament, till they have been washed at the last ablutions (Rit. cel., VIII, 5). The reason of this is, of course, lest any crumb may have remained between them. He lifts up his eyes at the words "elevatis oculis", and makes a sign of the cross over the host at the word "benedixit". If other hosts are to be consecrated they stay on the corporal. The ciborium (if there is one) is opened before the words: "Qui pridie". The words of Institution are said "secretly, plainly, and attentively" over the host and over all, if several are to be consecrated. The Catholic Church has always believed that the words of Institution are those that consecrate. Immediately therefore follows the ceremony of the Elevation. The priest genuflects on one knee, still holding the Blessed Sacrament, rises, lifts it up above his head to show it to the people, replaces it on the corporal and genuflects again. An adoration of the Blessed Sacrament at this point is an old rite. The first Roman Ordo, which does not give the words of Consecration, says that during the Canon "the bishops, deacons, subdeacons, and priests stay in the presbytery bowing down" ("inclinati", ed. Atchley, 138). On account of the heresy of Berengarius (d. 1088), the Elevation was introduced in France in the twelfth, and then throughout the West in the thirteenth, century. Gregory X (1271–76) ordered it to be used throughout the West in his Ceremonial (Ordo Rom. XIII). At first only the Host, not the Chalice, was elevated. The priest's genuflexions were not introduced till later. In the fourteenth century he still only bowed his head (Ordo Rom. XIV, 53). Meanwhile the assistants kneel and bow low. Durandus says "they prostrate themselves reverently on the ground", so also the XIII Roman Ordo. However, since the only object of the Elevation is to show the Blessed Sacrament to the people, this does not mean that they should not look up at it. At each genuflexion, and between them at the elevation, the bell is rung. This ceremony also begins in the fourteenth century. Durandus notices it (IV, 41). The bell should be sounded three times at each elevation, or continuously from the first to the second genuflexion (Rit. cel., VIII, 6). This is the first sounding of the bell ordered by the rubrics after the Sanctus. The common practice of ringing at the "Hanc igitur" has no authority. The server also lifts up the chasuble with his left hand at the elevation, not at the genuflexion (Rubr. gen., VIII, 6). This is to keep back the vestment (which the rubrics always suppose to cover the arms) while the priest elevates. With a modern Roman-shaped chasuble it is a mere form, and a memory of better days. As soon as the celebrant rises from the second genuflexion he continues the Consecration prayer.

Simili modo.—So all liturgies (ὡσαύτως at Antioch, Brightman, 52, and at Alexandria, ib., 133). "Postquam cœnatum est"; the Canon supposes that the cup our Lord consecrated was the last of the Hillel-cups. "Hunc præclarum calicem", a dramatic identification of the Mass with the Last Supper. The Consecration-form for the chalice is put together from the four accounts of the Last Supper quoted above. It is mainly from St. Matthew (xxvi, 26); "Calix Sanguinis mei" is adapted from St. Luke and St. Paul, "pro vobis" from St. Luke, "pro multis" from

St. Matthew; and the last clause, "Hæc quotiescumque feceritis", etc., is again slightly modified from St. Paul. Moreover, two additions have been made to it that are not in the New Testament at all, "et æterni" and "mysterium fidei". This last clause especially has been much discussed (Gihr, 599). It seems that it was originally a warning spoken by the deacon. The catechumens have been sent away before the Offertory; at the Consecration he again warns the people that it is not for catechumens, it is a "mystery of Faith", that is a mystery for the faithful (the baptized) only. The ceremonies at this Consecration are the same as those for the preceding one, except that the deacon (at low Mass here, as always, the celebrant must supply the deacon's part himself) takes the pall from the chalice before the words of Consecration and replaces it as soon as the chalice is put down after its Elevation. The words "Haec quotiescumque", etc., are now generally said during the first genuflexion. In the Middle Ages they were often said after the Elevation (Ordo Rom. XIV, 53). At high Mass a certain amount of very natural ritual has been added to both elevations. At least two torches are lit or brought in by the acolytes, which are removed after the elevation (on fast days and for requiem Masses they stay till the end of the Communion). The thurifer puts incense into his thurible, and incenses the Blessed Sacrament thrice at each elevation (Ritus cel., VIII, 8).

Unde et memores.—A solemn memory of Christ's life, death and resurrection (the *Anamnesis*, Ἀνάμνησις), naturally following the words "as often as you shall do these things, do them in memory of me", comes immediately after the words of Institution in all liturgies (Apost. Const., Brightman, 20, St. James, ib., 52, St. Mark, 133). The five signs of the cross made over the Blessed Sacrament during this prayer have often been discussed. Before the Consecration such signs are obviously blessings of the offering. How can blessings be given to what is now consecrated and has become the Real Presence? St. Thomas says the blessings refer to the "terminus a quo", the bread and wine, not to the "terminus ad quem", the Body and Blood of Christ (III, Q. lxxxiii, a. 5 ad 3). People have seen in them symbols representing our offering to God, memories of the Crucifixion, blessings for the future communicants (Bossuet, Médit. sur l'Evang., I, 63e jour.), or merely a way of pointing to the Blessed Sacrament. It seems that really here again is one more case of what is very common in all our rites, namely, a dramatic representation that does not consider at what moment the effect of a Sacrament is really produced. Such effects must really all happen at one instant, the moment the matter and form are complete. But the Church cannot with words express everything in one instant; moreover before scholastic days people did not ask very closely about the actual moment. So we continually have such dramatic divisions of one simple act, and continually in her prayers the Church goes on asking for something that really must already have been granted. So in our baptism service the devil is driven out before, and the white robe and candle given after the actual baptism. The truth of these symbols presumably occurs at one instant. Our ordination service is a still more striking instance. Long after the subject is ordained priest, after he has concelebrated, the bishop gives him the power of forgiving sins which is certainly involved in the priesthood he has already received. So these blessings after the Consecration need be only such dramatic forms as our expression, "Receive . . . this *spotless* Host", said at the Offertory long before. The question is important because of the Epiklesis.

Supra quae.—This prayer, too, with its memory of sacrifices in the Old Testament (Abel, Abraham, Melchisedech), is common to other liturgies. St. Mark's Rite mentions the offerings of Abel, Abraham, Zachary's incense, the alms of Cornelius and the widow's mite (Brightman, 129; cf. the Coptic form, 171). The words *sanctum sacrificium immaculatam Hostiam* are said to have been added by St. Leo I (440–61; Ben. XIV, "De SS. Missæ Sacr., II, xii, p. 161). They do not occur in the text as given in "De Sacramentis". Grammatically they must refer to Melchisedech's sacrifice.

Supplices te rogamus.—This prayer is commonly believed to be the remnant of the Roman Epiklesis (Duchesne joins the preceding "Supra quæ" to it as making up the Invocation, "Origines", 173). It seems certain that our liturgy, like all the others, once had an Epiklesis, and this would be its natural place. Even as late as the time of Pope Gelasius I (492–96) there seems to have still been one. He writes: "How shall the Heavenly Spirit, when He is invoked to consecrate the divine mystery, come, if the priest and he who prays Him to come is guilty of bad actions?" (Ep., vii; Thiel, Ep. Rom. Pont., I, 486: "si sacerdos, et qui eum adesse deprecatur". By striking out the "et" we have a much plainer sentence: "If the priest who prays Him to come".) Watterich (Konsekrationsmoment, 166), and Drews (Entstehungsgesch., 28) think that several of the Secrets in the Leonine Sacramentary (which does not contain the Canon) are really Epikleses. For instance: "Send, we pray Thee O Lord, thy Holy Spirit, who shall make these our present gifts into thy Sacrament for us", etc. (ed. Feltoe, p. 74; XXX Mass for July). The chief reason for considering our prayer "Supplices te rogamus" as the fragment of an Epiklesis is its place in the Canon, which corresponds exactly to that of the Epiklesis (following the Anamnesis) in the Syrian Rite (Brightman, 54). But its form is hardly that of an Epiklesis. The first words of the preceding prayer, "Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris", suggest the beginning of the Alexandrine Epiklesis: "Look down upon us and upon this bread and this wine" (Brightman, 134), and the last part (Sacrosanctum Filii tui Corpus et Sanguinem) have perhaps a vague resemblance; but certainly the chief thing, the Invocation of the Holy Ghost to change this bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, is wanting. Moreover there is a prayer in the Alexandrine Liturgy which corresponds singularly to these two prayers ("Supra quæ" and "Supplices"): "the Sacrifices . . . of them that offer honour and glory to thy holy name receive upon thy reasonable altar in heaven . . . through the ministry of thy holy angels and archangels; like as Thou didst accept the gifts of righteous Abel and the sacrifice of our father Abraham", etc. (Brightman, I, 170, 171; the Greek form, 129). And this is not an Epiklesis but an Offertory prayer, coming in the middle of the Intercession that with them fills up what we should call the Preface. On the other hand the end of the "Supplices te rogamus" (from "ut quotquot") corresponds very closely to the end of both Eastern Epikleses. Antioch has here : "that it may become to all who partake of it" (quotquot ex hac Altaris participatione) "for a forgiveness of sins and for life everlasting", etc. (Brightman, 54); and at Alexandria the form is: "that it may become to all of us who partake of it (a source of) Faith", etc. (ib., 134). It seems, then, that this prayer in our Canon is a combination of the second part of an Invocation (with the essential clause left out) and an old Offertory prayer. It has been suggested that the angel mentioned here is the Holy Ghost—an attempt to bring it more into line with the proper form of an Invocation. There is however no foundation for this assertion. We have seen that the Alexandrine form has the plural "thy holy angels"; so has the Latin form in "De Sacramentis": "per manus angelorum tuorum" (IV, v). The reference is simply to an angel or to angels who assist at the throne of God and carry

our prayers to Him (Tob., xii, 12, etc.). We have already seen that the order and arrangement of our Canon presents difficulties; this is a further case in point. As for the vanished Invocation itself, it will probably always remain a mystery what has become of it. Watterich (op. cit., p. 142) thinks that it was Gelasius himself who removed it from this place and put it before the words of Institution. And indeed the prayer "Quam oblationem" has a curious suggestion of an Invocation in its terms. On the other hand an Epiklesis *before* the words of Institution would be an anomaly unparalleled in any rite in the world. To come back to the rubrics, the celebrant has resumed the normal attitude of standing with uplifted hands after the "Unde et memores", except that now the forefingers and thumbs remain joined; at the "Supplices te rogamus" he bows deeply over the altar—a ceremony obviously in accordance with the nature of its first words—resting his joined hands on it; and he stays so to the words "ex hac altaris participatione", at which he kisses the altar, rises, joins his hands, and makes the sign of the cross over the Host at "Corpus", over the chalice at "Sanguinem", and on himself at "omni benedictione" (while he crosses himself, the left hand is, as always in this case, laid on the breast). He joins his hands for "Per eumdem", etc., and lifts them up for the next prayer. The next two prayers complete the Intercession, of which we have the greater part before the Consecration.

Commemoratio pro defunctis.—The place of this prayer has often been changed (Ebner, Miss. Rom., 420). If we accept Drews' theory that an original memory of the faithful departed was once joined to what is now the second half of the "Hanc igitur", it would follow that this prayer must be a later one, introduced after the "Hanc igitur" had changed its meaning. This is confirmed by the fact that it is absent from the Canon in the Gelasian Sacramentary (ed. Wilson, 235). Why "Memento *etiam*"? This would seem to refer to a commemoration of some one else, that should come just before. If we arrange the Canon as above, this prayer comes naturally just after the Commemoration of the Living and the "Communicantes" (we have seen that such is the order of the Eastern liturgies), and then this "etiam" refers quite naturally to the parallel commemoration of the living. In any case it must always be a mystery that these two last prayers, obviously forming the conclusion of the Intercession, should stand out here by themselves. Gihr finds a mystic reason for this, because the living offer with the priest, but the dead do not (Messopfer, 626). The ritual is the same as for the other Memento. The celebrant may not now say any names at the place marked "N. et N."; passing on, he reads "Famularumque tuarum, qui nos præcesserunt", etc., and after "in somno pacis", folding his hands, he silently prays for anyone he likes. The diptychs of the dead of course once were read here. Now no names are ever read out at either Commemoration. Benedict XIV quotes a case in which names were read out at the "N. et N." in the sixteenth century (De SS. Missæ Sacr., 220). At the final clause, "Per eumdem", etc., the priest not only folds his hands bus bows the head—a unique case in the Roman Rite, for which there has not been found any satisfactory explanation. Benedict XIV quotes from Cavalieri a mystic reason—because Christ bowed His head when He died, and we here think of the dead (p. 219). The rubric occurs in Pius V's Missal.

Nobis quoque peccatoribus.—A prayer for ourselves that naturally follows that for the faithful departed, although the Commemoration for the Living has gone before. So the Eastern liturgies (St. James, Brightman, 57; St. Mark, ib., 129). The parallel between this prayer and the latter half of the "Hanc igitur" has already been noticed. It is a petition that we too may find a good death and be admitted to the glorious company of the saints. The names of saints that follow are arranged rhythmically, as in "Communicantes". Like the others they are all martyrs. First comes St. John the Baptist, as Our Lady before, then seven men and seven women. After the first martyr, St. Stephen, St. Matthias finds here the place he has not been given among the Apostles in the other list. The Peter here is a Roman exorcist martyred at Silva Candida (now part of the Diocese of Porto, near Rome). His feast with St. Marcellinus is on 2 June. The female saints are all well known. Benedict XIV quotes from Adalbert, "De Virginitate", that St. Gregory I, having noticed that no female saints occur in the Canon, added these seven here (p. 162). This list of saints, like the other one, was subject to local additions in the Middle Ages (ib., 223). The celebrant strikes his breast and slightly raises his voice at the words: "Nobis quoque peccatoribus". This rite (the only case of part of the Canon being spoken aloud, if we except the "Per omnia sæcula sæculorum" that closes it) is a reminder to the assistants that he has come to the prayer for all of those now present, in which prayer they may join. There is no Amen after the "Per Christum Dominum nostrum", since now the following words, "Per quem", follow it at once. Nevertheless after it comes a noticeable break in the Canon.

Per quem hæc omnia, again a difficult text. It has no connexion with what goes before; the words "hæc omnia" refer to nothing in the former prayer. Moreover, the prayer itself is not easily explained. God is said to "sanctify, enliven, bless and give to us these good things". What good things? Such a form as applied to what is already the Blessed Sacrament is very strange. Duchesne notes that at this point fruits of the earth and various kinds of foods were brought up and blessed by the celebrant; thus the milk and honey once given to the newly baptized at Easter and Whitsunday, beans on Ascension day, grapes on the feast of St. Sixtus (6 August). And even yet at this point the Holy Oils are blessed on Maundy Thursday (Origines, 174–75). He sees in this prayer, then, an old blessing of such fruits; the "hæc omnia bona" were once the good things of the earth. Now the form must be taken as again a dramatic representation like the sign of the cross after the Consecration. Finally this prayer and the whole Canon ends with a stately doxology. The "Per omnia sæcula sæculorum" is said aloud, or sung at high Mass. The answer, "Amen", of the people, closes the Canon. Signs of the cross are made at the three words: "Sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis", and the doxology has a special ritual. The celebrant uncovers the chalice and genuflects, makes three signs of the cross with the Host over the chalice at the three forms: "per ipsum et cum ipso et in ipso", two more signs over the altar in front of the chalice at "Patri omnipotenti" and "Spiritus Sancti", and finally at "omnis honor and gloria" he slightly elevates the chalice with the left hand, holding the Host above it with the right. He then replaces both, covers the chalice (at high Mass the deacon always uncovers and covers the chalice), genuflects and with joined hands says: "Per omnia sæcula sæculorum". So he goes on to the Embolism of the Our Father. This ceremony went through slight changes in the Middle Ages [St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) notices it, II, Q. lxxxiii, a. 5, ad 3]; the essence of it is the Elevation, made to show the people the Blessed Sacrament. The reason why these crosses are formed with the Host is that it is just about to be elevated. The priest has already taken it up to elevate it (Gihr, 650, n. 2). This corresponds more or less to the point at which the Eastern Churches elevate (Antioch, Brightman, 61; Alexandria, 138). It is the original Elevation of the Roman use, and till the heresy of Berengarius it was the only one. We note finally that at and after the Consecration the

Host, chalice, ciborium, and all other Hosts that may be consecrated, must always be placed on the altar-stone, if it is a movable altar, and on the corporal. Also the celebrant, whenever he lays his hand on the altar before the Consecration, does so outside the corporal; after the Consecration he lays it on the corporal.

IV. Mystical Interpretations.—It is obvious that in the great days of mystic theology so venerable and sacred a text as the Canon of the Mass should have received elaborate mystical explanations. Indeed, after the Bible, it was chiefly to the Canon that these pious writers turned their attention. Equally obvious is it that such interpretations never have any sort of regard to the historical development of the text. By the time they began the Canon had reigned unquestioned and unchanged for centuries, as the expression of the most sacred rite of the Church. The interpreters simply took this holy text as it stood, and conceived mystic and allegorical reasons for its divisions, expressions, rites, even—as has been seen—for the letter T, with which in their time it began. No one who is accustomed to the subtle conceptions of medieval mysticism will be surprised to see that these interpretations all disagree among themselves and contradict each other in every point. The system leads to such contradictions inevitably. You divide the Canon where you like, trying, of course, as far as possible to divide by a holy number—three, or seven, or twelve—and you then try somehow to show that each of these divisions corresponds to some epoch of our Lord's life, or to one of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, or—if you can make eight divisions somewhere—to one of the Beatitudes. The arrangements are extremely ingenious. Indeed, perhaps the strongest impression one receives from such mystical divisions and explanations is how extraordinarily well their inventors do it. Nor does the utterly artificial nature of the whole proceeding prevent many of the interpretations from being quite edifying, often very poetic and beautiful. To give even a slight account of the endless varieties of these mystic commentaries would take up very much space. Various examples will be found in the books quoted below. William Durandus (Duranti) the Elder, Bishop of Mende (d. 1296), in his "Rationale divinorum officiorum", set the classic example of these interpretations. His work is important chiefly because incidentally we get from it a very exact account of the prayers and ceremonies of the thirteenth century. Very many theologians followed in his footsteps. Perhaps Benedict XIV and Cardinal Bona are the most important. Gihr has collected all the chief mystical explanations in his book on the Mass. One or two of the more interesting or curious examples may be added here. A favourite idea is that the Ordinary to the Sanctus, with its lessons, represents Christ's public life and teaching; the Canon is a type of his Passion and death—hence it is said in silence. Christ taught plainly, but did not open his mouth when he was accused and suffered. From Durandus comes the idea of dividing the Mass according to the four kinds of prayer mentioned in I Tim., ii, 1. It is an *Obsecratio* (supplication) to the Secret, an *Oratio* (prayer) to the Pater Noster, a *Postulatio* (intercession) to the Communion, and a *Gratiarum Actio* (thanksgiving) to the end. Benedict XIV and many others divide the Canon into four sets of threefold prayers: (1) "Te igitur", "Memento vivorum", "Communicantes"; (2) "Hanc igitur", "Quam oblationem", "Qui pridie"; (3) "Unde et memores", "Supra quæ", "Supplices te rogamus"; (4) "Memento defunctorum", "Nobis quoque", "Per quem hæc omnia". This gives the mystic numbers four, three, and twelve. So again each separate expression finds a mystic meaning. Why do we say "rogamus ac petimus" in the "Te igitur"? "Rogamus" shows humility, "petimus" confidence (Odo Cameracensis; "Exp. in Can. Missæ", dist. iii). Why do we distinguish "hæc dona" and "hæc munera"? "Dona" because God gives them to us, "munera" because we offer them back to Him (Gihr, 552, n. 5). Why is there no Amen after the "Nobis quoque peccatoribus"? Because the angels say it at that place (Albertus Magnus, "Summa de off. Missæ", III, c. ix). "Per ipsum et cum ipso et in ipso est tibi . . . omnis honor et gloria" signifies in its triple form that our Lord suffered three kinds of indignities in His Passion—in His body, soul, and honour (Ben. XIV, 227). See also the explanations of the twenty-five crosses made by the priest in the Canon suggested by various commentators (Gihr, 550). Historically, when these prayers were first composed, such reduplications and repetitions were really made for the sake of the rhythm which we observe in all liturgical texts. The medieval explanations are interesting as showing with what reverence people studied the text of the Canon and how, when every one had forgotten the original reasons for its forms, they still kept the conviction that the Mass is full of venerable mysteries and that all its clauses mean more than common expressions. And in this conviction the sometimes naive medieval interpreters were eminently right.

I. Texts.—Muratori, *Liturgia vetus tria sacramentaria complectens* (2 vols. in fol., Venice, 1748), contains the texts of the Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries. The Gregorian Sacramentary is edited in Pamelius, *op. cit. infra*, 178–387 in *P. L.*, LXXVIII, 25, sqq. The Leonine Book was first edited by Bianchini, *Anastasius Bibliothecarius* (1735), IV, xii–lvii; also in Assemani, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiæ universæ*, VI, 1–180; and among St. Leo's works in *P. L.*, LV, 21–156. Feltoe, *Sacramentarium Leonianum* (Cambridge, 1896). First edition of the Gelasian book, Thomasius, *Codices Sacramentorum* (Rome, 1680); also Assemani, *op. cit.*, IV, 1–126; *P. L.*, LXXIV, 1055, sqq. Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford, 1894), and Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies* (Cambridge, 1884), 191–203, contain the Greek version of the Roman Mass referred to above. Pamelius, *Liturgica Latinorum* (2 vols., Cologne, 1571 and 1675); Gavanti, *Thesaurus sacrorum rituum* (Rome, 1630); Mabillon, *Museum italicum* (2 vols., 2nd ed., Paris, 1724); Vol. II, reprinted in *P. L.*, LXXVIII, contains eleven of the Roman *Ordines*. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (2nd ed., Paris, 1898), App. I, pp. 440–63, and App. II, pp. 464–68, gives the text of two more *ordines*, that of the *Saint-Amand MS.* (c. 800), and a fragment from Einsiedeln of about the same date. Atchley, *Ordo Romanus primus* (London, 1905) in *Library of Liturgiology and Ecclesiology for English Readers*, VI, contains dissertations on the first Ordo; the text in Latin from Mabillon with a translation and a version of the *Saint-Amand Ordo* from Duchesne are given in the appendix. For editions of the great number of medieval local Missals see the excellent little book of Cabrol, *Introduction aux études liturgiques* (Paris, 1907), and the *British Museum Catalogue*, XLV, *Latin Rite, Hours, Missals;* also the index to the *Liturgical Catalogue* (3 vols., London, 1899). Wilson, *A Classified Index to the Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries* (Cambridge, 1892); Weale, *Bibliographia Liturgica; Catalogus Missalium ritus Latini* (London, 1886).

II. Medieval Commentaries on the Canon.—St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636), *De ecclesiæ officiis*, II in *P. L.*, LXXXIII, 738, sqq.; Amalarius of Metz (d. c. 850), *De ecclesiæ officiis*, IV in *P. L.*, CV, 986, sqq.; Walafrid Strabo (d. 879), *De exordiis et incrementis rerum eccl.* in *P. L.*, CXIV, 919, sqq.; Berno of Reichenau (11th cent.), *Libellus de quibusdam rebus ad missæ officium pertinentibus* in *P. L.*, CXLII, 1055, sqq.; Micrologus, *De ecclesiasticis observationibus* in *P. L.*, CLI, 974, sqq. [probably written by Bernold of Constance (eleventh century)]; Belethus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum* in *P. L.*, CCII, 14, sqq.; Hildebert of Tours (d. 1134), *Expositio Missæ* in *P. L.*, CLXXI, 1158, sqq.; Ioannes Abrincensis, *Liber de officiis ecclesiasticis* in *P. L.*, CXLVII, 15, sqq.; Robertus Pullus (d. 1153), *De Cœrimoniis, sacramentis et officiis eccl.* in *P. L.*, CLXXVII, 381, sqq.; Sicardus of Cremona, *Mitrale sive de officiis ecclesiasticis summa* in *P. L.*, CCXIII, 13, sqq.; Innocent III (d. 1216), *De Sacrificio Missæ* in *P. L.*, CCXVII, 763, sqq.; Durandus, *Rationale divinorum Officiorum* (Lyons, 1561; Naples, 1859), VIII; Albertus Magnus, *Summa de officio Missæ*.

III. Later Writers.—Hittorpius, *De divinis Cathol. Eccl. officiis* (Cologne, 1568; Rome, 1591), a collection of medieval interpreters; Hugo, *Expositio Missæ* (Nuremberg, 1507); Bechoffen, *Quadruplex Missalis expositio* (Basle, 1512); Biel, *Sacri canonis Missæ . . . expositio* (Basle, 1515); Duranti, *De ritibus ecclesiæ* (Cologne, 1592), III; Baldassari, *La sacra liturgia* (Venice, 1715); Benedict XIV (d. 1758), *De Sacrosancto Sacrificio Missæ*, Latin version by Giacomelli, ed. Schneider (Mainz, 1879), lib. III; Bona, *Rerum Liturgicarum* (Turin, 1763), lib. II; Idem, *De Sacrificio Missæ* (Paris, 1846); Muratori, *De rebus liturgicis dissertatio;* Quarti, *Rubricæ Missalis Romani commentariis illustratæ* (Venice, 1727).

IV. Modern Works.—Probst, *Liturgie der drei ersten*

christl. Jahrhunderten (Tübingen, 1870); IDEM, *Liturgie des IV. Jahrhunderts und deren Reform* (Münster, 1893); IDEM, *Die abendl. Messe vom V. bis zum VIII. Jahrhdt.* (Münster, 1896); DUCHESNE, *Origines* (Paris, 1898); MAGANI, *L'antica liturgia romana* (3 vols., Milan, 1897); CABROL, *Origines liturgiques* (Paris, 1906); IDEM, *Le livre de la prière antique* (Paris, 1900), introduction; EBNER, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Gesch. und Kunstgesch. des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter* (Freiburg im Br., 1896); EISENRING, *Das heilige Messopfer* (Einsiedeln, 1880); KNEIP, *Erklärung des heiligen Messopfers* (Ratisbon, 1876); SAUTER, *Das heilige Messopfer* (Paderborn, 1894); WALTER, *Die heilige Messe* (Brixen, 1881); WEICKUM, *Das heilige Messopfer* (Schaffhausen, 1865); LAMPRECHT, *De SS. Missæ Sacrificio* (Louvain, 1875); LEBRUN, *Explication . . . des prières et des cérémonies de la Messe* (Lyons, 1860); COCHEM, *Erklärung des heiligen Messopfers* (Cologne, 1870); GIHR, *Das heilige Messopfer, dogmatisch liturgisch und ascetisch erklärt* (6th ed., Freiburg im Br., 1897); KÖSSING, *Liturgische Erklärung der heiligen Messe* (Ratisbon, 1869); VAN DER BURG, *Brevis elucidatio totius Missæ* (Tournai, 1860); HAZÉ, *De sensu cæremoniarum Missæ brevis expositio* (Brussels, 1869); BOURBON, *Introduction aux cérémonies Romaines* (Luçon, 1864); NOËL, *Instructions sur la Liturgie* (5 vols., Paris, 1861); PATRONI, *Lezioni di s. Liturgia* (Naples, 1881); FLUCK, *Katholische Liturgik* (Ratisbon, 1853); DE HERDT, *Sacræ Liturgiæ Praxis* (7th ed., 3 vols., Louvain, 1883); DREWS, *Zur Entstehungsgesch. des Kanons in der römischen Messe* (Tübingen and Leipzig, 1902); DRURY, *Elevation in the Eucharist: its History and Rationale* (Cambridge, 1907), of no great value; BERNARD, *Cours de liturgie romaine* (Paris, 1884).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Canon of the Holy Scriptures.—The word *canon* as applied to the Scriptures has long had a special and consecrated meaning. In its fullest comprehension it signifies the authoritative list or closed number of the writings composed under Divine inspiration, and destined for the well-being of the Church, using the latter word in the wide sense of the theocratic society which began with God's revelation of Himself to the people of Israel, and which finds its ripe development and completion in the Catholic organism. The whole Biblical Canon therefore consists of the canons of the Old and New Testaments. The Greek κανών means primarily a reed, or measuring-rod; by a natural figure it was employed by ancient writers both profane and religious to denote a rule or standard. We find the substantive first applied to the Sacred Scriptures in the fourth century, by St. Athanasius; for its derivatives, the Council of Laodicea of the same period speaks of the κανονικὰ βιβλία and Athanasius of the βιβλία κανονιζόμενα. The latter phrase proves that the passive sense of *canon*, viz., that of a regulated and defined collection, was already in use, and this has remained the prevailing connotation of the word in ecclesiastical literature.

The terms *protocanonical* and *deuterocanonical*, of frequent usage among Catholic theologians and exegetes, require a word of caution. They are not felicitous, and it would be wrong to infer from them that the Church successively possessed two distinct Biblical Canons. Only in a partial and restricted way may we speak of a first and second Canon. Protocanonical (πρῶτος, "first") is a conventional word denoting those sacred writings which have been always received by Christendom without dispute. The protocanonical books of the Old Testament correspond with those of the Bible of the Hebrews and the O. T. as received by Protestants. The deuterocanonical (δεύτερος, "second") are those whose Scriptural character was contested in some quarters, but which long ago gained a secure footing in the Bible of the Catholic Church, though those of the O. T. are classed by Protestants as the "Apocrypha". These consist of seven books: Tobias, Judith, Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, First and Second Machabees; also certain additions to Esther and Daniel. Some portions of the New Testament whose canonicity was formerly contested are sometimes styled the deuterocanonicals of the N. T. These are the Epistle to the Hebrews, those of St. James and Jude, the Second of St. Peter, the Second and Third of John, that of St. Jude, and the Apocalypse; also a few portions of books. The origin and history of the doubts concerning these writings will be considered in their place. *Protocanonical* and *deuterocanonical* are modern terms, not having been used before the sixteenth century. As they are of cumbersome length, the latter (being frequently used in this article) will be often found in the abbreviated form *deutero*.

The scope of an article on the sacred Canon may now be seen to be properly limited to an examination of (1) what may be ascertained regarding the process of the collection of the sacred writings into bodies or groups which from their very inception were the objects of a greater or less degree of veneration; (2) the circumstances and manner in which these collections were definitely *canonized*, or adjudged to have a uniquely Divine and authoritative quality; (3) the vicissitudes which certain compositions underwent in the opinions of individuals and localities before their Scriptural character was universally established. It is thus seen that *canonicity* is a correlative of inspiration, being the extrinsic dignity belonging to writings which have been officially declared as of sacred origin and authority. It is antecedently very probable that according as a book was written early or late it entered into a sacred collection and attained a canonical standing. Hence the views of traditionalist and critic (not implying that the tradionalist may not also be critical) on the Canon parallel, and are largely influenced by, their respective hypotheses on the origin of its component members.

I.—THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AMONG THE JEWS.—It has already been intimated that there is a smaller, or incomplete, and a larger, or complete, Old Testament. Both of these were handed down by the Jews; the former by the Palestinian, the latter by the Alexandrian, or Hellenist, Jews; in consequence, this large topic must be subdivided:—

(1) *The Canon among the Palestinian Jews* (*Protocanonical Books*).—The Jewish Bible of to-day is composed of three divisions, whose titles combined form the current Hebrew name for the complete Scriptures of Judaism: *Hat-Torah, Nebiim, wa-Kethubim*, i. e. The Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. This triplication is ancient; it is supposed as long-established in the Mishnah, the Jewish code of unwritten sacred laws, reduced to writing c. A. D. 200. A grouping closely akin to it occurs in the N. T. in Christ's own words, Luke, xxiv, 44: "All things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me." Going back to the prologue of Ecclesiasticus, prefixed to it about 132 B. C., we find mentioned "the Law, and the Prophets, and others that have followed them". The Torah, or Law, consists of the five Mosaic books, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy. The Prophets were subdivided by the Jews into the Former Prophets [i. e. the prophetico-historical books: Josue, Judges, Samuel (I and II Kings), and Kings (III and IV Kings)] and the Latter Prophets (Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, and the twelve minor Prophets, counted by the Hebrews as one book). The Writings, more generally known by a title borrowed from the Greek Fathers, Hagiographa (holy writings), embrace all the remaining books of the Hebrew Bible. Named in the order in which they stand in the current Hebrew text, these are: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticle of Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Esdras, Nehemias, or II Esdras, Paralipomenon.

(a) Traditional view of the Canon of the Palestinian Jews, or Proto-Canon.—In opposition to scholars of more recent views, conservatives do not admit that the Prophets and the Hagiographa represent two successive stages in the formation of the Palestinian Canon. According to this older school, the principle which dictated the separation between the Prophets and the Hagiographa was not of a chronological kind, but one found in the very nature of the respective

sacred compositions. That literature was grouped under the Ké-thubim, or Hagiographa, which neither was the direct product of the prophetical order, namely, that comprised in the Latter Prophets, nor contained the history of Israel as interpreted by the same prophetic teachers—narratives classed as the Former Prophets. The Book of Daniel was relegated to the Hagiographa as a work of the prophetic *gift* indeed, but not of the permanent prophetic *office*. These same conservative students of the Canon—now scarcely represented outside the Church—maintain, for the reception of the documents composing these groups into the sacred literature of the Israelites, dates which are in general much earlier than those admitted by critics. They place the practical, if not formal, completion of the Palestinian Canon in the era of Esdras (Ezra) and Nehemias, about the middle of the fifth century B. C., while, true to their adhesion to a Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, they insist that the canonization of the five books followed soon after their composition.

Since the traditionalists infer the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch from other sources, they can rely for proof of an early collection of these books chiefly on Deuteronomy, xxxi, 9-13, 24-26, where there is question of a book of the law, delivered by Moses to the priests with the command to keep it in the ark and read it to the people on the feast of Tabernacles. But the effort to identify this book with the entire Pentateuch is not convincing to the opponents of Mosaic authorship.

The Remaining Books.—The Completion of the Palestinian-Jewish Canon.—Without being positive on the subject, the advocates of the older views regard it as highly probable that several additions were made to the sacred repertory between the canonization of the Mosaic Torah above described and the Exile (598 B. C.). They cite especially Isaias, xxxiv, 16; II Paralipomenon, xxix, 30; Proverbs, xxv, 1; Daniel, ix, 2. For the period following the Babylonian Exile the conservative argument takes a more confident tone. This was an era of construction, a turning-point in the history of Israel. The completion of the Jewish Canon, by the addition of the Prophets and Hagiographa as bodies to the Law, is attributed by conservatives to Esdras, the priest-scribe and religious leader of the period, abetted by Nehemias, the civil governor; or at least to a school of scribes founded by the former. (Cf. II Esdras, viii–x; II Machabees, ii, 13, in the Greek original.) Far more arresting in favour of an Esdrine formulation of the Hebrew Bible is the much-discussed passage from Josephus, "Contra Apionem", I, viii, in which the Jewish historian, writing about A. D. 100, registers his conviction and that of his coreligionists —a conviction presumably based on tradition—that the Scriptures of the Palestinian Hebrews formed a closed and sacred collection from the days of the Persian king, Artaxerxes Longimanus (465–25 B. C.), a contemporary of Esdras. Josephus is the earliest writer who numbers the books of the Jewish Bible. In its present arrangement this contains 40; Josephus arrived at 22 artificially, in order to match the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, by means of collocations and combinations borrowed in part from the Septuagint. The conservative exegetes find a confirmatory argument in a statement of the apocryphal Fourth Book of Esdras (xiv, 18–47), under whose legendary envelope they see an historical truth, and a further one in a reference in the Baba Bathra tract of the Babylonian Talmud to hagiographic activity on the part of "the men of the Great Synagogue", and Esdras and Nehemias.

But the Catholic Scripturists who admit an Esdrine Canon are far from allowing that Esdras and his colleagues intended to so close up the sacred library as to bar any possible future accessions. The Spirit of God might and did breathe into later writings, and the presence of the deuterocanonical books in the Church's Canon at once forestalls and answers those Protestant theologians of a preceding generation who claimed that Esdras was a Divine agent for an inviolable fixing and sealing of the O. T. To this extent at least, Catholic writers on the subject dissent from the drift of the Josephus testimony. And while there is what may be called a consensus of Catholic exegetes of the conservative type on an Esdrine or quasi-Esdrine formulation of the canon so far as the existing material permitted it, this agreement is not absolute; Kaulen and Danko, favouring a later completion, are the notable exceptions among the above-mentioned scholars.

(b) Critical views of the formation of the Palestinian Canon.—Its three constituent bodies, the Law, Prophets, and Hagiographa, represent a growth and correspond to three periods more or less extended. The reason for the isolation of the Hagiographa from the Prophets was therefore mainly chronological. The only division marked off clearly by intrinsic features is the legal element of the O. T., viz., the Pentateuch.

The Torah, or Law.—Until the reign of King Josias, and the epoch-making discovery of "the book of the law" in the Temple (621 B. C.), say the critical exegetes, there was in Israel no written code of laws, or other work, universally acknowledged as of supreme and Divine authority. This "book of the law" was practically identical with Deuteronomy, and its recognition or canonization consisted in the solemn pact entered into by Josias and the people of Juda, described in IV Kings, xxiii. That a written sacred Torah was previously unknown among the Israelites, is demonstrated by the negative evidence of the earlier prophets, by the absence of any such factor from the religious reform undertaken by Ezechias (Hezekiah), while it was the mainspring of that carried out by Josias, and lastly by the plain surprise and consternation of the latter ruler at the finding of such a work. This argument, in fact, is the pivot of the current system of Pentateuchal criticism, and will be developed more at length in the article on the Pentateuch, as also the thesis attacking the Mosaic authorship and promulgation of the latter as a whole. The actual publication of the entire Mosaic code, according to the dominant hypothesis, did not occur until the days of Esdras, and is narrated in chapters viii–x of the second book bearing that name. In this connexion must be mentioned the argument from the Samaritan Pentateuch to establish that the Esdrine Canon took in nothing beyond the Hexateuch, i. e. the Pentateuch *plus* Josue. (See PENTATEUCH; SAMARITANS.)

The *Nebiim*, or Prophets.—There is no direct light upon the time or manner in which the second stratum of the Hebrew Canon was finished. The creation of the above-mentioned Samaritan Canon (c. 432 B. C.) may furnish a *terminus a quo;* perhaps a better one is the date of the expiration of prophecy about the close of the fifth century before Christ. For the other *terminus* the lowest possible date is that of the prologue to Ecclesiasticus (c. 132 B. C.), which speaks of "the Law, and the Prophets, and the others that have followed them". But compare Ecclesiasticus itself, chapters xlvi–xlix, for an earlier one.

The *Kéthubim*, or *Hagiographa:* Completion of the Jewish Canon.—Critical opinion as to date ranges from c. 165 B. C. to the middle of the second century of our era (Wildeboer). The Catholic scholars Jahn, Movers, Nickes, Danko, Haneberg, Aicher, without sharing all the views of the advanced exegetes, regard the Hebrew Hagiographa as not definitely settled till after Christ. It is an incontestable fact that the sacredness of certain parts of the Palestinian Bible (Esther, Ecclesiastes, Canticle

of Canticles) was disputed by some rabbis as late as the second century of the Christian Era (Mishna, Yadaim, III, 5; Babylonian Talmud, Megilla, fol. 7). However differing as to dates, the critics are assured that the distinction between the Hagiographa and the Prophetic Canon was one essentially chronological. It was because the Prophets already formed a sealed collection that Ruth, Lamentations, and Daniel, though naturally belonging to it, could not gain entrance, but had to take their place with the last-formed division, the Kéthubim.

(c) The Protocanonical Books and the New Testament.—The absence of any citations from Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles may be reasonably explained by their unsuitability for N. T. purposes, and is further discounted by the non-citation of the two books of Esdras. Abdias, Nahum, and Sophonias, while not directly honoured, are included in the quotations from the other minor Prophets by virtue of the traditional unity of that collection. On the one hand, such frequent terms as "the Scripture", the "Scriptures", "the holy Scriptures", applied in the N. T. to the older sacred writings, would lead us to believe that the latter already formed a definite fixed collection; but, on the other, the reference in St. Luke to "the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms", while demonstrating the fixity of the Torah and the Prophets as sacred groups, does not warrant us in ascribing the same fixity to the third division, the Palestinian-Jewish Hagiographa. If, as seems certain, the exact content of the broader catalogue of the O. T. Scriptures (that comprising the deutero books) cannot be established from the N. T., a fortiori there is no reason to expect that it should reflect the precise extension of the narrower and Judaistic Canon. We are sure, of course, that all the Hagiographa were eventually, before the death of the last Apostle, divinely committed to the Church as Holy Scriptures, but we know this as a truth of faith, and by theological deduction, not from documentary evidence in the N. T. The latter fact has a bearing against the Protestant claim that Jesus approved and transmitted *en bloc* an already defined Bible of the Palestinian Synagogue.

(d) Authors and Standards of Canonicity among the Jews.—Though the O. T. reveals no formal notion of inspiration, the later Jews at least must have possessed the idea (cf. II Timothy, iii, 16; II Peter, i, 21). There is an instance of a Talmudic doctor distinguishing between a composition "given by the wisdom of the Holy Spirit" and one supposed to be the product of merely human wisdom. But as to our distinct concept of canonicity, it is a modern idea, and even the Talmud gives no evidence of it. To characterize a book which held an acknowledged place in the divine library, the rabbis spoke of it as "defiling the hands", a curious technical expression due probably to the desire to prevent any profane touching of the sacred roll. But though the formal *idea* of canonicity was wanting among the Jews the *fact* existed. Regarding the sources of canonicity among the Hebrew ancients, we are left to surmise an analogy. There are both psychological and historical reasons against the supposition that the O. T. Canon grew spontaneously by a kind of instinctive public recognition of inspired books. True, it is quite reasonable to assume that the prophetic office in Israel carried its own credentials, which in a large measure extended to its written compositions. But there were many pseudo-prophets in the nation, and so some authority was necessary to draw the line between the true and the false prophetical writings. And an ultimate tribunal was also needed to set its seal upon the miscellaneous and in some cases mystifying literature embraced in the Hagiographa. Jewish tradition, as illustrated by the already cited Josephus, Baba Bathra, and pseudo-Esdras data, points to authority as the final arbiter of what was Scriptural and what not. The so-called Council of Jamnia (c. A. D. 90) has reasonably been taken as having terminated the disputes between rival rabbinic schools concerning the canonicity of Canticles. So while the intuitive sense and increasingly reverent consciousness of the faithful element of Israel could, and presumably did, give a general impulse and direction to authority, we must conclude that it was the word of official authority which actually fixed the limits of the Hebrew Canon, and here, broadly speaking, the advanced and conservative exegetes meet on common ground. However the case may have been for the Prophets, the preponderance of evidence favours a late period as that in which the Hagiographa were closed, a period when the general body of Scribes dominated Judaism, sitting "in the chair of Moses", and alone having the authority and prestige for such action. The term *general body* of Scribes has been used advisedly; contemporary scholars gravely suspect, when they do not entirely reject, the "Great Synagogue" of rabbinic tradition, and the matter lay outside the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin.

As a touchstone by which uncanonical and canonical works were discriminated, an important influence was that of the Pentateuchal Law. This was always the Canon *par excellence* of the Israelites. To the Jews of the Middle Ages the Torah was the inner sanctuary, or Holy of Holies, while the Prophets were the Holy Place, and the *Kéthubim* only the outer court of the Biblical temple, and this medieval conception finds ample basis in the pre-eminence allowed to the Law by the rabbis of the Talmudic age. Indeed, from Esdras downwards the Law, as the oldest portion of the Canon, and the formal expression of God's commands, received the highest reverence. The Cabbalists of the second century after Christ, and later schools, regarded the other section of the O. T. as merely the expansion and interpretation of the Pentateuch. We may be sure, then, that the chief test of canonicity, at least for the Hagiographa, was conformity with the Canon *par excellence*, the Pentateuch. It is evident, in addition, that no book was admitted which had not been composed in Hebrew, and did not possess the antiquity and prestige of a classic age, or name at least. These criteria are negative and exclusive rather than directive. The impulse of religious feeling or liturgical usage must have been the prevailing positive factors in the decision. But the negative tests were in part arbitrary, and an intuitive sense cannot give the assurance of Divine certification. Only later was the infallible Voice to come, and then it was to declare that the Canon of the Synagogue, though unadulterated indeed, was incomplete.

(2) *The Canon among the Alexandrian Jews (Deuterocanonical Books).*—The most striking difference between the Catholic and Protestant Bibles is the presence in the former of a number of writings which are wanting in the latter and also in the Hebrew Bible, which became the O. T. of Protestantism. These number seven books: Tobias (Tobit), Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, I and II Machabees, and three documents added to protocanonical books, viz., the supplement to Esther, from x, 4, to the end, the Canticle of the Three Youths (Song of the Three Children) in Daniel, iii, and the stories of Susanna and the Elders and Bel and the Dragon, forming the closing chapters of the Catholic version of that book. Of these works, Tobias and Judith were written originally in Aramaic, perhaps in Hebrew; Baruch and I Machabees in Hebrew, while Wisdom and II Machabees were certainly composed in Greek. The probabilities favour Hebrew as the original language of the addition to Esther, and Greek for the enlargements of Daniel.

The ancient Greek Old Testament known as the Septuagint was the vehicle which conveyed these additional Scriptures into the Catholic Church. The Septuagint version was the Bible of the Greek-speaking, or Hellenist, Jews, whose intellectual and literary centre was Alexandria (see SEPTUAGINT). The oldest extant copies date from the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, and were therefore made by Christian hands; nevertheless scholars generally admit that these faithfully represent the O. T. as it was current among the Hellenist or Alexandrian Jews in the age immediately preceding Christ. These venerable MSS. of the Septuagint vary somewhat in their content outside the Palestinian Canon, showing that in Alexandrian-Jewish circles the number of admissible extra books was not sharply determined either by tradition or by authority. However, aside from the absence of Machabees from the Codex Vaticanus (the very oldest copy of the Greek O. T.), all the entire MSS. contain all the deutero writings; where the manuscript Septuagints differ from one another, with the exception noted, it is in a certain excess above the deuterocanonical books. It is a significant fact that in all these Alexandrian Bibles the traditional Hebrew order is broken up by the interspersion of the additional literature among the other books, outside the Law, thus asserting for the extra writings a substantial equality of rank and privilege.

It is pertinent to ask the motives which impelled the Hellenist Jews to thus, virtually at least, canonize this considerable section of literature, some of it very recent, and depart so radically from the Palestinian tradition. Some would have it that not the Alexandrian, but the Palestinian, Jews departed from the Biblical tradition. The Catholic writers Nickes, Movers, Danko, and more recently Kaulen and Mullen, have advocated the view that originally the Palestinian Canon must have included all the deuterocanonicals, and so stood down to the time of the Apostles (Kaulen, c. 100 B. C.), when, moved by the fact that the Septuagint had become the O. T. of the Church, it was put under ban by the Jerusalem Scribes, who were actuated moreover (thus especially Kaulen) by hostility to the Hellenistic largeness of spirit and Greek composition of our deuterocanonical books. These exegetes place much reliance on St. Justin Martyr's statement that the Jews had mutilated Holy Writ, a statement that rests on no positive evidence. They adduce the fact that certain deutero books were quoted with veneration, and even in a few cases as Scripture, by Palestinian or Babylonian doctors; but the private utterances of a few rabbis cannot outweigh the consistent Hebrew tradition of the canon, attested by Josephus—although he himself was inclined to Hellenism—and even by the Alexandrian-Jewish author of IV Esdras. We are therefore forced to admit that the leaders of Alexandrian Judaism showed a notable independence of Jerusalem tradition and authority in permitting the sacred boundaries of the Canon, which certainly had been fixed for the Prophets, to be broken by the insertion of an enlarged Daniel and the Epistle of Baruch. On the assumption that the limits of the Palestinian Hagiographa remained undefined until a relatively late date, there was less bold innovation in the addition of the other books, but the wiping out of the lines of the triple division reveals that the Hellenists were ready to extend the Hebrew Canon, if not establish a new official one of their own.

On their human side these innovations are to be accounted for by the free spirit of the Hellenist Jews. Under the influence of Greek thought they had conceived a broader view of Divine inspiration than that of their Palestinian brethren, and refused to restrict the literary manifestations of the Holy Ghost to a certain terminus of time and the Hebrew form of language. The Book of Wisdom, emphatically Hellenist in character, presents to us Divine wisdom as flowing on from generation to generation and making holy souls and prophets (vii, 27, in the Greek). Philo, a typical Alexandrian-Jewish thinker, has even an exaggerated notion of the diffusion of inspiration (Quis rerum divinarum hæres, 52; ed. Lips., iii, 57; De migratione Abrahæ, 11,299; ed. Lips. ii, 334). But even Philo, while indicating acquaintance with the deutero literature, nowhere cites it in his voluminous writings. True, he does not employ several books of the Hebrew Canon; but there is a natural presumption that if he had regarded the additional works as being quite on the same plane as the others, he would not have failed to quote so stimulating and congenial a production as the Book of Wisdom. Moreover, as has been pointed out by several authorities, the independent spirit of the Hellenists could not have gone so far as to setup a different *official* Canon from that of Jerusalem, without having left historical traces of such a rupture. So, from the available data we may justly infer that, while the deuterocanonicals were admitted as sacred by the Alexandrian Jews, they possessed a lower degree of sanctity and authority than the longer accepted books, i. e. the Palestinian Hagiographa and the Prophets, themselves inferior to the Law.

For the Canon among the Jews.—Catholic works: MULLEN, *Canon of the Old Testament* (New York, 1892); GLATIGNY, *Les commencements du canon de l'Ancien Testament* (Rome, 1906); FRACASSINI, *Le Origini del canone del Vecchio Testamento* in *Rivista Storico-critica delle Scienze Teologiche*, II, 1906, 89–99, 249–68.—Non-Catholic works: W. R. SMITH, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (New York, 1891); RYLE, *Canon of the Old Testament* (London, 1892); WILDEBOER, *Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament*, tr. BACON (London, 1895).

II.—THE CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.—The most explicit definition of the Catholic Canon is that given by the Council of Trent, Session IV, 1546. For the O. T. its catalogue reads as follows: "The five books of Moses (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy), Josue, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, two of Paralipomenon, the first and second of Esdras (which latter is called Nehemias), Tobias, Judith, Esther, Job, the Davidic Psalter (in number one hundred and fifty Psalms), Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Isaias, Jeremias, with Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, the twelve minor Prophets (Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias), two books of Machabees, the first and second". The order of books copies that of the Council of Florence, 1442, and in its general plan is that of the Septuagint. The divergence of titles from those found in the Protestant versions is due to the fact that the official Latin Vulgate retained the forms of the Septuagint.

(1) *The O. T. Canon (including the deuteros) in the N. T.*—The Tridentine decree from which the above list is extracted was the first infallible and effectually promulgated pronouncement on the Canon, addressed to the Church Universal. Being dogmatic in its purport, it implies that the Apostles bequeathed the same Canon to the Church, as a part of the *depositum fidei*. But this was not done by way of any formal decision; we should search the pages of the N. T. in vain for any trace of such action. The larger Canon of the O. T. passed through the Apostles' hands to the Church tacitly, by way of their usage and whole attitude toward its components; an attitude which, for most of the sacred writings of the Old Testament, reveals itself in the New, and for the rest, must have exhibited itself in oral utterances, or at least in tacit approval of the special reverence of the faithful. Reasoning backward from the status in which we find the deutero books in the earliest ages of post-Apostolic Christianity, we rightly affirm that such a status points to Apostolic sanction, which in turn must have rested on revelation either by Christ or the Holy Spirit. For the deuterocanonicals at least, we needs must have recourse to this legitimate pre-

scriptive argument, owing to the complexity and inadequacy of the N. T. data.

All the books of the Hebrew Old Testament are cited in the New except those which have been aptly called the *Antilegomena* of the O. T., viz., Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles; moreover Esdras and Nehemias are not employed. The admitted absence of any explicit citation of the deutero writings does not therefore prove that they were regarded as inferior to the above-mentioned works in the eyes of N. T. personages and authors. The deutero literature was in general unsuited to their purposes, and some consideration should be given to the fact that even at its Alexandrian home it was not quoted by Jewish writers, as we saw in the case of Philo. The negative argument drawn from the non-citation of the deuterocanonicals in the N. T. is especially minimized by the indirect use made of them by the same Testament. This takes the form of allusions and reminiscences, and shows unquestionably that the Apostles and Evangelists were acquainted with the Alexandrian increment, regarded its books as at least respectable sources, and wrote more or less under its influence. A comparison of Hebrews, xi and II Machabees, vi and vii reveals unmistakable references in the former to the heroism of the martyrs glorified in the latter. There are close affinities of thought, and in some cases also of language, between I Peter, i, 6, 7, and Wisdom, iii, 5, 6; Hebrews, i, 3, and Wisdom, vii, 26, 27; I Corinthians, x, 9, 10, and Judith, viii, 24–25; I Corinthians, vi, 13, and Ecclesiasticus, xxxvi, 20.

Yet the force of the direct and indirect employment of O. T. writings by the New is slightly impaired by the disconcerting truth that at least one of the N. T. authors, St. Jude, quotes explicitly from the "Book of Henoch", long universally recognized as apocryphal, see verse 14, while in verse 9 he borrows from another apocryphal narrative, the "Assumption of Moses". Concerning the use of apocrypha in the N. T. cf. Wildeboer, "Origin of the Canon of the O. T., Par. 5." The N. T. quotations from the Old are in general characterized by a freedom and elasticity regarding manner and source which further tend to diminish their weight as proofs of canonicity. But so far as concerns the great majority of the Palestinian Hagiographa—a fortiori, the Pentateuch and Prophets—whatever want of conclusiveness there may be in the N. T., evidence of their canonical standing is abundantly supplemented from Jewish sources alone, in the series of witnesses beginning with the Mishnah and running back through Josephus and Philo to the translation of the above books for the Hellenist Greeks. But for the deuterocanonical literature, only the last testimony speaks as a Jewish confirmation. However, there are signs that the Greek version was not deemed by its readers as a closed Bible of definite sacredness in all its parts, but that its somewhat variable contents shaded off in the eyes of the Hellenists from the eminently sacred Law down to works of questionable divinity, such as III Machabees.

This factor should be considered in weighing a certain argument. A large number of Catholic authorities see a canonization of the deuteros in a supposed wholesale adoption and approval, by the Apostles, of the Greek, and therefore larger, O. T. The argument is not without a certain force; the N. T. undoubtedly shows a preference for the Septuagint; out of about 350 texts from the O. T., 300 favour the language of the Greek version rather than that of the Hebrew. But there are considerations which bid us hesitate to admit an Apostolic adoption of the Septuagint *en bloc*. As remarked above, there are cogent reasons for believing that it was not a fixed quantity at the time. The existing oldest representative MSS. are not entirely identical in the books they contain. Moreover, it should be remembered that at the beginning of our era, and for some time later, complete sets of any such voluminous collection as the Septuagint in manuscript would be extremely rare; the version must have been current in separate books or groups of books, a condition favourable to a certain variability of compass. So neither a fluctuating Septuagint nor an inexplicit N. T. conveys to us the exact extension of the pre-Christian Bible transmitted by the Apostles to the Primitive Church. It is more tenable to conclude to a selective process under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and a process completed so late in Apostolic times that the N. T. fails to reflect its mature result regarding either the number or note of sanctity of the extra-Palestinian books admitted. To historically learn the Apostolic Canon of the O. T. we must interrogate less sacred but later documents, expressing more explicitly the belief of the first ages of Christianity.

(2) *The Canon of the O. T. in the Church of the first three centuries.*—The sub-Apostolic writings of Clement, Polycarp, the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, of the pseudo-Clementine homilies, and the "Shepherd" of Hermas, contain implicit quotations from, or allusions to, all the deuterocanonicals except Baruch (which anciently was often united with Jeremias) and I Machabees and the additions to Daniel. No unfavourable argument can be drawn from the loose, implicit character of these citations, since these Apostolic Fathers quote the protocanonical Scriptures in precisely the same manner. For details of these testimonies see Loisy, "Canon de l'Ancien Testament", pp. 71–72.

Coming down to the next age, that of the apologists, we find Baruch cited by Athenagoras as a prophet. St. Justin Martyr is the first to note that the Church has a set of O. T. Scriptures different from the Jews', and also the earliest to intimate the principle proclaimed by later writers, namely, the self-sufficiency of the Church in establishing the Canon; its independence of the Synagogue in this respect. The full realization of this truth came slowly, at least in the Orient, where there are indications that in certain quarters the spell of Palestinian-Jewish tradition was not fully cast off for some time. St. Melito, Bishop of Sardis (c. 170), first drew up a list of the canonical books of the O. T. While maintaining the familiar arrangement of the Septuagint, he says that he verified his catalogue by inquiry among Jews; Jewry by that time had everywhere discarded the Alexandrian books, and Melito's Canon consists exclusively of the protocanonicals *minus* Esther. It should be noticed, however, that the document to which this catalogue was prefixed is capable of being understood as having an anti-Jewish polemical purpose, in which case Melito's restricted canon is explicable on another ground (see Cornely, Introductio, I, 75 sqq.). St. Irenæus, always a witness of the first rank, on account of his broad acquaintance with ecclesiastical tradition, vouches that Baruch was deemed on the same footing as Jeremias, and that the narratives of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon were ascribed to Daniel. The Alexandrian tradition is represented by the weighty authority of Origen. Influenced, doubtless, by the Alexandrian-Jewish usage of acknowledging in practice the extra writings as sacred while theoretically holding to the narrower Canon of Palestine, his catalogue of the O. T. Scriptures contains only the protocanonical books, though it follows the order of the Septuagint. Nevertheless Origen employs all the deuterocanonicals as Divine Scriptures, and in his letter to Julius Africanus defends the sacredness of Tobias, Judith, and the fragments of Daniel, at the same time implicitly asserting the autonomy of the Church in fixing the Canon (see references in Cornely). In his Hexaplar edition of

the O. T. all the deuteros find a place. The sixth-century Biblical MS. known as the "Codex Claromontanus" contains a catalogue to which both Harnack and Zahn assign an Alexandrian origin, about contemporary with Origen. At any rate it dates from the period under examination and comprises all the deuterocanonical books, with IV Machabees besides. St. Hippolytus (d. 236) may fairly be considered as representing the primitive Roman tradition. He comments on the Susanna chapter, often quotes Wisdom as the work of Solomon, and employs as Sacred Scripture Baruch and the Machabees. For the West African Church the larger canon has two strong witnesses in Tertullian and St. Cyprian. All the deuteros except Tobias, Judith, and the addition to Esther, are Biblically used in the works of these Fathers. (With regard to the employment of apocryphal writings in this age see under APOCRYPHA.)

(3) *The Canon of the O. T. during the fourth, and first half of the fifth, century.*—In this period the position of the deuterocanonical literature is no longer as secure as in the primitive age. The doubts which arose should be attributed largely to a reaction against the apocryphal or pseudo-Biblical writings with which the East especially had been flooded by heretical and other writers. Negatively, the situation became possible through the absence of any Apostolic or ecclesiastical definition of the Canon. The definite and inalterable determination of the sacred sources, like that of all Catholic doctrines, was in the Divine economy left to gradually work itself out under the stimulus of questionings and opposition. Alexandria, with its elastic Scriptures, had from the beginning been a congenial field for apocryphal literature, and St. Athanasius, the vigilant pastor of that flock, to protect it against the pernicious influence, drew up a catalogue of books with the values to be attached to each. First, the strict canon and authoritative source of truth is the Jewish O. T., Esther excepted. Besides, there are certain books which the Fathers had appointed to be read to catechumens for edification and instruction; these are the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), Esther, Judith, Tobias, the Didache, or Doctrine of the Apostles, the Shepherd of Hermas. All others are apocrypha and the inventions of heretics (Festal Epistle for 367). Following the precedent of Origen and the Alexandrian tradition, the saintly doctor recognized no other formal canon of the O. T. than the Hebrew one; but also, faithful to the same tradition, he practically admitted the deutero books to a Scriptural dignity, as is evident from his general usage. At Jerusalem there was a renascence, perhaps a survival, of Jewish ideas, the tendency there being distinctly unfavourable to the deuteros. St. Cyril of that see, while vindicating for the Church the right to fix the Canon, places them among the apocrypha and forbids all books to be read privately which are not read in the churches. In Antioch and Syria the attitude was more favourable. St. Epiphanius shows hesitation about the rank of the deuteros; he esteemed them, but they had not the same place as the Hebrew books in his regard. The historian Eusebius attests the widespread doubts in his time; he classes them as *antilegomena*, or disputed writings, and, like Athanasius, places them in a class intermediate between the books received by all and the apocrypha. The 59th (or 60th) canon of the provincial Council of Laodicea (the authenticity of which however is contested) gives a catalogue of the Scriptures entirely in accord with the ideas of St. Cyril of Jerusalem. On the other hand, the Oriental versions and Greek MSS. of the period are more liberal; the extant ones have all the deuterocanonicals and, in some cases, certain apocrypha.

The influence of Origen's and Athanasius's restricted canon naturally spread to the West. St. Hilary of Poitiers and Rufinus followed their footsteps, excluding the deuteros from canonical rank in theory, but admitting them in practice. The latter styles them "ecclesiastical" books, but in authority unequal to the other Scriptures. St. Jerome cast his weighty suffrage on the side unfavourable to the disputed books. In appreciating his attitude we must remember that Jerome lived long in Palestine, in an environment where everything outside the Jewish Canon was suspect, and that, moreover, he had an excessive veneration for the Hebrew text, the *Hebraica veritas* as he called it. In his famous "Prologus Galeatus", or Preface to his translation of Samuel and Kings, he declares that everything not Hebrew should be classed with the apocrypha, and explicitly says that Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobias, and Judith are not on the Canon. These books, he adds, are read in the churches for the edification of the people, and not for the confirmation of revealed doctrine. An analysis of Jerome's expressions on the deuterocanonicals, in various letters and prefaces, yields the following results: first, he strongly doubted their inspiration; secondly, the fact that he occasionally quotes them, and translated some of them as a concession to ecclesiastical tradition, is an involuntary testimony on his part to the high standing these writings enjoyed in the Church at large, and to the strength of the practical tradition which prescribed their reading in public worship. Obviously, the inferior rank to which the deuteros were relegated by authorities like Origen, Athanasius, and Jerome, was due to too rigid a conception of canonicity, one demanding that a book, to be entitled to this supreme dignity, must be received by all, must have the sanction of Jewish antiquity, and must moreover be adapted not only to edification, but also to the "confirmation of the doctrine of the Church", to borrow Jerome's phrase.

But while eminent scholars and theorists were thus depreciating the additional writings, the official attitude of the Latin Church, always favourable to them, kept the majestic tenor of its way. Two documents of capital importance in the history of the canon constitute the first formal utterance of papal authority on the subject. The first is the so-called "Decretal of Gelasius", *de recipiendis et non recipiendis libris*, the essential part of which is now generally attributed to a synod convoked by Pope Damasus in the year 382. The other is the Canon of Innocent I, sent in 405 to a Gallican bishop in answer to an inquiry. Both contain all the deuterocanonicals, without any distinction, and are identical with the catalogue of Trent. The African Church, always a stanch supporter of the contested books, found itself in entire accord with Rome on this question. Its ancient version, the *Vetus Latina* (less correctly the *Itala*), had admitted all the O. T. Scriptures. St. Augustine seems to theoretically recognize degrees of inspiration; in practice he employs protos and deuteros without any discrimination whatsoever. Moreover in his "De Doctrinâ Christianâ" he enumerates the components of the complete O. T. The Synod of Hippo (393) and the three of Carthage (393, 397, and 419), in which, doubtless, Augustine was the leading spirit, found it necessary to deal explicitly with the question of the Canon, and drew up identical lists from which no sacred books are excluded. These councils base their canon on tradition and liturgical usage. For the Spanish Church valuable testimony is found in the work of the heretic Priscillian, "Liber de Fide et Apocryphis"; it supposes a sharp line existing between canonical and uncanonical works, and that the Canon takes in all the deuteros.

(4) *The Canon of the O. T. from the middle of the fifth to the close of the seventh century.*—This period

exhibits a curious exchange of opinions between the West and the East, while ecclesiastical usage remained unchanged, at least in the Latin Church. During this intermediate age the use of St. Jerome's new version of the O. T. (the Vulgate) became widespread in the Occident. With its text went Jerome's prefaces disparaging the deuterocanonicals, and under the influence of his authority the West began to distrust these and to show the first symptoms of a current hostile to their canonicity. On the other hand, the Oriental Church imported a Western authority which had canonized the disputed books, viz., the decree of Carthage, and from this time there is an increasing tendency among the Greeks to place the deuteros on the same level with the others—a tendency, however, due more to forgetfulness of the old distinctions than to deference to the Council of Carthage.

(5) *The Canon of the O. T. during the Middle Ages.*—(a) In the Greek Church.—The result of this tendency among the Greeks was that about the beginning of the twelfth century they possessed a canon identical with that of the Latins, except that it took in the apocryphal III Machabees. That all the deuteros were liturgically recognized in the Greek Church at the era of the schism in the ninth century, is indicated by the "Syntagma Canonum" of Photius. (b) In the Latin Church, all through the Middle Ages we find evidence of hesitation about the character of the deuterocanonicals. There is a current friendly to them, another one distinctly unfavourable to their authority and sacredness, while wavering between the two are a number of writers whose veneration for these books is tempered by some perplexity as to their exact standing, and among these we note St. Thomas Aquinas. Few are found to unequivocally acknowledge their canonicity. The prevailing attitude of Western medieval authors is substantially that of the Greek Fathers. The chief cause of this phenomenon in the West is to be sought in the influence, direct and indirect, of St. Jerome's depreciating Prologus. The compilatory "Glossa Ordinaria" was widely read and highly esteemed as a treasury of sacred learning during the Middle Ages; it embodied the prefaces in which the Doctor of Bethlehem had written in terms derogatory to the deuteros, and thus perpetuated and diffused his unfriendly opinion. And yet these doubts must be regarded as more or less academic. The countless MS. copies of the Vulgate produced by these ages, with a slight, probably accidental, exception, uniformly embrace the complete O. T. Ecclesiastical usage and Roman tradition held firmly to the canonical equality of all parts of the O. T. There is no lack of evidence that during this long period the deuteros were read in the churches of Western Christendom. As to Roman authority, the catalogue of Innocent I appears in the collection of ecclesiastical canons sent by Pope Adrian I to Charlemagne, and adopted in 802 as the law of the Church in the Frankish Empire; Nicholas I, writing in 865 to the bishops of France, appeals to the same decree of Innocent as the ground on which all the sacred books are to be received.

(6) *The Canon of the O. T. and the general councils.*—(a) In the Council of Florence.—In 1442, during the life, and with the approval, of this Council, Eugenius IV issued several Bulls, or decrees, with a view to restore the Oriental schismatic bodies to communion with Rome, and according to the common teaching of theologians these documents are infallible statements of doctrine. The "Decretum pro Jacobitis" contains a complete list of the books received by the Church as inspired, but omits, perhaps advisedly, the terms *canon* and *canonical*. The Council of Florence therefore taught the inspiration of all the Scriptures, but did not formally pass on their canonicity.—(b) In the Council of Trent: Definition of the Canon, 1546.—It was the exigencies of controversy that first led Luther to draw a sharp line between the books of the Hebrew Canon and the Alexandrian writings. In his disputation with Eck at Leipzig, in 1519, when his opponent urged the well-known text from II Machabees in proof of the doctrine of purgatory, Luther replied that the passage had no binding authority since the book was outside the Canon. In the first edition of Luther's Bible, 1534, the deuteros were relegated, as apocrypha, to a separate place between the two Testaments. To meet this radical departure of the Protestants, and as well define clearly the inspired sources from which the Catholic Faith draws its defence, the Council of Trent among its first acts solemnly declared as "sacred and canonical" all the books of the Old and New Testaments "with all their parts, as they have been used to be read in the churches, and as found in the ancient vulgate edition". During the deliberations of the Council there never was any real question as to the reception of all the traditional Scriptures. Neither—and this is remarkable—in the proceedings is there manifest any serious doubt of the canonicity of the disputed writings. In the mind of the Tridentine Fathers they had been virtually canonized, by the decree of Florence, and the same Fathers felt especially bound by the action of the preceding œcumenical synod. The Council of Trent did not enter into an examination of the fluctuations in the history of the Canon. Neither did it trouble itself about questions of authorship or character of contents. True to the practical genius of the Latin Church, it based its decision on immemorial tradition as manifested in the decrees of previous councils and popes, and liturgical reading, relying on traditional teaching and usage to determine a question of tradition. The Tridentine catalogue has been given above.—(c) In the Vatican Council, 1870.—The great constructive Synod of Trent had put the sacredness and canonicity of the whole traditional Bible forever beyond the permissibility of doubt on the part of Catholics. By implication it had defined that Bible's plenary inspiration also. The Vatican Council took occasion of a recent error on inspiration to remove any lingering shadow of uncertainty on this head; it formally ratified the action of Trent and explicitly defined the Divine inspiration of all the books with their parts.

III. The Canon of the Old Testament outside the Church.—(1) *Among Oriental Schismatics.*—The Greek Orthodox Church preserved its ancient Canon in practice as well as theory until recent times, when, under the dominant influence of its Russian offshoot, it is shifting its attitude towards the deuterocanonical Scriptures. The rejection of these books by the Russian theologians and authorities is a lapse which began early in the eighteenth century (cf. "Revue biblique", April, 1901). The Monophysites, Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians, and Copts, while concerning themselves little with the Canon, admit the complete catalogue and several apocrypha besides.

(2) *Among Protestants.*—The Protestant Churches have continued to exclude the deutero writings from their canons, classifying them as "Apocrypha". Presbyterians and Calvinists in general, especially since the Westminster Synod of 1648, have been the most uncompromising enemies of any recognition, and owing to their influence the British and Foreign Bible Society decided in 1826 to refuse to distribute Bibles containing the Apocrypha. Since that time the publication of the deuterocanonicals as an appendix to Protestant Bibles has almost entirely ceased in English-speaking countries. The books still supply lessons for the liturgy of the Church of England, but the number has been lessened by the hostile agitation. There is an Apocrypha appendix to the British Re-

vised Version, in a separate volume. The deuteros are still appended to the German Bibles printed under the auspices of the orthodox Lutherans.

For the O. T. Canon in general.—Catholic works: *The Introductions of* CORNELY, KAULEN, VIGOUROUX, GIGOT, UBALDI, etc.; VIGOUROUX, in *Dict. de la bible*.—Non-Catholic works: DAVIDSON, *The Canon of the Bible* (3d ed., London, 1878); REUSS, *History of the Canon of Holy Scripture in the Christian Church* (tr., Edinburgh, 1884); BUHL, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament* (tr., Edinburgh, 1892); GREEN, *General Introduction to the O. T.: The Canon* (New York, 1898), conservative; WOODS, in HAST. *Bibl. Dict.*

IV. THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.—The Catholic N. T., as defined by the Council of Trent, does not differ, as regards the books contained, from that of all Christian bodies at present. Like the O. T., the New has its *deuterocanonical* books and portions of books, their canonicity having formerly been a subject of some controversy in the Church. These are for the entire books: the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, the Second of St. Peter, the Second and Third of John, Jude, and Apocalypse; giving seven in all as the number of the N. T. contested books. The formerly disputed passages are three: the closing section of St. Mark's Gospel, xvi, 9–20 about the apparitions of Christ after the Resurrection; the verses in Luke about the bloody sweat of Jesus, xxii, 43, 44; the *Pericope Adulteræ*, or narrative of the woman taken in adultery, St. John, vii, 53 to viii, 11. Since the Council of Trent it is not permitted for a Catholic to question the inspiration of these passages.

(1) *The formation of the New Testament Canon; c. A. D. 100–220.*—The idea of a complete and clear-cut canon of the N. T. existing from the beginning, that is from Apostolic times, has no foundation in history. The Canon of the New Testament, like that of the Old, is the result of a development, of a process at once stimulated by disputes with doubters, both within and without the Church, and retarded by certain obscurities and natural hesitations, and which did not reach its final term until the dogmatic definition of the Tridentine Council.

(a) The witness of the N. T. to itself: The first collections.—Those writings which possessed the unmistakable stamp and guarantee of Apostolic origin must from the very first have been specially prized and venerated, and their copies eagerly sought by local Churches and individual Christians of means, in preference to the narratives and *Logia*, or Sayings of Christ, coming from less authorized sources. Already in the N. T. itself there is some evidence of a certain diffusion of canonical books: II Peter, iii, 15, 16, supposes its readers to be acquainted with some of St. Paul's Epistles; St. John's Gospel implicitly presupposes the existence of the Synoptics (Matthew, Mark, and Luke). There are no indications in the N. T. of a systematic plan for the distribution of the Apostolic compositions, any more than there is of a definite new Canon bequeathed by the Apostles to the Church, or of a strong self-witness to Divine inspiration. Nearly all the N. T. writings were evoked by particular occasions, or addressed to particular destinations. But we may well presume that each of the leading Churches—Antioch, Thessalonica, Alexandria, Corinth, Rome—sought by exchanging with other Christian communities to add to its special treasure, and have publicly read in its religious assemblies all Apostolic writings which came under its knowledge. It was doubtless in this way that the collections grew, and reached completeness within certain limits, but a considerable number of years must have elapsed (and that counting from the composition of the latest book) before all the widely separated Churches of early Christendom possessed the new sacred literature in full. And this want of an organized distribution, secondarily to the absence of an early fixation of the Canon, left room for variations and doubts which lasted far into the centuries. But evidence will presently be given that from days touching on those of the last Apostles there were two well defined bodies of sacred writings of the N. T., which constituted the firm, irreducible, universal minimum, and the nucleus of its complete Canon: these were the Four Gospels, as the Church now has them, and thirteen Epistles of St. Paul—the *Evangelium* and the *Apostolicum*.

(b) The principle of canonicity.—Before entering into the historical proof for this primitive emergence of a compact, nucleative Canon, it is pertinent to briefly examine this problem: During the formative period what principle operated in the selection of the N. T. writings and their recognition as Divine?—Theologians are divided on this point. The view that Apostolicity was the test of the inspiration during the building up of the N. T. Canon, is favoured by the many instances where the early Fathers base the authority of a book on its Apostolic origin, and by the truth that the definitive placing of the contested books on the N. T. catalogue coincided with their general acceptance as of Apostolic authorship. Moreover, the advocates of this hypothesis point out that the Apostles' office corresponded with that of the Prophets of the Old Law, inferring that as inspiration was attached to the *munus propheticum* so the Apostles were aided by Divine inspiration whenever in the exercise of their calling they either spoke or wrote. Positive arguments are deduced from the N. T. to establish that a permanent prophetical *charisma* (see CHARISMATA) was enjoyed by the Apostles through a special indwelling of the Holy Ghost, beginning with Pentecost: Matth., x, 19, 20; Acts, xv, 28; I Cor., ii, 13; II Cor., xiii, 3; I Thess., ii, 13, are cited. The opponents of this theory allege against it that the Gospels of Mark and of Luke and Acts were not the work of Apostles (however, tradition connects the Second Gospel with St. Peter's preaching and St. Luke's with St. Paul's); that books current under an Apostle's name in the Early Church, such as the Epistle of Barnabas and the Apocalypse of St. Peter, were nevertheless excluded from canonical rank, while on the other hand Origen and St. Dionysius of Alexandria in the case of Apocalypse, and St. Jerome in the case of II and III John, although questioning the Apostolic authorship of these works, unhesitatingly received them as Sacred Scriptures. An objection of a speculative kind is derived from the very nature of inspiration *ad scribendum*, which seems to demand a specific impulse from the Holy Ghost in each case, and preclude the theory that it could be possessed as a permanent gift, or charisma. The weight of Catholic theological opinion is deservedly against mere Apostolicity as a sufficient criterion of inspiration. This adverse view has been taken by Franzelin (De Divinâ Traditione et Scripturâ, 1882), Schmid (De Inspirationis Bibliorum Vi et Ratione, 1885), Crets (De Divinâ Bibliorum Inspiratione, 1886), Leitner (Die prophetische Inspiration, 1895—a monograph), Pesch (De Inspiratione Sacræ Scripturæ, 1906). These authors (some of whom treat the matter more speculatively than historically) admit that Apostolicity is a positive and partial touchstone of inspiration, but emphatically deny that it was exclusive, in the sense that all non-Apostolic works were by that very fact barred from the sacred Canon of the N. T. They hold to doctrinal tradition as the true criterion.

Catholic champions of Apostolicity as a criterion are: Ubaldi (Introductio in Sacram Scripturam, II, 1876); Schanz (in Theologische Quartalschrift, 1885, pp. 666 sqq., and A Christian Apology, II, tr. 1891); Székely (Hermeneutica Biblica, 1902). Recently Professor Batiffol, while rejecting the claims of these latter advocates, has enunciated a theory regarding the principle that presided over the formation of the N. T. Canon which challenges attention and perhaps marks a new stage in the controversy. According to Monsignor Batiffol, the *Gospel* (i. e. the words and

commandments of Jesus Christ) bore with it its own sacredness and authority from the very beginning. This Gospel was announced to the world at large by the Apostles and Apostolic disciples of Christ, and this message, whether spoken or written, whether taking the form of an evangelic narrative or epistle, was holy and supreme by the fact of containing the Word of Our Lord. Accordingly, for the primitive Church, *evangelical character* was the test of Scriptural sacredness. But to guarantee this character it was necessary that a book should be known as composed by the official witnesses and organs of the Evangel; hence the need to certify the Apostolic authorship, or at least sanction, of a work purporting to contain the Gospel of Christ. In Batiffol's view the Judaic notion of inspiration did not at first enter into the selection of the Christian Scriptures. In fact, for the earliest Christians the Gospel of Christ, in the wide sense above noted, was not to be classified with, because transcending, the O. T. It was not until about the middle of the second century that under the rubric of *Scripture* the New Testament writings were assimilated to the Old; the authority of the N. T. as the Word preceded and produced its authority as a new Scripture. (Revue Biblique, 1903, 226 sqq.) Monsignor Batiffol's hypothesis has this in common with the views of other recent students of the N. T. Canon, that the idea of a new body of sacred writings became clearer in the Early Church as the faithful advanced in a knowledge of the Faith. But it should be remembered that the inspired character of the N. T. is a Catholic dogma, and must therefore in some way have been revealed to, and taught by, Apostles.—Assuming that Apostolic authorship is a positive criterion of inspiration, two inspired Epistles of St. Paul have been lost. This appears from I Cor., v, 9 sqq.; II Cor., ii, 4, 5.

(c) The formation of the Tetramorph, or Fourfold Gospel.—Irenæus, in his work "Against Heresies" (A. D. 182–88), testifies to the existence of a *Tetramorph*, or Quadriform Gospel, given by the Word and unified by one Spirit; to repudiate this Gospel or any part of it, as did the Alogi and Marcionites, was to sin against revelation and the Spirit of God. The saintly Doctor of Lyons explicitly states the names of the four Elements of this Gospel, and repeatedly cites all the Evangelists in a manner parallel to his citations from the O. T. From the testimony of St. Irenæus alone there can be no reasonable doubt that the Canon of the Gospel was inalterably fixed in the Catholic Church by the last quarter of the second century. Proofs might be multiplied that our canonical Gospels were then universally recognized in the Church, to the exclusion of any pretended Evangels. The magisterial statement of Irenæus may be corroborated by the very ancient catalogue known as the Muratorian Canon, and St. Hippolytus, representing Roman tradition; by Tertullian in Africa, by Clement in Alexandria; the works of the Gnostic Valentinus, and the Syrian Tatian's Diatessaron, a blending together of the Evangelists' writings, presuppose the authority enjoyed by the fourfold Gospel towards the middle of the second century. To this period or a little earlier belongs the pseudo-Clementine epistle in which we find, for the first time after II Peter, iii, 16, the word *Scripture* applied to a N. T. book. But it is needless in the present article to array the full force of these and other witnesses, since even rationalistic scholars like Harnack admit the canonicity of the quadriform Gospel between the years 140–175.

But against Harnack we are able to trace the Tetramorph as a sacred collection back to a more remote period. The apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter, dating from about 150, is based on our canonical Evangelists. So with the very ancient Gospel of the Hebrews and Egyptians (see APOCRYPHA). St. Justin Martyr (130–63) in his Apology refers to certain "memoirs of the Apostles, which are called gospels", and which "are read in Christian assemblies together with the writings of the Prophets". The identity of these "memoirs" with our Gospels is established by the certain traces of three, if not all, of them scattered through St. Justin's works; it was not yet the age of explicit quotations. Marcion, the heretic refuted by Justin in a lost polemic, as we know from Tertullian, instituted a criticism of Gospels bearing the names of Apostles and disciples of the Apostles, and a little earlier (c. 120) Basilides, the Alexandrian leader of a Gnostic sect, wrote a commentary on "the Gospel" which is known by the allusions to it in the Fathers to have comprised the writings of the Four Evangelists.

In our backward search we have come to the sub-Apostolic age, and its important witnesses are divided into Asian, Alexandrian, and Roman: (α) St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and St. Polycarp, of Smyrna, had been disciples of Apostles; they wrote their epistles in the first decade of the second century (100–110). They employ Matthew, Luke, and John. In St. Ignatius we find the first instance of the consecrated term "it is written" applied to a Gospel (Ad Philad., viii, 2). Both these Fathers show not only a personal acquaintance with "the Gospel" and the thirteen Pauline Epistles, but they suppose that their readers are so familiar with them that it would be superfluous to name them. Papias, Bishop of Phrygian Hierapolis, according to Irenæus a disciple of St. John, wrote about A. D. 125. Describing the origin of St. Mark's Gospel, he speaks of Hebrew (Aramaic) Logia, or Sayings of Christ, composed by St. Matthew, which there is reason to believe formed the basis of the canonical Gospel of that name, though the greater part of Catholic writers identify them with the Gospel. As we have only a few fragments of Papias, preserved by Eusebius, it cannot be alleged that he is silent about other parts of the N. T. (β) The so-called Epistle of Barnabas, of uncertain origin, but of highest antiquity (see BARNABAS, EPISTLE), cites a passage from the First Gospel under the formula "it is written". The Didache, or Teaching of the Apostles, an uncanonical work dating from c. 110, implies that "the Gospel" was already a well-known and definite collection. (γ) St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, and disciple of St. Paul, addressed his Letter to the Corinthian Church c. A. D. 97, and, although it cites no Evangelist explicitly, this epistle contains combinations of texts taken from the three synoptic Gospels, especially from St. Matthew. That Clement does not allude to the Fourth Gospel is quite natural, as it was not composed till about that time.

Thus the patristic testimonies have brought us step by step to a Divine inviolable fourfold Gospel existing in the closing years of the Apostolic Era. Just how the Tetramorph was welded into unity and given to the Church, is a matter of conjecture. But, as Zahn observes, there is good reason to believe that the tradition handed down by Papias, of the approval of St. Mark's Gospel by St. John the Evangelist, reveals that either the latter himself or a college of his disciples added the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptics, and made the group into the compact and unalterable "Gospel", the one in four, whose existence and authority left their clear impress upon all subsequent ecclesiastical literature, and find their conscious formulation in the language of St. Irenæus.

(d) The Pauline Epistles.—Parallel to the chain of evidence we have traced for the canonical standing of the Gospels extends one for the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, forming the other half of the irreducible kernel of the complete N. T. Canon. All the authorities cited for the Gospel Canon show acquaintance with, and recognize, the sacred quality of these letters. St. Irenæus, as acknowledged by the Har-

nackian critics, employs all the Pauline writings, except the short Philemon, as sacred and canonical. The Muratorian Canon, contemporary with Irenæus, gives the complete list of the thirteen, which, it should be remembered, does not include Hebrews. The heretical Basilides and his disciples quote from this Pauline group in general. The copious extracts from Marcion's works scattered through Irenæus and Tertullian show that he was acquainted with the thirteen as in ecclesiastical use, and selected his *Apostolikon* of six from them. The testimony of Polycarp and Ignatius is again capital in this case. Eight of St. Paul's writings are cited by Polycarp; St. Ignatius of Antioch ranked the Apostles above the Prophets, and must therefore have allowed the written compositions of the former at least an equal rank with those of the latter ("Ad Philadelphios", v). St. Clement of Rome refers to Corinthians as at the head "of the Evangel"; the Muratorian Canon gives the same honour to I Corinthians, so that we may rightfully draw the inference, with Dr. Zahn, that as early as Clement's day St. Paul's Epistles had been collected and formed into a group with a fixed order. Zahn has pointed out confirmatory signs of this in the manner in which Sts. Ignatius and Polycarp employ these Epistles. The tendency of the evidence is to establish the hypothesis that the important Church of Corinth was the first to form a complete collection of St. Paul's writings.

(e) The remaining Books.—In this formative period the Epistle to the Hebrews did not obtain a firm footing in the Canon of the Universal Church. At Rome it was not yet recognized as canonical, as shown by the Muratorian catalogue of Roman origin; Irenæus probably cites it, but makes no reference to a Pauline origin. Yet it was known at Rome as early as St. Clement, as the latter's epistle attests. The Alexandrian Church admitted it as the work of St. Paul, and canonical. The Montanists favoured it, and the aptness with which vi, 4–8, lent itself to Montanist and Novatianist rigour was doubtless one reason why it was suspect in the West. Also during this period the excess over the minimal Canon composed of the Gospels and thirteen epistles varied. The seven "Catholic" Epistles (James, Jude, I and II Peter, and the three of John) had not yet been brought into a special group, and, with the possible exception of the three of St. John, remained isolated units, depending for their canonical strength on variable circumstances. But towards the end of the second century the canonical minimum was enlarged and, besides the Gospels and Pauline Epistles, unalterably embraced Acts, I Peter, I John (to which II and III John were probably attached), and Apocalypse. Thus Hebrews, James, Jude, and II Peter remained hovering outside the precincts of universal canonicity, and the controversy about them and the subsequently disputed Apocalypse form the larger part of the remaining history of the Canon of the N. T. However, at the beginning of the third century the N. T. was formed in the sense that the content of its main divisions, what may be called its essence, was sharply defined and universally received, while *all* the secondary books were recognized in some Churches. A singular exception to the universality of the above-described substance of the N. T. was the Canon of the primitive East Syrian Church, which did not contain any of the Catholic Epistles or Apocalypse.

(f) The idea of a New Testament.—The question of the principle that dominated the practical canonization of the N. T. Scriptures has already been discussed under (b). The faithful must have had from the beginning some realization that in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists they had acquired a new body of Divine Scriptures, a New written Testament destined to stand side by side with the Old. That the Gospel and Epistles were the written Word of God, was fully realized as soon as the fixed collections were formed; but to seize the relation of this new treasure to the old was possible only when the faithful acquired a better knowledge of the faith. In this connexion Zahn observes with much truth that the rise of Montanism, with its false prophets, who claimed for their written productions—the self-styled Testament of the Paraclete—the authority of revelation, aroused the Christian Church to a fuller sense that the age of revelation had expired with the last of the Apostles, and that the circle of sacred Scripture is not extensible beyond the legacy of the Apostolic Era. Montanism began in 156; a generation later, in the works of Irenæus, we discover the firmly-rooted idea of two Testaments, with the same Spirit operating in both. For Tertullian (c. 200) the body of the new Scriptures is an *instrumentum* on at least an equal footing and in the same specific class as the *instrumentum* formed by the Law and the Prophets. Clement of Alexandria was the first to apply the word "Testament" to the sacred library of the New Dispensation. A kindred external influence is to be added to Montanism: the need of setting up a barrier, between the genuine inspired literature and the flood of pseudo-Apostolic apocrypha, gave an additional impulse to the idea of a N. T. Canon, and later contributed not a little to the demarcation of its fixed limits.

(2) *The period of discussion; c.* A. D. *220–367.*—In this stage of the historical development of the Canon of the N. T. we encounter for the first time a consciousness, reflected in certain ecclesiastical writers, of the differences between the sacred collections in divers sections of Christendom. This variation is witnessed to, and the discussion stimulated by, two of the most learned men of Christian antiquity, Origen, and Eusebius of Cæsarea, the ecclesiastical historian. A glance at the Canon as exhibited in the authorities of the African, or Carthaginian, Church, will complete our brief survey of this period of diversity and discussion:—

(a) Origen and his school.—Origen's travels gave him exceptional opportunities to know the traditions of widely separated portions of the Church and made him very conversant with the discrepant attitudes toward certain parts of the N. T. He divided books with Biblical claims into three classes: (α) those universally received; (β) those whose Apostolicity was questioned; (γ) apocryphal works. In the first class, the *Homologoumena*, stood the Gospels, the thirteen Pauline Epistles, Acts, Apocalypse, I Peter, and I John. The contested writings were Hebrews, II Peter, II and III John, James, Jude, Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Didache, and probably the Gospel of the Hebrews. Personally, Origen accepted all of these as Divinely inspired, though viewing contrary opinions with toleration. Origen's authority seems to have given to Hebrews and the disputed Catholic Epistles a firm place in the Alexandrian Canon, their tenure there having been previously insecure, judging from the exegetical work of Clement, and the list in the Codex Claromontanus, which is assigned by competent scholars to an early Alexandrian origin.

(b) Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, was one of Origen's most eminent disciples, a man of wide erudition. In imitation of his master he divided religious literature into three classes: (α) *Homologoumena*, or compositions universally received as sacred, the Four Gospels, thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, Hebrews, Acts, I Peter, I John, and Apocalypse. There is some inconsistency in his classification; for instance, though ranking Hebrews with the books of universal reception, he elsewhere admits it is disputed. (β) The second category is composed of the Antilegomena, or contested writings; these in turn

are of the superior and inferior sort. The better ones are the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude, II Peter, II and III John; these, like Origen, Eusebius wished to be admitted to the Canon, but was forced to record their uncertain status; the Antilegomena of the inferior sort were Barnabas, the Didache, Gospel of the Hebrews, the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd, the Apocalypse of Peter. (γ) All the rest are spurious (*νόθα*).

Eusebius diverged from his Alexandrian master in personally rejecting Apocalypse as un-Biblical, though compelled to acknowledge its almost universal acceptance. Whence came this unfavourable view of the closing volume of the Christian Testament?—Zahn attributes it to the influence of Lucian of Samosata, one of the founders of the Antioch school of exegesis, and with whose disciples Eusebius had been associated. Lucian himself had acquired his education at Edessa, the metropolis of Eastern Syria, which had, as already remarked, a singularly curtailed Canon. Lucian is known to have edited the Scriptures at Antioch, and is supposed to have introduced there the shorter N. T. which later St. John Chrysostom and his followers employed—one in which Apocalypse, II Peter, II and III John, and Jude had no place. It is known that Theodore of Mopsuesta rejected all the Catholic Epistles. In St. John Chrysostom's ample expositions of the Scriptures there is not a single clear trace of the Apocalypse, while he seems to implicitly exclude the four smaller Epistles—II Peter, II and III John, and Jude—from the number of the canonical books. Lucian, then, according to Zahn, would have compromised between the Syriac Canon and the Canon of Origen by admitting the three longer Catholic Epistles and keeping out Apocalypse. But after allowing fully for the prestige of the founder of the Antioch school, it is difficult to grant that his personal authority could have sufficed to strike such an important work as Apocalypse from the Canon of a notable Church, where it had previously been received. It is more probable that a reaction against the abuse of the Johannine Apocalypse by the Montanists and Chiliasts —Asia Minor being the nursery of both these errors— led to the elimination of a book whose authority had perhaps been previously suspected. Indeed it is quite reasonable to suppose that its early exclusion from the East Syrian Church was an outer wave of the extreme reactionist movement of the Aloges—also of Asia Minor—who branded Apocalypse and all the Johannine writings as the work of the heretic Cerinthus. Whatever may have been all the influences ruling the personal Canon of Eusebius, he chose Lucian's text for the fifty copies of the Bible which he furnished to the Church of Constantinople at the order of his imperial patron Constantine; and he incorporated all the Catholic Epistles, but excluded Apocalypse. The latter remained for more than a century banished from the sacred collections as current in Antioch and Constantinople. However, this book kept a minority of Asiatic suffrages, and, as both Lucian and Eusebius had been tainted with Arianism, the approbation of Apocalypse, opposed by them, finally came to be looked upon as a sign of orthodoxy. Eusebius was the first to call attention to important variations in the text of the Gospels, viz., the presence in some copies and the absence in others of the final paragraph of Mark, the passage of the Adulterous Woman, and the Bloody Sweat.

(c) The African Church.—St. Cyprian, whose Scriptural Canon certainly reflects the content of the first Latin Bible, received all the books of the N. T. except Hebrews, II Peter, James, and Jude; however, there was already a strong inclination in his environment to admit II Peter as authentic. Jude had been recognized by Tertullian, but, strangely, it had lost its position in the African Church, probably owing to its citation of the apocryphal Henoch. Cyprian's testimony to the non-canonicity of Hebrews and James is confirmed by Commodian, another African writer of the period. A very important witness is the document known as Mommsen's Canon, a MS. of the tenth century, but whose original has been ascertained to date from West Africa about the year 360. It is a formal catalogue of the sacred books, unmutilated in the N. T. portion, and proves that at its time the books universally acknowledged in the influential Church of Carthage were almost identical with those received by Cyprian a century before. Hebrews, James, and Jude are entirely wanting. The three Epistles of St. John and II Peter appear, but after each stands the note *una sola*, added by an almost contemporary hand, and evidently in protest against the reception of these Antilegomena, which, presumably, had found a place in the official list recently, but whose right to be there was seriously questioned.

(3) *The period of fixation; c.* A. D. *367–405.*

(a) St. Athanasius.—While the influence of Athanasius on the Canon of the O. T. was negative and exclusive (see *supra*), in that of the N. T. it was trenchantly constructive. In his "Epistola Festalis" (A. D. 367) the illustrious Bishop of Alexandria ranks all of Origen's N. T. Antilegomena, which are identical with the deuteros, boldly inside the Canon, without noticing any of the scruples about them. Thenceforward they were formally and firmly fixed in the Alexandrian Canon. And it is significant of the general trend of ecclesiastical authority that not only were works which formerly enjoyed high standing at broad-minded Alexandria—the Apocalypse of Peter and the Acts of Paul—involved by Athanasius with the apocrypha, but even some that Origen had regarded as inspired—Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Didache—were ruthlessly shut out under the same damnatory title.

(b) The Roman Church: The Synod under Damasus: St. Jerome.—The Muratorian Canon or Fragment, composed in the Roman Church in the last quarter of the second century, is silent about Hebrews, James, II Peter; I Peter, indeed, is not mentioned, but must have been omitted by an oversight, since it was universally received at the time. There is evidence that this restricted Canon obtained not only in the African Church, with slight modifications, as we have seen, but also at Rome and in the West generally until the close of the fourth century. The same ancient authority witnesses to the very favourable and perhaps canonical standing enjoyed at Rome by the Apocalypse of Peter and the Shepherd of Hermas. In the middle decades of the fourth century the increased intercourse and exchange of views between the Orient and the Occident led to a better mutual acquaintance regarding Biblical canons and the correction of the catalogue of the Latin Church. It is a singular fact that while the East, mainly through St. Jerome's pen, exerted a disturbing and negative influence on Western opinion regarding the O. T., the same influence, through probably the same chief intermediary, made for the completeness and integrity of the N. T. Canon. The West began to realize that the ancient Apostolic Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch, indeed the whole Orient, for more than two centuries had acknowledged Hebrews and James as inspired writings of Apostles, while the venerable Alexandrian Church, supported by the prestige of Athanasius, and the powerful Patriarchate of Constantinople, with the scholarship of Eusebius behind its judgment, had canonized all the disputed Epistles. St. Jerome, a rising light in the Church, though but a simple priest, was summoned by Pope Damasus from the East, where he was pursuing sacred lore, to assist at an eclectic, but not œcumenical, synod at Rome in the year 382. Neither the general council at Constantinople of the preceding year nor that of Nice

(365) had considered the question of the Canon. This Roman synod must have devoted itself specially to the matter. The result of its deliberations, presided over, no doubt, by the energetic Damasus himself, has been preserved in the document called "Decretum Gelasii de recipiendis et non recipiendis libris", a compilation partly of the sixth century (Turner, in "Journal of Theological Studies", I, 1900), but containing much material dating from the two preceding ones. The Damasan catalogue presents the complete and perfect Canon which has been that of the Church Universal ever since. The N. T. portion bears the marks of Jerome's views (cf. Zahn, "Grundriss der Geschichte d. neutest. Kanons", *in loco*). St. Jerome, always prepossessed in favour of Oriental positions in matters Biblical, exerted then a happy influence in regard to the N. T.; if he attempted to place any Eastern restriction upon the Canon of the O. T. his effort failed of any effect. The title of the decree—"Nunc vero de scripturis divinis agendum est quid universalis Catholica recipiat ecclesia, et quid vitare debeat"—proves that the council drew up a list of apocryphal as well as authentic Scriptures. The Shepherd and the false Apocalypse of Peter now received their final blow. "Rome had spoken, and the nations of the West had heard" (Zahn). The works of the Latin Fathers of the period—Jerome, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Sardinia, Philaster of Brescia—manifest the changed attitude toward Hebrews, James, Jude, II Peter, and III John.

(c) Fixation in the African and Gallican Churches.—It was some little time before the African Church perfectly adjusted its N. T. to the Damasan Canon. Optatus of Mileve (370–85) does not use Hebrews. St. Augustine, while himself receiving the integral Canon, acknowledged that many contested this Epistle. But in the Synod of Hippo (393) the great Doctor's view prevailed, and the correct Canon was adopted. However, it is evident that it found many opponents in Africa, since three councils there at brief intervals—Hippo, Carthage, in 393; Third of Carthage in 397; Carthage in 419—found it necessary to formulate catalogues. The introduction of Hebrews was an especial crux, and a reflection of this is found in the first Carthage list, where the much vexed Epistle, though styled of St. Paul, is still numbered separately from the time-consecrated group of thirteen. The catalogues of Hippo and Carthage are identical with the Catholic Canon of the present. In Gaul some doubts lingered for a time, as we find Pope Innocent I, in 405, sending a list of the Sacred Books to one of its bishops, Exsuperius of Toulouse.

So at the close of the first decade of the fifth century the entire Western Church was in possession of the full Canon of the N. T. In the East, where, with the exception of the Edessene Syrian Church, approximate completeness had long obtained without the aid of formal enactments, opinions were still somewhat divided on the Apocalypse. But for the Catholic Church as a whole the content of the N. T. was definitely fixed, and the discussion closed.

The final process of this Canon's development had been twofold: positive, in the permanent consecration of several writings which had long hovered on the line between canonical and apocryphal; and negative, by the definite elimination of certain privileged apocrypha that had enjoyed here and there a canonical or quasi-canonical standing. In the reception of the disputed books a growing conviction of Apostolic authorship had much to do, but the ultimate criterion had been their recognition as inspired by a great and ancient division of the Catholic Church. Thus, like Origen, St. Jerome adduces the *testimony of the ancients* and ecclesiastical usage in pleading the cause of the Epistle to the Hebrews (De Viris Illustribus, lix) There is no sign that the Western Church ever positively repudiated any of the N. T. deuteros; not admitted from the beginning, these had slowly advanced towards a complete acceptance there. On the other hand, the apparently formal exclusion of Apocalypse from the sacred catalogue of certain Greek Churches was a transient phase, and supposes its primitive reception. Greek Christianity everywhere, from about the beginning of the sixth century, practically had a complete and pure N. T. Canon. (See Hebrews, Epistle to; St. Peter, James, Jude, John, Epistles of; Apocalypse.)

(4) *Subsequent history of the N. T. Canon.*

(a) To the Protestant Reformation.—The N. T. in its canonical aspect has little history between the first years of the fifth and the early part of the sixteenth century. As was natural in ages when ecclesiastical authority had not reached its modern centralization, there were sporadic divergences from the common teaching and tradition. There was no diffused contestation of any book, but here and there attempts by individuals to *add* something to the received collection. In several ancient Latin MSS. the spurious Epistle to the Laodiceans is found among the canonical letters, and, in a few instances, the apocryphal III Corinthians. The last trace of any Western contradiction within the Church to the Canon of the N. T. reveals a curious transplantation of Oriental doubts concerning the Apocalypse. An act of the Synod of Toledo, held in 633, states that many contest the authority of that book, and orders it to be read in the churches under pain of excommunication. This opposition in all probability came from the Visigoths, who had recently been converted from Arianism. The Gothic Bible had been made under Oriental auspices at a time when there was still much hostility to Apocalypse in the East.

(b) The New Testament and the Council of Trent (1546).—This œcumenical synod had to defend the integrity of the New Testament as well as the Old against the attacks of the pseudo-Reformers. Luther, basing his action on dogmatic reasons and the judgment of antiquity, had discarded Hebrews, James, Jude, and Apocalypse as altogether uncanonical. Zwingli could not see in Apocalypse a Biblical book. Œcolampadius placed James, Jude, II Peter, II and III John in an inferior rank. Even a few Catholic scholars of the Renaissance type, notably Erasmus and Cajetan, had thrown some doubts on the canonicity of the above-mentioned Antilegomena. As to whole books, the Protestant doubts were the only ones the Fathers of Trent took cognizance of; there was not the slightest hesitation regarding the authority of any entire document. But the deuterocanonical parts gave the council some concern, viz., the last twelve verses of Mark, the passage about the Bloody Sweat in Luke, and the *Pericope Adulteræ* in John. Cardinal Cajetan had approvingly quoted an unfavourable comment of St. Jerome regarding Mark, xvi, 9–20; Erasmus had rejected the section on the Adulterous Woman as unauthentic. Still, even concerning these no doubt of authenticity was expressed at Trent; the only question was as to the manner of their reception. In the end these portions were received, like the deuterocanonical books, without the slightest distinction. And the clause "cum omnibus suis partibus" regards especially these portions.—For an account of the action of Trent on the Canon, the reader is referred back to the respective section of this article: II. *The Canon of the Old Testament in the Catholic Church.*

The Tridentine decree defining the Canon affirms the authenticity of the books to which proper names are attached, without however including this in the definition. The order of books follows that of the Bull of Eugenius IV (Council of Florence), except that Acts was moved from a place before Apocalypse to its present position, and Hebrews put at the end of St. Paul's Epistles. The Tridentine order

has been retained in the official Vulgate and vernacular Catholic Bibles. The same is to be said of the titles, which as a rule are traditional ones, taken from the Canons of Florence and Carthage.—For the bearing of the Vatican Council on the N. T. see II. *The Canon of the Old Testament in the Catholic Church.*

The New Testament Canon outside the Church.—The Orthodox Russian and other branches of the schismatic Greek Church have a N. T. identical with the Catholic. In Syria the Nestorians possess a Canon almost identical with the final one of the ancient East Syrians; they exclude the four smaller Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse. The Monophysites receive all the books. The Armenians have one apocryphal letter *to* the Corinthians and two *from* the same. The Coptic-Arabic Church includes with the canonical Scriptures the Apostolic Constitutions and the Clementine Epistles. The Ethiopic N. T. also contains the so-called "Apostolic Constitutions".—As for Protestantism, the Anglicans and Calvinists always kept the entire N. T. But for over a century the followers of Luther excluded Hebrews, James, Jude, and Apocalypse, and even went further than their master by rejecting the three remaining deuterocanonicals, II Peter, II and III John. The trend of the seventeenth century Lutheran theologians was to class all these writings as of doubtful, or at least inferior, authority. But gradually the German Protestants familiarized themselves with the idea that the difference between the contested books of the N. T. and the rest was one of degree of certainty as to origin rather than of intrinsic character. The full recognition of these books by the Calvinists and Anglicans made it much more difficult for the Lutherans to exclude the N. T. deuteros than those of the Old. One of their writers of the seventeenth century allowed only a theoretic difference between the two classes, and in 1700 Bossuet could say that all Catholics and Protestants agreed on the N. T. Canon. The only trace of opposition now remaining in German Protestant Bibles is in the order, Hebrews, coming with James, Jude, and Apocalypse at the end; the first not being included with the Pauline writings, while James and Jude are not ranked with the Catholic Epistles.

The criterion of inspiration (less correctly known as the criterion of canonicity).—Even those Catholic theologians who defend Apostolicity as a test for the inspiration of the N. T. (see above) admit that it is not exclusive of another criterion, viz., Catholic tradition as manifested in the universal reception of compositions as Divinely inspired, or the ordinary teaching of the Church, or the infallible pronouncements of œcumenical councils. This external guarantee is the sufficient, universal, and ordinary proof of inspiration. The unique quality of the Sacred Books is a revealed dogma. Moreover, by its very nature inspiration eludes human observation and is not self-evident, being essentially superphysical and supernatural. Its sole absolute criterion, therefore, is the Holy inspiring Spirit, witnessing decisively to Itself, not in the subjective experience of individual souls, as Calvin maintained, neither in the doctrinal and spiritual tenor of Holy Writ itself, according to Luther, but through the constituted organ and custodian of Its revelations, the Church. All other evidences fall short of the certainty and finality necessary to compel the absolute assent of faith. (See Franzelin, "De Divinâ Traditione et Scripturâ"; Wiseman, "Lectures on Christian Doctrine", Lecture ii; also INSPIRATION.)

Short disquisitions on the Canon of the N. T. appear in the Catholic *Introductions* of BACUEZ, SCHAEFER, KAULEN, TRENKLE, BELSER, PELT, GIGOT; a longer one in CORNELY, *Introductio Generalis* (unabridged); VIGOUROUX, in *Dict. de la Bible;* STANTON in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible.* The great contemporary treatise is by ZAHN, Protestant and conservatively critical. His *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig, 1901) is a compendium of the voluminous *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen and Leipzig, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892); WESTCOTT, *General Survey of the Canon of the New Testament* (6th ed., Cambridge and London, 1889); CHARTERIS, *Canonicity;* an incomplete collection of Patristic testimonies (Edinburgh and London, 1880); LEIPOLDT, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* Pt. I, *Die Entstehung* (Leipzig, 1907); GREGORY, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (1907).—Special: CAMERLYNCK, *Saint Irénée et le canon du Nouveau Testament* (Louvain, 1896); Refutations of Harnack; ROSE, *Etudes sur les Evangiles* (Paris, 1902), 1–38; BATIFFOL in *Revue Biblique* (1903), 10–26, 226–233.

GEORGE J. REID.

Canons, APOSTOLIC, a collection of ancient ecclesiastical decrees (eighty-five in the Eastern, fifty in the Western Church) concerning the government and discipline of the Christian Church, incorporated with the Apostolic Constitutions (VIII, 47). They deal mostly with the office and duties of a Christian bishop, the qualifications and conduct of the clergy, the religious life of the Christian flock (abstinence, fasting), its external administration (excommunication, synods, relations with pagans and Jews), the sacraments (Baptism, Eucharist, Marriage); in a word, they are a handy summary of the statutory legislation of the primitive Church. The last of these decrees contains a very important list or canon of the Holy Scriptures (see CANON OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES under sub-title *Canon of the New Testament*). In the original Greek text they claim to be the very legislation of the Apostles themselves, at least as promulgated by their great disciple, Clement. Nevertheless, though a venerable mirror of ancient Christian life and blameless in doctrine, their claim to genuine Apostolic origin is quite false and untenable. Some, like Beveridge and Hefele, believe that they were originally drawn up about the end of the second or the beginning of the third century. Most modern critics agree that they could not have been composed before the Council of Antioch (341), some twenty of whose canons they quote; nor even before the latter end of the fourth century, since they are certainly posterior to the Apostolic Constitutions. Von Funk, admittedly a foremost authority on the latter and all similar early canonical texts, locates the composition of the Apostolic Canons in the fifth century, near the year 400. Thereby he approaches the opinion of his scholarly predecessor, Drey, the first among modern writers to study profoundly these ancient canons; he distinguished two editions of them, a shorter one (fifty) about the middle of the fifth century, and a longer one (eighty-five) early in the sixth century. Von Funk admits but one edition. They were certainly current in the Eastern Church in the first quarter of the sixth century, for about 520 Severus of Antioch quotes canons 21–23 [E. W. Brooks, "Select Letters of Severus of Antioch", London, 1904 (Syriac text), I, 463–64. For various opinions concerning the date of composition see F. Nau, in Dict. de théol. cath., II, 1607–8, and the new Fr. tr. of Hefele's "History of the Councils", Paris, 1907, 1206–11]. The home of the author seems to be Syria. He makes use of the Syro-Macedonian calendar (can. 26), borrows very largely from a Syrian council (Antioch, 341), and according to Von Funk is identical with the compiler or interpolator of the Apostolic Constitutions, who was certainly a Syrian (Die apostol. Konstitutionen, 204-5).

As just indicated the number of these canons has given rise to no little controversy. In the Apostolic Constitutions (loc. cit.) they are eighty-five (occasionally eighty-four, a variant in the MSS. that arises from the occasional counting of two canons as one). In the latter half of the sixth century, John of Antioch (Joannes Scholasticus), Patriarch of Constantinople from 565 to 577, published a collection of synodal decrees in which he included these eighty-five canons (see Justel-Voellus, Bibliotheca Juris Canonici veteris, Paris, 1661, II, 501), and this number was finally consecrated for the Greek Church by the Trullan or

Quinisext Council (692), which also confirmed the current Greek tradition of their Apostolic origin. On the other hand the Latin Church, throughout the Middle Ages, recognized but fifty canons of the Apostles. This was the number finally adopted by Dionysius Exiguus, who first translated these canons into Latin about 500. It is not very clear why he omitted canons 51–85; he seems to have been acquainted with them and to have used the Apostolic Constitutions. In reality Dionysius made three versions of the Apostolic Canons (the oldest of them first edited by C. H. Turner, Ecclesiæ Occidentalis monumenta juris antiquissima, Oxford, 1899, fasc. I, 1–32); it is the second of these versions which obtained general European currency by its incorporation as the opening text of his famous Latin collection of canons (both synodal decrees and papal decretals) known as the "Dionysiana Collectio" (P. L., LXVII, 9 sqq.), made public in the first decade of the sixth century. Later collections of canons (Italy, Spain, France, Germany, etc.) borrowed from him; the text passed into Pseudo-Isidore, and eventually Gratian included (c. 1140) some excerpts from these canons in his "Decretum", whereby a universal recognition and use were gained for them in the law schools. At a much earlier date Justinian (in his Sixth Novel) had recognized them as the work of the Apostles and confirmed them as ecclesiastical law. (For the Western references in the early Middle Ages see Von Funk, "Didascalia" etc. quoted below, II, 40–50, and for their insertion in the early Western collections of canons, Maassen, "Gesch. der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande, Gratz, 1872, 438–40.) Nevertheless, from their first appearance in the West they aroused suspicion. Canon 46 for example, that rejected all heretical baptism, was notoriously opposed to Roman and Western practice. In the so-called "Decretum" of Pope Gelasius (429–96) they are denounced as an apocryphal book, i. e. not recognized by the Church (Thiel, Epistolæ Rom. pontificum genuinæ, 1867, I, 53–58, 454–71; Von Funk, op. cit., II, 40), though this note of censure was probably not in the original "Decretum", but with others was added under Pope Hormisdas (514–23). Consequently in a second edition (lost, except preface) of his "Collectio canonum", prepared under the latter pope, Dionysius Exiguus omitted them; even in the first edition he admitted that very many in the West were loath to acknowledge them (*quamplurimi quidem assensum non præbuere facilem*). Hincmar of Reims (d. 882) declared that they were not written by the Apostles, and as late as the middle of the eleventh century, Western theologians (Cardinal Humbert, 1054) distinguished between the eighty-five Greek canons that they declared apocryphal, and the fifty Latin canons recognized as "orthodox rules" by antiquity.

The influence of the Apostolic Canons was greatly increased by the various versions of them soon current in the Christian Church, East and West. We have already indicated the influence of the second Latin version of Dionysius Exiguus. They were also translated (more or less fully) into Syriac, Arabic, Coptic, and Armenian; in general they seem to have furnished during the fifth and sixth centuries a large element of the ecclesiastical legislation in the Eastern Church (see the detailed description of the so-called "127 Copto-Arabic canons", by F. Nau in Dict. de théol. cath., II, 1612–19; also Funk, Die apostolischen Konstitutionen, Rottenburg, 1891, and the articles Apostolic Church-Ordinance, Egyptian Church-Ordinance, Didache, Didascalia Apostolorum). The manuscripts of the (Greek) Apostolic Canons are described by Pitra, "Juris ecc. Græcorum historia et monumenta", Rome, 1864, I, 3–4; the manuscripts of the Latin versions of Dionysius Exiguus, by C. H. Turner, op. cit. supra, fasc. I, p. 1; cf. Von Funk, "Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum", (Paderborn, 1906), I, xlviii–liv, also xxiv–xlviii. The fifty Latin canons were first printed in Jacques Merlin's edition of the Councils (Paris, 1524); the eighty-five Greek Canons by G. Holoander, in his edition of Justinian's Novels (Nuremberg, 1531), whence they made their way into the earlier editions of the "Corpus Juris Civilis", the "Corpus Juris Canonici", and the large collections of acts and decrees of the councils.

A few other ancient canonical texts that pretend to Apostolic origin are described by F. Nau, op. cit., 1620–26; the most interesting of them is a brief collection of nine canons that purport to date from an imaginary Apostolic Council of Antioch. They may be read in Pitra, "Hist. et monumenta Juris eccl. Græcorum" (Rome, 1864), I, 88–91; also in Lagarde, "Reliquiæ juris eccl. antiquissimæ græce", 18–20, and in Harnack, "Mission und Ausbreitung" (Leipzig, 1902). They recommend the faithful not to practice circumcision, to admit the Gentiles, to avoid Jewish and pagan customs, the distinction of clean and unclean foods, the worship of idols, the vices of avarice and gluttony, frequentation of theatres, and taking of oaths. The earliest Christian literature offers numerous parallels to the content of these canons, which, in general, recall the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Didache. In the sixteenth century the Jesuit Turrianus (Torres) defended their authenticity, his chief argument being a reference of Innocent I (401–17) to an Apostolic Council of Antioch (Mansi, III, 1055). A notable literary controversy followed that is not yet quite closed (see Nau, op. cit., 1621–22). Interest centres chiefly in the first canon, which decrees that the Galileans shall henceforth be called Christians (see Acts, xi, 26), a holy people, a royal priesthood (see I Peter, ii, 9) according to the grace and title of baptism. Some critics see in this canon a defiant reply to the contemptuous use of "Galileans" by Julian the Apostate (Harnack, "Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums", Leipzig, 1902; Paul Lejay, in "Revue du clergé français", 15 Oct., 1903, 349–55, with a Fr. tr. of the nine canons). F. Nau is of opinion that they are much older than the latter quarter of the fourth century and calls attention (op. cit., 1624) to Origen, "Contra Celsum", VIII, 29 (P. G., XI, 1560—"it seemed good to the Apostles and the elders assembled at Antioch, and in their own words to the Holy Spirit to write a letter to the Gentiles who believed"). This statement contradicts Acts, xv, 6, 23, 28, according to which the Apostolic letter was written from Jerusalem. Nevertheless, it seems that this collection of canons was known to Origen, all the more as it claims (in the title) to come from the library of Origen at Cæsarea and to have been found there by the blessed martyr, Pamphilus (cf. Eus., H. E., VI, 32, 3). F. Nau thinks that they may represent a personal rule of conduct drawn up by some second-century Christian (on the basis of Apostolic precepts) who miscopied Acts, xi, 26, into the form of the afore-mentioned canon 1, and then added the other precepts—canon 9 reproduces the decree of Acts, xv, 29. At any rate Dallæus (Daillé) was wrong in charging Turrianus with downright forgery of all these canons (De pseudepigraphis apostolicis libri tres, 1653, III, cc. xxii–xxv, pp. 687–737), and deliberate corruption of the text of Ps. xvi, 14, "they are full of children" (ὑιῶν), making it read ὑιέων—i. e. "they are filled with pork". This reading of the fifth canon of Antioch is found not only in the oldest Latin Psalters, and in other reliable fourth to sixth century Latin witnesses to the Scripture-text, but also in the best Greek manuscripts (Vaticanus, Sinaiticus). In other words the Scripture-text used by these canons antedates Origen, and is, in itself, an evidence of their great antiquity. (See Antioch.)

The critical text of the Apostolic Canons is that of the late IGNAZ VON FUNK, a monument of exact scholarship: *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Paderborn, 1906), I, 565–95, with valuable notes. The best historical study of their origin and nature is also owing to VON FUNK, *Die apostolischen Konstitutionen* (Rottenburg, 1891), 180–206; IDEM, *Das achte Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen und die verwandten Schriften* (Tübingen, 1893), and his *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen* (Paderborn, 1899, 1907), II, 369–72, III, 355 sqq. He was preceded in the nineteenth century by SEBASTIAN DREY (like Funk a professor of the Catholic faculty of theology in the University of Tübingen, where the study of these ancient texts has become an academic heirloom), *Neue Untersuchungen über die Constitutionen und Kanones der Apostel* (Tübingen, 1832), and by the learned J. W. BICKELL, *Gesch d. Kirchenrechts* (Giessen, 1843).

Among the older erudite researches into the history and study of the Apostolic Canons honour is due especially to the Anglican savant G. BEVERIDGE, *Synodicon sive Pandectæ canonum sanctorum Apostolorum et conciliorum ab ecclesiâ græcâ receptorum* (Oxford, 1672–82; see *P. G.*, CXXXVII, 36–217, for the Apostolic Canons, text and commentary of BEVERIDGE); JUSTEL, *Codex canonum ecclesiæ universæ a Justiniano imperatore confirmatus . . . . C. J(ustel) latinum fecit et notisillustravit* (Paris, 1610–1618; re-edited by VŒLLUS as *Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris*, Paris, 1661); DE MARCA, *Dissertatio de veterum canonum collectionibus* in his *Opuscula* (Paris, 1681); GALLAND, *De vetustis canonum collectionibus dissertationum sylloge* (Venice, 1778). See MACNALLAY, *The Apostolical Canons in Greek, Latin and English with Notes* (London, 1867); LIGHTFOOT, *St. Clement of Rome* (London, 1890), I, III, 187, 368; LAUCHERT, *Die kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien, nebst den apostolischen Kanones* (Leipzig, 1896); NAU, *Canons des Apôtres* in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (1905), II, 5–12; HEFELE, tr. LECLERCQ, *Histoire des Conciles, nouvelle traduction française faite sur la deuxième éd. allemande, corrigée et augmentée de notes critiques et bibliographiques* (Paris, 1907), I, ii, 1203–21, with an excellent bibliography, 1216–21; ACHELIS in *Real-Encyc. f. prot. Theol. und Kirche* (Leipzig, 1896), I, 734–41, s. v. *Apostolische Kanones;* BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie* (Freiburg, 1901), 310–14.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Canons, COLLECTIONS OF ANCIENT.—While the essential principles of the constitution and government of the Church were immutably fixed by her Divine Founder, ecclesiastical legislation, emanating as it does from the authority established by Christ in His society, has shared all the vicissitudes of the latter. This means that it was not a finished product from the beginning, but rather a gradual growth, each phase of which was dictated by the ecclesiastical wisdom of the time. This is especially true of the earlier Christian centuries, when as yet the Church lived largely on tradition and custom, and when such written laws as existed were not originally universal laws, but local or provincial statutes, to which later a broader obligation was added through the express or tacit approbation of the legitimate authority. Hence arose the necessity of collecting, or in a way codifying, such legislation. These ancient collections may be classified either according to their *historical authority* or according to the *method of the compiler*.

Authority.—If we consider only their historical authority these collections are genuine (e. g. the "Versio Hispanica"), or apocryphal, i. e. made with the help of documents forged, interpolated, wrongly attributed, or otherwise defective (e. g. the Pseudo-Isidore collection). If we consider their juridical authority they are official, authentic, i. e. promulgated by competent authority, or private, the work of individuals, and owning no value other than their intrinsic worth or that derived from habitual usage.

Method.—If we consider the method of the compiler, these collections are chronological, in case their laws are classified according to the time of promulgation, or systematic (logical, methodical), if the collection follow a rational order. Naturally, in the earlier centuries the collections are brief and contain few laws chronologically certain. Only with the increase of legislation did a methodical classification become necessary, or at least the addition of methodical tables (see below, African and Spanish collections).

In this article we shall describe the ancient collections of canons (1) From the earliest Christian times to the period of the apocryphal collections (middle of the ninth century); (2) From the end of the ninth century to the Decretum of Gratian (1139–50). The forged collections of the middle of the ninth century will be treated in the article, FALSE DECRETALS. Much of our knowledge of these matters is owing to the historical researches begun at the end of the sixteenth century, whence issued the critical editions of the Fathers, the councils, and the papal decretals. We are particularly indebted, however, to two works of primary importance: (1) the dissertation (P. L., LVI) of the Ballerini brothers of Verona (eighteenth century) "Concerning the ancient collection and collectors of Canons as far as Gratian"—a study quite unique for its erudition and critical acumen; (2) the history of the sources and literature of canon law by Frederic Maassen (Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des Canonischen Rechts, Gratz, 1870, vol. I), in which the learned professor of Gratz took up this subject where the Ballerini had left it, but with a far richer supply of documents. Unfortunately he stops at Pseudo-Isidore.

FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE APOCRYPHAL COLLECTIONS.—*Collections of the Apostolic Period.*—The Apostles certainly issued disciplinary regulations, either as inspired authors (Divine Apostolic law, pertaining to the immutable deposit of faith), or simply as ecclesiastical legislation (human Apostolic law). In the primitive Christian ages there were current divers collections attributed to the Apostles. These collections were apocryphal, although there may be in it some regulations of really Apostolic origin. It is all very interesting, partly because of the vestiges it offers of the earliest Christian life, and partly because, *de facto*, many of these regulations were long considered truly Apostolic and, as such, influenced seriously the formation of ecclesiastical law. The most important of these collections are the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles (q. v.), the Apostolic Constitutions (q. v.), and the Apostolic Canons (see CANONS APOSTOLIC). The Apostolic Constitutions, though originally accepted throughout the Orient, were declared apocryphal in the Trullan (Quinisext) Council of 692; they were never accepted as ecclesiastical law in the West. The Apostolic Canons (eighty-five) were, on the other hand, approved by the abovementioned Trullan Council. Dionysius Exiguus, a Western canonist of the first half of the sixth century, noted that "many accept with difficulty the so-called canons of the Apostles". Nevertheless he admitted into his collection the first fifty of these canons. The so-called Decretum Gelasianum, *de libris non recipiendis* (about the sixth century), puts them among the apocrypha. From the collection of Dionysius Exiguus they passed into divers Western collections, though their authority was never on one level. We find them admitted at Rome in the ninth century in ecclesiastical decisions; in the eleventh century Cardinal Humbert accepts only the first fifty (Adversus Simoniacos, I, 8, and Contra Nicætam, 16 P. L., CXLIII). Only two of them (20, 29) found their way into the Decretals of Gregory IX.

Papal Decretals.—In primitive Christian centuries the popes carried on ecclesiastical government by means of an active and extensive correspondence. We learn from a synod of the year 370, under Pope Damasus, that the minutes of their letters or decretals (q. v.) were kept in the papal archives. These archives (see VATICAN ARCHIVES) have perished up to the time of John VIII (d. 882). In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries attempts were made to reconstruct them; the most successful is that of Jaffé ("Regesta RR. Pont.", 2nd ed., 1885; cf. the important revision of Jaffé by P. Kehr, "Italia Pontificia", Berlin, 1906 sqq.). During the period under discussion (i. e. to the middle of the eleventh century) we shall note a constant use of the papal decretals by the compilers of canonical collections from the sixth century on.

Greek Collections.—(1) In 451 there was quoted at the Council of Chalcedon a collection of councils no longer extant, nor has the name of the compiler ever transpired. It seems to have been based on the canons of Ancyra (314) and Neo-Cæsarea (314–25), to which were added later those of Gangra (36–70). At the beginning of the collection were then placed the decrees of Nicæa (325); subsequently the canons of Antioch (341) were included, in which shape it was known to the Fathers of Chalcedon. In the latter part of the fifth century the canons of Laodicæa (343–81), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451), were incorporated with this ecclesiastical code, and finally (after the canons of Neo-Cæsarea) the decrees of Sardica (343–44), in which form the collection was in use during the sixth century. Though unofficial in character, it represents (inclusive of sixty-eight canons taken from the "Canonical Epistles" of St. Basil, I, III) the conciliar discipline of the Greek Church between 500 and 600.

(2) This collection was chronological in order. Towards 535 an unknown compiler classified its materials in a methodical way under sixty titles, and added to the canons twenty-one imperial constitutions relative to ecclesiastical matters taken from the Code of Justinian. This collection has been lost.

(3) Some years later (540–550) Johannes Scholasticus, Patriarch of Constantinople, made use of this code to compile a new methodical collection, which he divided into fifty books. It is printed in the second volume of Voel and Justel, "Bibliotheca Juris Canonici veteris" (Paris, 1661). After the emperor's death (565), the patriarch extracted from ten of the former's constitutions, known as "Novellæ", some eighty-seven chapters and added them to the aforesaid collection.

(4) In this way arose the mixed collections known as Nomocanons (Gk. νομοι, "laws", κανονες, "canons"), containing not only ecclesiastical laws but also imperial laws pertaining to the same matters. The first of these was published under Emperor Maurice (582–602); under each title were given, after the canons, the corresponding civil laws. This collection (wrongly attributed to the afore-mentioned patriarch) is also found in the second volume of Voel and Justel (op. cit.).

(5) The Quinisext Council (695) of Constantinople, called Trullan from the hall of the palace (*in trullo*) where it was held, issued 102 disciplinary canons; it included also the canons of the former councils and certain patristic regulations, all of which it considered constitutive elements of the ecclesiastical law of the East. This collection contains, therefore, an official enumeration of the canons which then governed the Eastern Church, but no official approbation of a given collection or particular text of these canons. It is to be noted that the Apostolic See never fully approved this council. In 787 a similar recapitulation of the ancient canons was made by the Second Council of Nicæa.

Italo-Latin Collections.—(1) Latin Version of the Canons of Nicæa and Sardica.—The former council (325) was always held in the highest repute throughout the West, where its canons were in vigour together with those of Sardica, the complement of the anti-Arian legislation of Nicæa, and whose decrees had been drawn up originally in both Latin and Greek. The canons of the two councils were numbered in running order, as though they were the work of but one council (a trait met with in divers Latin collections), which explains why the Council of Sardica is sometimes called œcumenical by earlier writers, and its canons attributed to the Council of Nicæa. For the text of the version as found in the various collections see Maassen, op. cit., p. 8 sqq. The oldest versions of these canons quoted in the papal decretals are no longer extant.

(2) The "Hispana" or "Isidoriana" Version.—Towards the middle of the fifth century, perhaps earlier, there appeared a Latin version of the aforesaid canons of Nicæa, Ancyra, Neo-Cæsarea, and Gangra, to which were added a little later those of Antioch, Laodicæa, and Constantinople; the canons of Sardica were inserted about the same time after those of Gangra. Bickell considers it possible that this version was made in Northern Africa, while Walter inclines to Spain; it is now generally believed that the version was made in Italy. It was long believed, however, that it came from Spain, hence the name of "Hispana" or "Isidoriana", the latter term derived from its insertion in the collection attributed to St. Isidore of Seville (see below, *Spanish Collections*), in which it was edited, of course according to the text followed by the Spanish compiler.

(3) "Prisca" or "Itala" Version.—This, too, seems to have grown up gradually in the course of the fifth century, and in its present shape exhibits the aforementioned canons of Ancyra, Neo-Cæsarea, Nicæa, Sardica, Gangra, Antioch, Chalcedon, and Constantinople. It came to be known as "Itala" from the place of its origin, and as "Prisca" because of an overhasty conclusion that Dionysius Exiguus referred to it in the preface of his first collection when he wrote: "Laurentius offended by the confusion that reigned in the ancient version [*priscæ versionis*]." It was edited by Voel and Justel in the first volume of their above-quoted "Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris"; a better text is that of the Ballerini brothers in the third volume of their edition of the works of St. Leo (P. L., LVI, 746).

(4) Collection of Dionysius Exiguus.—The collections we have now to describe were justified and called for by the increasing canonical material of the Latin West in the course of the fifth century. It may be said at once that they were far from satisfactory. Towards 500 a Scythian monk, known as Dionysius Exiguus (q. v.), who had come to Rome after the death of Pope Gelasius (496), and who was well skilled in both Latin and Greek, undertook to bring out a more exact translation of the canons of the Greek councils. In a second effort he collected papal decretals from Siricius (384–89) to Anastasius II (496–98), inclusive, anterior therefore, to Pope Symmachus (514–23). By order of Pope Hormisdas (514–23), Dionysius made a third collection, in which he included the original text of all the canons of the Greek councils, together with a Latin version of the same. Of this collection the preface alone has survived. Finally, he combined the first and second in one collection, which thus united the canons of the councils and the papal decretals; it is in this shape that the work of Dionysius has reached us. This collection opens with a table or list of titles, each of which is afterwards repeated before the respective canons; then come the first fifty canons of the Apostles, the canons of the Greek councils, the canons of Carthage (419), and the canons of preceding African synods under Aurelius, which had been read and inserted in the Council of Carthage. This first part of the collection is closed by a letter of Pope Boniface I, read at the same council, letters of Cyril of Alexandria and Atticus of Constantinople to the African Fathers, and a letter of Pope Celestine I. The second part of the collection opens likewise with a preface, in the shape of a letter to the priest Julian, and a table of titles; then follow one decretal of Siricius, twenty-one of Innocent I, one of Zozimus, four of Boniface I, three of Celestine I, seven of Leo I, one of Gelasius I, and one of Anastasius II. The additions met with in Voel and Justel (op. cit.) are taken from inferior manuscripts.

There were gaps in the work of Dionysius; he seems, in particular, to have taken the papal decretals, not from the archives of the Roman Church, but

from previous compilations, hence certain omissions, which need not arouse any suspicion of the authenticity of documents not quoted. In spite of its defects this collection far surpassed all previous efforts of the kind, not alone by its good order, but also by the clear, intelligible text of its version, and by the importance of its documents. Very soon it superseded all earlier collections and was much used (*celeberrimo usu*), especially in the Roman Church, says Cassiodorus. It became popular in Spain and Africa and even before Charlemagne had found its way into Gaul and Britain. It was the medium by which the African canons reached the East. Copyists used it to correct the text of the other collections, a fact not to be lost sight of at the risk of taking an interdependence of manuscripts for an interdependence of collections. Despite its authority of daily use and its occasional service in the papal chancery, it never had a truly official character; it even seems that the popes were wont to quote their own decretal letters not from Dionysius, but directly from the papal registers. In time the "Collectio Dionysiana", as it came to be known, was enlarged and some of these additions entered the "Collectio Hadriana", which Adrian I sent (774) to Charlemagne, and which was received by the bishops of the empire at Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen) in 802. It is none other than the "Collectio Dionysiana", with some additions in each of its two parts. In this shape it acquired and kept the title of "Codex Canonum". Neither the action of Pope Adrian nor the acceptance by the Synod of Aix-la-Chapelle conferred on the book an official character, or made it a code of universally obligatory laws; with much greater reason may it be said that it did not thereby become an exclusively authoritative code of ecclesiastical law. It was first printed in the first volume of Voel and Justel (op. cit.), re-edited by Lepelletier (Paris, 1687), and reprinted in P. L., LXVII. A new and more satisfactory edition is that of Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, in "Ecclesiæ Occidentalis Monumenta Juris Antiquissima" (Oxford, 1899–1908), vol. II, fasc. II.

(5) The "Avellana" Collection, so-called because its oldest known manuscript was bought for the abbey of Santa Croce Avellana by St. Peter Damian (d. 1073). The collection probably dates from the middle of the sixth century. It follows neither chronological nor logical order, and seems to have grown to its present shape according as the compiler met with the materials that he has transmitted to us. Nevertheless, the Ballerini pronounce it a very valuable collection because of the great number of early canonical documents (nearly 200) that are found in no other collection. All its texts are authentic, save eight letters from divers persons to Peter, Bishop of Antioch. The "Avellana" has never been edited as such, though all its documents have passed into the great works of Sirmond, Coustant, Baronius, and Foggini, with the exception of two letters whose text is given by the Ballerini, in whose work, quoted above, are also indicated the places where the various texts of the "Avellana" may be read.

(6) Various Other Collections.—Despite the exceptional popularity of Dionysius Exiguus, which caused the previous compilations to be disused and soon forgotten, several of them were preserved, as also were some other contemporary collections—among them several that still offer a certain interest. See the above-quoted dissertation of the Ballerini, II, iv, and Maassen (op. cit., 476, 526, 721). It will suffice to mention the collection known as the "Chieti" or "Vaticana Reginæ", through which a very old and distinct version of the decrees of the Council of Nicæa has reached us. It has been edited by the Ballerini (P. L., LVI, 818).

Collection of the African Church.—(1) Canons of the African Councils.—From the Eastern Church Northern Africa received only the decrees of Nicæa (325), which it owed to Cæcilianus of Carthage, one of the Nicene Fathers. The African Church created its domestic code of discipline in its own councils. It was customary to read and confirm in each council the canons of preceding councils, in which way there grew up collections of conciliar decrees, but purely local in authority. Their moral authority, however, was great, and from the Latin collections they eventually made their way into the Greek collections. The best-known are: (a) the Canons of the Council of Carthage (Aug., 397) which confirmed the "Breviarium" of the canons of Hippo (393), one of the chief sources of African ecclesiastical discipline; (b) the Canons of the Council of Carthage (419), at which were present 217 bishops and among whose decrees were inserted 105 canons of previous councils.

(2) "Statuta Ecclesiæ Antiqua".—In the second part of the "Hispana" (see below) and in other collections are found, together with other African councils, 104 canons which the compiler of the "Hispana" attributes to a Pseudo-Fourth Council of Carthage of 398. These canons are often known as "Statuta Ecclesiæ Antiqua", and in some manuscripts are entitled "Statuta antiqua Orientis". Hefele maintains that in spite of their erroneous attribution, these canons are authentic, or at least summaries of authentic canons of ancient African councils, and collected in their present shape before the end of the sixth century. On the other hand, Maassen, Mgr. Duchesne, and Abbé Malnory believe them a compilation made at Arles in the first part of the sixth century; Malnory specifies St. Cæsarius of Arles (q. v.) as their author.

(3) The "Breviatio Canonum" of Fulgentius Ferrandus.—It is a methodical collection and under its seven titles disposes 230 abridged canons of Greek ("Hispana" text) and African councils. It was compiled towards 546 by Fulgentius, a deacon of Carthage and a disciple of St. Fulgentius of Ruspe; the text is in P. L., LXVII.

(4) The "Concordia" of Cresconius.—This writer, apparently an African bishop, compiled his collection about 690. It is based on that of Dionysius Exiguus; only, in place of reproducing in full each canon, it cuts it up to suit the demands of the titles used; hence its name of "Concordia". Between the preface and the text of the collection the writer inserted a resume of his work. This took on the name of "Breviatio Canonum" which led some to imagine that the latter title implied a work other than the "Concordia", whereas it meant only a part or rather the preamble of the latter, whose text is in P. L., LXXXVIII.

Collections of the Spanish Church.—Under this heading the historian of canon law generally understands the collections that arose in the lands once under Visigothic rule—Spain, Portugal, and Southern Gaul. In this territory councils were very frequent, especially after the conversion of King Reccared (587), and they paid much attention to ecclesiastical discipline. Naturally the need of canonical collections was soon felt. As a rule, such collections contain, besides the decrees of Spanish synods, the canons also of Nicæa and Sardica (accepted in the Spanish Church from the beginning), those of the Greek councils known through the "Itala", and those of the Gallican and African Councils, quite influential in the formation of Spanish ecclesiastical discipline. Three of these collections are important:—

(1) The "Capitula Martini".—It is divided into two parts, one dealing with the bishop and his clergy, the other relative to the laity; in both the author classifies methodically the canons of the councils in eighty-four chapters. He says himself in the preface that he does not pretend to reproduce the text literally, but with set purpose breaks up, abridges, or glosses the same, in order to make it more intelligible to "simple people"; possibly he has occasionally

modified it to suit the Spanish discipline of his time. Though much has been borrowed from Latin, Gallican, and African Councils, it is the Greek Councils that furnish the greater part of the canons. The "Capitula" were read and approved at the Council of Braga (572). Some writers, misled by the name, attributed them to Pope Martin I; they are in reality the work of Martin of Pannonia, better known as Martin of Braga (q. v.), of which place he was archbishop in the sixth century. Their text was incorporated with the "Isidoriana", from which they were taken and edited apart by Merlin and by Gaspar Loaisa, and in the first volume of the oft-quoted work by Voel and Justel, after collation of the variants in the best manuscripts.

(2) The Spanish "Epitome", the name of the collection edited by the Ballerini (op. cit., III, IV) from two manuscripts (Verona and Lucca). It has two parts: one includes the canons of Greek, African, Gallican, and Spanish councils; the other divers papal decretals from Siricius to Vigilius (384-555), with two apocryphal texts of St. Clement and an extract from St. Jerome. The compiler designedly abridged his texts, and mentions only three sources, a Braga collection (the "Capitula Martini", his first chapter being a resume of that work), an Alcalá (Complutum) collection, and one of Cabra (Agrabensis). Though characterized by lack of order and exactness, the "Epitome" interests us because of the antiquity of its sources. Maassen thinks it connected with the "Codex Canonum", the nucleus of the group of collections whence eventually issued the "Hispana", and of which we shall treat apropos of the latter.

(3) The "Hispana" or "Isidoriana".—This collection must not be confounded with the above-described "Versio Hispanica" or "Isidoriana", among the earlier Latin collections, and which contained only canons of Greek councils. The collection in question, like that of Dionysius Exiguus on which it is based, contains two parts: the first includes canons of Greek, African, Gallican, and Spanish councils, with some letters of St. Cyril of Alexandria and Atticus of Constantinople, while the second has the papal decretals as found in Dionysius, together with some others, most of the latter addressed to Spanish bishops. This is the chronological "Hispana". Somewhat later, towards the end of the seventh century, it was recast in logical order, by some unknown writer, and divided into ten books, which were again subdivided into titles and chapters. This is the methodical "Hispana". Finally, the copyists were wont to place at the beginning of the chronological "Hispana" a table of contents of the methodical collection, but with references to the text of the chronological: in this shape it was known as the "Excerpta Canonum". The chronological "Hispana" seems to have been originally the "Codex Canonum" mentioned at the Fourth Council of Toledo (633), with later additions. In the ninth century it was attributed, with insufficient evidence, to St. Isidore of Seville. In spite of this erroneous attribution, the "Hispana" contains very few documents of doubtful authenticity. Later on, additions were made to it, the latest being taken from the seventeenth council of Toledo (694). In this enlarged form, i. e. the "Codex Canonum", the "Hispana" was approved by Alexander III as authentic (Innocent III, Ep. 121, to Peter, Archbishop of Compostella). Until the thirteenth century, its authority was great in Spain. Pseudo-Isidore (see below) made a generous use of its materials. (See the text in P. L., LXXXXIV, reprinted from the edition of Madrid, 1808-21, executed at the Royal Printing House).

Gallican Collections.—(1) The "Collectio Quesnelliana".—The close relations of the churches of Gaul with those of Italy and Spain familiarized the former at an early date with the canonical collections of the latter churches, to which were added the canons of their own Gallican synods. At the beginning of the sixth century there arose in Gaul an extensive collection, based apparently on the "Antiqua Isidoriana", the "Prisca", the "Chieti" collection (see above), and the African collections, and which, besides the earliest Eastern and the African councils, includes papal decretals, letters of Gallican bishops, and other documents. It is of Gallican origin, though it includes no councils of Gaul. Its name is derived from the Oratorian, P. Quesnel, its first editor, who wrongly entitled it "Codex Canonum ecclesiæ Romanæ", and tried to prove that it was an official collection of the Roman Church. It cannot, therefore, serve as authentic confirmation of the usages of that Church or of the churches of Africa. The Ballerini reprinted it in the third volume of their edition of the works of St. Leo I, with excellent dissertations against Quesnel (P. L., LVI). During the sixth and succeeding centuries the canonical compilers kept at their task; they received the African canons, those of Gallican councils, the statutes and letters of national bishops. Some of these collections were chronological, others methodical (see the Ballerini, II, x and Maassen, op. cit., 556, 821). We have already called attention to the importance (after 802) of the "Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana".

(2) The "Codex Carolinus", a collection of papal decretals addressed to Charles Martel, Pepin, and Charlemagne, compiled by the latter's order in 791 (P. L., XCVIII), not to be confounded with the "Libri Carolini" (see CAROLINE BOOKS) in which were set forth for Pope Adrian I various *dubia* concerning the veneration of images.

English and Irish Collections.—Before the seventh century we meet with no collections of canons particular to the English and Irish Churches. In England ecclesiastical discipline is at this time based on the provincial councils, which draw their inspiration from the general councils, and are reinforced by the ordinances of the Anglo-Saxon kings. Roman collections appear in 678 when Dionysius Exiguus is quoted at the Council of Herford. Thenceforth appear various collections of local origin, e. g. the "De Jure Sacerdotali" (P. L., LXVIII) and the "Exceptiones" attributed (but without sufficient reason) to Egbert of York (d. 767). The most celebrated of these collections is the "Synodus Patritii" or "Collectio Hibernensis", of the early part of the eighth century, whose compiler put together previous ecclesiastical legislation in sixty-four to sixty-nine chapters, preceded by extracts from the "Etymologiæ" of St. Isidore concerning synodal regulations. The preface states that for the sake of brevity and clearness, and to reconcile certain juridical antinomies, effort is made to render the sense of the canons rather than their letter. It is a methodical collection to the extent that the matters treated are placed in their respective chapters, but there is much confusion in the distribution of the latter. In spite of its defects this collection made its way into France and Italy and until the twelfth century influenced the ecclesiastical legislation of churches in both countries (Paul Fournier, De l'influence de la collection irlandaise sur les collections canoniques).

Particular Collections.—Apart from the above-described general collections there are some special or particular collections that deserve brief mention. (1) Some of them deal with a particular heresy or schism, e. g. the collections of Tours, Verona, Salzburg, Monte Cassino, those of Notre Dame, of Rusticus, the Novaro-Vaticana, and the "Codex Encyclius" relative to Eutyches and the Council of Chalcedon, the "Veronensis" and the "Virdunensis" in the affair of Acacius. (2) Others contain the documents and juridical texts that concern an individual church or country, e. g. the collection of Arles, in

which were gathered the privileges of that Church, the collections of Lyons, Beauvais, Saint-Amand, Fécamp, etc., in which were brought together the canons of the councils of France. (3) In the same category may be placed the *capitula* or episcopal statutes, i. e. decisions and regulations collected from various quarters by local bishops for the use and direction of their clergy (see CAPITULARIES), e. g. the "Capitula" of Theodulf of Orléans, end of the eighth century (P. L., CV), of Hatto of Basle (882, in Mon. Germ. Hist: Leges, I, 439–41), of Boniface of Mainz (745, in D'Achéry, Spicilegium, ed. nova I, 597). Still other collections deal with some special point of discipline. Such are the ancient liturgical collections called by the Greeks "Euchologia" (q. v.) and by the Latins "Libri mysteriorum", or "sacramentorum", more usually "Sacramentaries" (q. v.), also since the eighth century the "Ordines Romani" (q. v.) found in P. L., LXXVIII. Here, too, belong the collections of ecclesiastical formulæ (see FORMULARIES, BOOKS OF), especially the "Liber Diurnus" (q. v.) of the Roman Chancery, compiled probably between 685 and 782 (P. L., CV, 11), edited by Garnier (Paris, 1680) and anew by M. de Rozières (Paris, 1869), and by Th. Sickel (Vienna, 1889). Special mention is due to the "Penitentials" (Libri Pœnitentiales), collections of penitential canons, councils, and catalogues of ecclesiastical sanctions, to which were gradually added rules for the administration of the Sacrament of Penance. This important subject will be treated more fully under the article PENITENTIAL BOOKS.

Collections of Ecclesiastico-Civil Laws.—The civil law, as such, has no standing in the canonical forum. Yet in the first centuries of her existence the Church often rounded out her own legislation by adopting certain provisions of the secular laws. Moreover, either by mutual agreement, as under the Carlovingian kings, or by the civil power's usurpation of ecclesiastical domain, as frequently happened under the Byzantine emperors, the civil authority legislated on matters in themselves purely canonical; such laws it behooved an ecclesiastic to know. Moreover, the priest often needs some acquaintance with the pertinent civil law in order to decide properly even in purely secular matters that are occasionally submitted to him. Hence the utility of collections of civil laws concerning ecclesiastical matters or the administration of the canonical laws (*praxis canonica*). We have already noted in the East the collections known as "Nomocanones"; the West also had mixed collections of the same nature.

(1) Collections of Roman Law.—This law interested quite particularly the ecclesiastics of the barbarian kingdoms that rose on the ruins of the Western Empire, since they continued to live by it (*Ecclesia vivit lege romana*); moreover, apart from the laws of the Anglo-Saxons, the legislation of all the barbarian peoples of Gaul, Spain, and Italy was profoundly influenced by the Roman law. (a) The "Lex romana canonice compta", apparently compiled in Lombardy during the ninth century, and handed down in a manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. It includes portions of the "Institutiones" of the "Codex" of Justinian, and of the "Epitome" of Julian.

(2) Capitularies of the Frankish Kings.—The laws of the latter were very favourable to religious interests; not a few of them were the result of the mutual deliberations of both the civil and the ecclesiastical power. Hence the exceptional authority of the royal capitularies (q. v.) before ecclesiastical tribunals. In the first half of the ninth century Ansegisus, Abbot of Fontenelles (823–33), collected in four books capitularies of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and Lothaire; the first two books contain provisions concerning the "ecclesiastical order", the latter two exhibit the "law of the world". Ansegisus himself added three appendixes. His work was widely used in France, Germany, and Italy, and was quoted in diets and councils as an authentic collection.

This rapid sketch exhibits the vitality of the Church from the earliest centuries, and her constant activity for the preservation of ecclesiastical discipline. During this long elaboration the Greek Church unifies her legislation, but accepts little from beyond her own boundaries. On the other hand the Western Church, with perhaps the sole exception of Africa, makes progress in the development of local discipline and exhibits an anxiety to harmonize particular legislation with the decretals of the popes, the canons of general councils, and the special legislation of the rest of the Church. Doubtless in the above-described collection of canons, the result of this long disciplinary development, we meet with forged decrees of councils and decretals of popes, even with forged collections, e. g. the collections of pseudo-Apostolic legislation. Nevertheless the influence of these apocryphal works on other canonical collections was restricted. The latter were, almost universally, made up of authentic documents. Canonical science in the future would have been nourished exclusively from legitimate sources had not a larger number of forged documents appeared about the middle of the ninth century (Capitula of Benedict Levita, Capitula Angilramni, Canons of Isaac of Langres, above all the collection of Pseudo-Isidore. See FALSE DECRETALS). But ecclesiastical vigilance did not cease; in the West especially, the Church kept up an energetic protest against the decay of her discipline; witness the many councils, diocesan synods, and mixed assemblies of bishops and civil officials, also the numerous (over forty) new canonical collections from the ninth to the beginning of the twelfth century and whose methodical order foreshadows the great juridical syntheses of later centuries. Being compiled, however, for the most part not directly from the original canonical sources, but from immediately preceding collections, which in turn often depend on apocryphal productions of the ninth century, they appear tainted to the extent in which they make use of these forgeries. Such taint, however, affects the critical value of these collections rather than the legitimacy of the legislation which they exhibit. While the "False Decretals" affected certainly ecclesiastical discipline, it is now generally recognized that they did not introduce any essential or constitutional modifications. They gave a more explicit formulation to certain principles of the constitution of the Church, or brought more frequently into practice certain rules hitherto less recognized in daily use. As to the substance of this long development of disciplinary legislation, we may recognize with Paul Fournier a double current. The German collections, while not failing to admit the rights of the papal primacy, are seemingly concerned with the adaptation of the canons to actual needs of time and place; this is particularly visible in the collection of Burchard of Worms. The Italian collections, on the other hand, insist more on the rights of the papal primacy, and in general of the spiritual power. M. Fournier indicates, as especially influential in this sense, the Collection in Seventy-four Titles. Both tendencies meet and unite in the works of Yvo of Chartres. The compilations of this epoch may, therefore, be classed in these two broad categories. We do not, however, insist too strongly on these views, as yet somewhat provisory, and proceed to describe the principal collections of the next period, following, as a rule, the chronological order.

END OF THE NINTH CENTURY TO GRATIAN (1139–50).—In these two centuries the ecclesiastical authorities were quite active in their efforts to withstand the decay of Christian discipline; the evidence of this is seen in the frequency of councils, mixed assemblies of bishops and imperial officials, and diocesan synods

whose decrees (capitularies) were often published by the bishops. In this period many new collections of canons were made, some forty of which, as already said, are known to us.

The "Collectio Anselmo Dedicata".—Though as yet unedited, this collection is generally accounted quite valuable by reason of its abundance of materials and its good order; it was also one of the most widely used. Its twelve books treat the following subjects: hierarchy, judgments, ecclesiastical persons, spiritual things (rules of faith, precepts, sacraments, liturgies), and persons separated from the Church. Its sources are the "Dionysiana", the "Hispana", the correspondence (*Registrum*) of Gregory I, and various collections of civil laws. Unfortunately it has also drawn on Pseudo-Isidore. It is dedicated to Anselm, doubtless Anselm II of Milan (833–97), and is now held to have been compiled in Italy towards the end of the ninth century. It is certainly anterior to Burchard (1012–23), whose work depends on this collection. The author is unknown.

The "Collection of Regino of Prüm" is entitled "De ecclesiasticis disciplinis et religione Christianâ" (on the discipline of the Church and the Christian religion), and according to the preface was put together by order of Ratbod, metropolitan of Trier, as a handy manual for episcopal use in the course of diocesan visitations. Its two books treat: (1) of the clergy and ecclesiastical property, and (2) of the laity. Each book begins with a list (*elenchus*) of questions that indicate the points of chief importance in the eyes of the bishop. After this catechism, the Abbot of Prüm (d. 915) adds the canons and ecclesiastical authorities relative to each question. The collection was made about 906 and seems to depend on an earlier one edited by Richter under the title, "Antiqua Canonum collectio qua in libris de synodalibus causis compilandis usus est Regino Prumiensis" (Marburg, 1844). The text of Regino is found in P. L., CXXXII; a more critical edition is that of Wasserschleben, "Reginonis Abbatis Prum. libri duo de synodalibus causis" (Leipzig, 1840).

The "Capitula Abbonis".—Abbo, Abbot of Fleury (d. 1004), dedicated to Hugues Capet (d. 996) and his son Robert (therefore before the end of the tenth century) a collection in fifty-six chapters, dealing with the clergy, ecclesiastical property, monks and their relations with the bishops. Besides the canons and papal decretals, he made use of the Capitularies, the Roman civil law, and the laws of the Visigoths; his collection is peculiar in that he enclosed within his own context the texts quoted by him. This collection is found in the second volume of the "Vetera Analecta" of Mabillon (Paris, 1675–85), and is reprinted in P. L., CXXXI.

The "Collectarium Canonum" or "Libri decretorum" of Burchard of Worms.—This collection is in twenty books and was compiled by Burchard, an ecclesiastic of Mainz, later Bishop of Worms (1002–25), at the suggestion of Brunicho, provost of Worms, and with the aid of Walter, Bishop of Speyer, and the monk Albert. This is the work often called "Brocardus". Burchard follows quite closely the following order: hierarchy, liturgy, sacraments, delicts, sanctions, and criminal procedure. The nineteenth book was familiarly known as "Medicus" or "Corrector", because it dealt with the spiritual ailments of different classes of the faithful; it has been edited by Wasserschleben in "Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche" (Leipzig, 1851). The twentieth, which treats of Providence, predestination, and the end of the world, is therefore a theological treatise. The collection, composed between 1013 and 1023 (perhaps in 1021 or 1022), is not a mere compilation, but a revision of the ecclesiastical law from the standpoint of actual needs, and an attempt to reconcile various juridical antinomies or contradictions. Burchard is a predecessor of Gratian and, like the latter, was a very popular canonist in his time. It is to be regretted that he depends on the above-mentioned ninth-century collections and even added to their apocryphal documents and erroneous attributions. The two collections just described (Regino and Collectio Anselmo dedicata) were known and largely used by him. Pseudo-Isidore also furnished him more than 200 pieces. The entire collection is in P. L., CXL.

The "Collectio Duodecim Partium", yet unedited, is by an unknown, but probably a German, author. It includes a great deal of Burchard, follows quite closely his order, and by most is held to have copied his material, though some believe it older than Burchard.

The Collection in Seventy-four Books, or "Diversorum sententia Patrum".—This collection, known to the Ballerini and Theiner, is the subject of a careful study by Paul Fournier ("Le premier manuel canonique de la réforme du onzième siècle" in "Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire publiés par l'Ecole Française de Rome", 1894). He considers it a compilation of the middle of the eleventh century, done about the reign of St. Leo IX (1048–54), and in the entourage of that pope and Hildebrand; moreover, it was well known in and out of Italy and furnished to other collections not only their general order, but also much of their material. Fournier believes it the source of the collection of Anselm of Lucca, of the "Tarraconensis" and the "Polycarpus" (see below), also of other collections specified by him. This collection is yet unedited; Fournier gives (op. cit.) the beginnings and endings (*Incipit, Explicit*) of all the titles, also references to their sources.

The Collection of St. Anselm of Lucca.—This collection, wrongly adjudicated from the Bishop of Lucca (1073–86), is divided into thirteen books, based on Burchard and the "Collectio Anselmo dedicata", and contains many apocryphal pieces; it also contains papal decretals not found in other collections, whence the Ballerini concluded that St. Anselm consulted directly the pontifical archives. It has no preface; from the beginning (*Incipit*) of a Vatican manuscript it is clear that St. Anselm compiled the work during the pontificate and by order of St. Gregory VII (d. 1085). It passed almost entire into the Decretum of Gratian. A critical edition is owing to Fr. Thaner, who published the first four books under the title "Anselmi episcopi Lucensis collectio canonum una cum collectione minore Jussu Instituti Saviniani (Savigny) recensuit F. T." (Innsbruck, 1906).

The Collection of Cardinal Deusdedit.—Created by St. Gregory VII, Cardinal Deusdedit was enabled to use the correspondence (*Registrum*) of this pope, also the Roman archives. His work is dedicated to Victor III (1086–87), the successor of Pope Gregory, and dates therefore from the reign of Victor; its four books on the papal primacy, the Roman clergy, ecclesiastical property, and the Patrimony of Peter, reflect the contemporary anxieties of the papal entourage during this phase of the conflict between the Church and the empire. We owe to Pio Martinucci (Venice, 1869) a very imperfect edition of this collection, and to Wolf de Granvell, professor at Gratz, a critical edition (Die Kanonessammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit, Paderborn, 1906).

Collection of Bonizo.—Bonizo, Bishop of Sutri near Piacenza, published, apparently a little later than 1089, a collection in ten books preceded by a brief preface. In this work he treats successively the catechism and baptism, then the duties of divers classes of the faithful: ecclesiastical rulers and inferior clergy, temporal authorities and their subjects, finally of the cure of souls and the penitential canons. The fourth book only (De excellentiâ Ecclesiæ Romanæ) has found an editor, Cardinal Mai, in the seventh vol-

ume of his "Nova Bibliotheca Patrum" (Rome, 1854).

The "Polycarpus", a collection in eight books so called by its author, Gregory, Cardinal of San Crisogono, and dedicated to an Archbishop of Compostella, of whose name only the initial "D." is given; in all probability he is Didacus, archbishop of that see from 1101 to 1120, which is therefore the approximate date of the "Polycarpus". It seems to depend on Anselm of Lucca and on the "Collectio Anselmo dedicata", and the above-mentioned "Collection in Seventy-four Books"; the author, however, must have had access to the Roman archives. This collection is as yet unedited.

Collection of Yvo of Chartres.—Both by his writings and his acts this great bishop exercised a pronounced influence on the development of canon law in the first quarter of the twelfth century (he died 1115 or 1117). We owe to Paul Fournier a profound study of his juridical activity ("Les collections canoniques attribuées à Yves de Chartres", Paris, 1897, and "Yves de Chartres et le droit canonique" in "Revue des questions historiques", 1898, LXII, 51, 385). Not to mention the "Tripartita" (see below), he has left us: (1) The "Decretum", a vast repertory in seventeen parts and three thousand seven hundred and sixty chapters; though roughly subdivided under the aforesaid seventeen rubrics, its contents are thrown together without order and seemingly represent undigested results of the author's studies and researches; hence it has been surmised that the "Decretum" is a mere preparatory outline of the "Panormia" (see below), its material in the rough. Theiner does not admit that the "Decretum" is the work of Yvo; it is, nevertheless, generally accepted that Yvo is the author, or at least that he directed the compilation. Nearly all of Burchard is found therein, and in addition a host of canonical texts, also Roman and Frankish law texts gathered from Italian sources. Fournier dates it between 1090 and 1095. It is found in P. L., CLXI. (2) The *"Panormia"*, admittedly a work of Yvo. It is much shorter than the "Decretum" (having only eight books) and is also more compact and orderly. Its material is taken from the Decretum, but it offers some additions, particularly in the third and fourth books. It seems to have been composed about 1095, and appears at that time as a kind of methodical *Summa* of the canon law; with Burchard it divided popularity in the next fifty years, i. e. until the appearance of the "Decretum" of Gratian.

The "Tripartita", so called because of its triple division. It contains in its first part papal decretals as late as Urban II (d. 1099), and is therefore not of later date; its second part offers canons of the councils after the "Hispana" text; the third part contains extracts from the Fathers and from the Roman and the Frankish law. Hitherto it was supposed to have been taken from the "Decretum" of Yvo or composed by some unknown author. Fournier, however, thinks that only the third book postdates the "Decretum", and then as an abridgment (A). The other two books he considers a trial-essay of the "Decretum", by Yvo himself, or by some writer who worked under his direction while he laboured at the vast bulk of the "Decretum". These two books, according to Fournier, formed a separate collection (A) later on joined to the above-mentioned third book (B), in which manner arose the actual "Tripartita". In this hypothesis many chapters in the "Decretum" were borrowed from the afore-mentioned (A) collection, whose nucleus is found in its extracts from Pseudo-Isidore completed from divers other sources, especially by use of a collection of Italian origin, now kept in the British Museum. hence known as the "Britannica". The "Tripartita" is yet unedited.

Divers Collections.—All three of these above-described collections (Decretum, Panormia, Tripartita) called for and found abridgements. Moreover, new collections arose, owing to fresh additions to these great compilations and new combinations with other similar works. Among them are: (1) The "Cæsaraugustana", so called because found in a Carthusian monastery near Saragossa. It seems to have been compiled in Aquitaine, and contains no papal decretals later than Paschal II (d. 1118), which suggests its composition at a previous date. Its fifteen books borrow much from the "Decretum" of Yvo of Chartres. (2) The "Collection in Ten Parts", compiled in France between 1125 and 1130, an enlarged edition of the "Panormia". (3) The "Summa-Decretorum" of Haymo, Bishop of Châlons (1153), an abridgment of the preceding. Antonius Augustinus (q. v.), who made known in the sixteenth century the "Cæsaraugustana", revealed also the existence of the "Tarraconensis", which came to him from the Cistercian monastery of Ploblete, near Tarragona. It is in six books and has no documents later than the reign of Gregory VII (d. 1085). It belongs, therefore, to the end of the eleventh century; the "Correctores Romani", to whom we owe (1572–85) the official edition of the "Corpus Juris canonici", made use of the "Tarraconensis". Fournier called attention to two manuscripts of this collection, one in the Vatican, the other in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (see above, the *Collection in Seventy-four Books*).

BALLERINI, *De antiquis Collectionibus et collectoribus canonum* in *P. L.*, LVI; MAASSEN, *Gesch. der Quellen und der Lit. des canon. Rechts* (Gratz, 1870); A. TARDIF, *Hist. des sources du droit canonique* (Paris, 1887); HUBLER, *Kirchenrechtsquellen* (Berlin, 1898); PHILIPPS, *Kirchenrechts* (Ratisbon, 1845), IV, and *Droit ecclésiastique dans ses sources* (tr. CROUZET, Paris, 1852); WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1905), I, tit. xi; SCHERER, *Handbuch des Kirchenrechts* (Gratz, 1898), I; SÄGMÜLLER, *Lehrbuch des Kathol. Kirchenrechts* (Ratisbon, 1900); VERING, *Lehrbuch d. Kath.-Orient. u. Prot. Kirchenrechts* (Freiburg, 1893); BICKELL, *Gesch. des Kirchenrechts* (Giessen, 1843), I; WALTER, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts aller christlichen Confessionen* (Bonn, 1871); POHLE in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1845.

JULES BESSON.

Canons, ECCLESIASTICAL, are certain rules or norms of conduct or belief prescribed by the Church. The name is derived from the Greek κανών, the instrument used by architects and artificers for making straight lines. Some writers think that the Church preferred the word *canon* to *law*, as the latter had a harsh meaning for the faithful in the times of persecution. The early Fathers use canon as equivalent to the rule of faith, or for some formula expressing a binding obligation on Christians (Irenæus, Adv. Hær., I, ix; Tertullian, De Præscr., 13). Bickell declares that for the first three hundred years, canon is scarcely ever found for a separate and special decree of the Church; rather does it designate the rule of faith in general. He appeals to the fact that the plural form of the word is seldom used in the earliest Christian writers (Bickell, Geschichte des Kirchenrechts, I, 8). With the fourth century began the use of canon for a disciplinary decree, owing to its employment in this sense by the First Council of Nice (325). The Cassinese editors of Ferraris (s. v. Canones) say that in the first ages of the Church many disciplinary regulations were not required, and hence it was scarcely necessary to discriminate decrees into dogmatic and disciplinary, as the faithful classed both under the obligation to observe the general rule of faith. From the fourth century onward, canon signified almost universally a disciplinary decree of a council or of the Roman pontiffs. The word *decretum* during the same period, though signifying in general an authoritative statute or decision, began to be limited more and more to dogmatic matters, while canon when used in opposition to it was restricted to laws of discipline. That this usage, however, was not invariable is evident from Gratian's use of "Decretum" to signify his collection of canons and decrees. From the Council of Nice to that of Trent exclusive, the regulations con-

cerning discipline issued by assemblies of bishops received the name of canons.

With the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century began the departure from this ancient usage. This council used the word *canon* for short, dogmatic definitions with an anathema attached to them. On the other hand it gave the name of *decrees* to its disciplinary regulations. The example set by Trent was followed by the Council of the Vatican. The usage of Trent seems to bring canon nearer to the signification it bore before the Council of Nice, when it referred rather to faith than to discipline. The general idea of a decision by Church authority seems to be also the root-meaning of the expressions "Canon of Scripture", "Canon of the Mass", "Canon of Saints", although for the last term Ducange (s. v. Canonizare) suggests a somewhat different origin. As ecclesiastical regulations began to multiply, it became necessary to gather them into codices, which generally received the title of "Collection of Canons" (see CANONS, COLLECTIONS OF ANCIENT). In these, civil laws are often added to the Church regulations. For such collections the Greeks used the term *Nomocanones*. The Latins have no special name for them, though Capitularies (q. v.), e. g. of Charlemagne, is sometimes referred to as a somewhat parallel usage in the West.

As to the authority of ecclesiastical canons, it is evident a distinction must be made when speaking of canons of faith and canons of discipline, for the former are irreversible, the latter are not. Similarly, it is plain that canons containing a precept already binding by reason of Divine or natural law, cannot be on the same footing as those that are of mere ecclesiastical origin. In general, the "Corpus Juris Canonici" declares (cap. 1. de Const.) that canonical statutes are binding on all; likewise (cap. Quum scimus) that bishops are the guardians of the canons and must see to their observance. When there is question of canons in the ordinary ecclesiastical sense (namely, that which obtained before the Council of Trent), as they refer principally to matters of discipline, it must be borne in mind that they are neither immutable nor irreformable. The subject-matter of such canons depends not only on circumstances of persons, places, and times, but also on considerations of expediency or temporary necessity. A change in any of the causes which brought about the framing of the canons, will make a change in their binding-force, for disciplinary regulations are almost necessarily mutable. In like manner when there is question of the binding force of a canon, it is important to determine whether it was issued by a general council or by the decree of a pope, as imposing an obligation on all the faithful, or whether it was framed solely for restricted regions or persons. In the latter case its binding-force is as restricted as its scope.

It must be borne in mind that the object which the Church has always had in view in promulgating her canons has been the guidance and preservation of the clergy and laity in the duties of a Christian life and in the best methods of ecclesiastical administration. Although, therefore, such canons contain elements of positive human law, yet ultimately they are founded on the Divine or natural law. As such they cannot be entirely abrogated by contrary custom (Ferraris, loc. cit.), though their rigour may be mitigated by certain circumstances, on the ceasing of which, the pristine rigour of the canon would be again binding. When they are entirely of human law, they may, of course, be completely abrogated, not only by legislation on the part of the proper authorities, but also by legitimate custom. The study of the sacred canons is especially enjoined on the clergy. Perhaps most of the regulations refer directly to ecclesiastics, and the clergy will find in them the surest guidance for their own conduct and for the fruitful exercise of their ministry in directing the faithful. The neglect of the prescriptions of the sacred canons has always been the source of corruption in morals, and perhaps the chief reason for the loss of faith by nations as well as by individuals.

FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca* (Rome, 1886), II; SMITH, *Elements of Eccl. Law* (New York, 1895), I; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1898); BICKELL, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts* (Leipzig, 1843).

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Canons and Canonesses Regular (also called REGULAR CLERICS, RELIGIOUS CLERICS, CLERIC-CANONS, AUGUSTINIAN CANONS, BLACK CANONS, MONK-CANONS).—According to St. Thomas Aquinas, a canon regular is essentially a religious cleric, or, as the same doctor aptly expresses it: "The Order of Canons Regular is necessarily constituted by religious clerics, because they are essentially destined to those works which relate to the Divine mysteries, whereas it is not so with the monastic Orders" (II–II, Q. clxxxix, a. 8, ad 2um, and 2, 2, Q. 189, A. 8, ad. 2, and 2, 2, Q. 184, A. 8, Q. clxxxiv, a. 8). We have then here what constitutes a canon regular and what distinguishes him from a monk. The clerical state is essential to the Order of Canons Regular, whereas it is only accidental to the Monastic Order. Hence Erasmus, himself a canon regular, declared that the canons regular are a *quid medium* between the monks and the secular clergy. And for the same reason Nigellus Vireker, a Benedictine monk of Canterbury in the twelfth century, contrasts the life of canons regular, as he knew them, with that of his own brethren and the Cistercians, pointing out the advantages of the former. The canons, he tells us, were spared the long choral duties, the sharp reproofs, the stern discipline of the Black Monks, and were not bound to the Spartan simplicity of vesture and diet of the field-working Cistercians ("Speculum Stultorum", Rolls Series; "The Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets of the Twelfth Century"). The "Llanthony Chronicler" relates how the first founders of his famous abbey, having consulted among themselves, decided to become canons regular, first, because on account of their charity they were well liked by all, and then because they were satisfied with a modest manner of living, their habit, though clean, being decent, neither too coarse, nor too rich. In this moderation of life we may say that canons regular follow the example of their lawgiver, St. Augustine, of whom St. Possidius, his biographer, relates that his habit, his furniture, his clothes were always decent, neither too showy nor too humble and shabby.

The spirit of the canonical order is thus quaintly but clearly explained in the "Observances in Use at the Augustinian Priory at Barnwell, Cambridge", lately edited with a translation, by F. W. Clarke: "The road along which Canons Regular walk in order to reach the heavenly Jerusalem is the rule of Blessed Augustine. Further lest Canons Regular should wander away from the rule, there are given to them, in addition, observances in accordance with it handed down from remote ages and approved among holy fathers in all quarters of the world. This rule is simple and easy, so that unlearned men and children can walk in it without stumbling. On the other hand it is deep and lofty, so that the wise and strong can find in it matter for abundant and perfect contemplation. An elephant can swim in it and a lamb can walk in it safely. As a lofty tower surrounded on all sides by walls makes the soldiers who garrison it safe, fearless, and impregnable, so the rule of Blessed Augustine, fortified on all sides by observances in accordance with it, makes its soldiers, that is, Canons Regular, undismayed at the attacks, safe and invincible."—To explain further the nature and distinctive spirit of the canonical order, we may say, with St. Augustine, that a canon regular professes two things, "sancti-

tatem et clericatum". He lives in community, he leads the life of a religious, he sings the praises of God by the daily recitation of the Divine Office in choir; but at the same time, at the bidding of his superiors, he is prepared to follow the example of the Apostles by preaching, teaching, and the administration of the sacraments, or by giving hospitality to pilgrims and travellers, and tending the sick. And so we find that Pope Paschal II, in his Bull addressed in 1118 to the prior and community at Colchester, tells them that their order has always been devoted to preaching, hearing confessions, and baptizing, and ready to accept the care of such parishes and public chapels as might be entrusted to their charge. This has been pointed out by other popes, as also by St. Ives of Chartres, and by Cancellieri, who, quoting the authority of an ancient writer to the effect that the clerics living in common in the Lateran Basilica observed the regulations introduced there by Pope Gelasius, says that "their work was the administration of the sacraments and the offering of prayer". It is the same now. From one monastery alone, that of St. Florian, in Austria, some forty parishes are served, and those same canons who gave hospitality on the Great St. Bernard serve a number of parishes in the Canton Valais. The public prayer, or liturgical office, is celebrated with all the splendour befitting God's honour and His house. But the canons regular do not confine themselves exclusively to canonical functions. Nothing, unless incompatible with the duty of clerics, is rejected. To this day, as already mentioned, they give hospitality to pilgrims and travellers on the Great St. Bernard and on the Simplon, and in former times the hospitals of St. Bartholomew's Smithfield, in London, of S. Spirito, in Rome, of Lochleven, Monymusk, and St. Andrew's, in Scotland, and others like them, were all served by canons regular. In fact, many congregations of canons made it their chief end to work among the poor, the lepers, the insane, and the infirm. The clerics established by St. Patrick in Ireland had a Guest House for pilgrims and the sick, whom they tended by day and by night. And the rule given by Chrodegang to his canons enjoined that a hospital should be near their house that they might tend the sick. The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen) also ordains the erection of a hospital for pilgrims over which a canon regular is to preside.

The essential and characteristic habit of canons regular is the rochet. With regard to the other parts, their dress, as a general rule, is that of other clergy, although some have added a scapular. By most the rochet is worn as part of their daily dress, though sometimes reduced to a small linen band hanging from the shoulders in front and behind. It is now so worn in Austria, on the Great St. Bernard, and at Aosta. As to the colour of the dress there is no fixed rule, the custom and traditions of the various Congregations may be observed. The general colour seems to have been white as now worn by the Lateran Congregation. A question having been raised as to the proper habit of a canon regular, when named bishop, it was settled by a Brief of Leo X. A long dissertation on the dress of the canons regular was presented to the pope by a jurisconsult, Zaccaria Ferreri, who maintained that, with the exception of the rochet, the canons regular, like the secular clergy, had no fixed dress. It may be interesting to note that, in this dissertation on the authority of the "Most Reverend Lord Cardinal of England, and many other Prelates, and the English Ambassador", the author says, "in England the Canons Regular wore violet like the other clergy". In the Constitutions given by Cardinal Wolsey to canons regular mention is also made of this variety of habit.

ORIGIN.—Having thus explained what a canon regular is, and what the spirit and work of the canonical order are, it will be easier now to answer such questions as these: Who was the founder of the canons regular?—Whence do they derive their origin?—When and where were they first known? Various and contradictory opinions have been expressed to answer these and similar questions. There have been some writers who, like the famous Cistercian abbot, Joachim, Coriolanus, Marquez, and others held that the canonical order began about 1100. According to others the order dates from the time of Charlemagne, who expressed the wish that "all the clergy should be either monks or canons living in common", as prescribed by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 789, and Mainz, in 813. The great Bishop of Hippo is also regarded by some as the founder of the canonical institute. All these opinions are set aside by many other writers, and especially by the historians of the order, who almost unanimously trace back the origin of the canons regular much farther in antiquity. Their institute, they maintain, was founded by Christ Himself, and dates from the time of the Apostles. These writers and historians begin by saying that, although it be true that there was a great revival, or general reformation and spreading of the order in the twelfth century, in France and elsewhere through the zeal of Ives, Bishop of Chartres, in Italy through the newly-founded congregation of Blessed Peter de Honestis, and elsewhere through the congregation of St. Rufus, yet this does not imply that the order took its origin at that epoch, but rather—since it needed reforming—that it had already existed for some time. History, in fact, tells us that about the eleventh century the regular or canonical life hitherto observed almost everywhere by the clergy was given up in many churches, and thus a distinction was made between the clerics who lived in separate houses and those who still preserved the old discipline, living under rule and having all things in common. The former were called *canonici sæculares*, the latter *canonici regulares*, by which name they have been known ever since. It is also true that in the year 763 Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, assembled the clergy of his cathedral around him, led with them a community life, and gave them a rule taken from the statutes of ancient orders and canons, a discipline also recommended shortly after by the Councils of Aix-la-Chapelle and Mainz; but in doing this he was only following the example of St. Augustine, who had introduced among his own clergy the manner of life which he had seen practiced at Milan. And that is why the members of the canonical order regard St. Augustine not as their founder, but only as their reformer, or lawgiver; because to the clergy who lived with him he had given certain special regulations, which were in course of time adopted by almost all the canons regular, who were on that account called "Canons Regular of St. Augustine".

Those who believe in the Apostolic origin of the canonical institute, support their contention by the authority of popes, theologians, and church historians. There is abundant evidence, they say, that Christ Himself instituted a perfect religious state, and that it was embraced by the Apostles and many of their disciples from the very beginning of the Church. It is also certain that from the time of the Apostles there have always been in the Church clerics who, following the example of the primitive Christians, living "secundum regulam sub sanctis Apostolis constitutam" (according to the Apostolic Rule), had all things in common. Eusebius, the historian, relates that St. Mark, the disciple of St. Peter, established this discipline at Alexandria, as did St. Crescentius in Gaul, St. Saturninus in Spain, and St. Maternus in Germany. We know that St. Eusebius introduced it at Vercelli in Italy, and St. Ambrose at Milan. Pope Urban I (A. D. 227), Paschal II (1099), Benedict XII (1334), Eugenius IV (1431), Sixtus V, and Pius V. in

their various Letters and Bulls, are quoted by the historians of the order, to prove distinctly that St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, only restored, or caused to reflourish, the order of canons regular, which was first instituted by the Apostles. St. Antoninus, Vincent of Beauvais, Sigebert, Peter of Cluny, Fagnani, and many others tell us that the canonical order traces back its origin to the earliest ages of the Church. It will suffice to give here the authority of Suarez, who sums up the case very clearly. After having stated that the Apostles taught by Christ Himself formed the first order of clerics, and that the order did not perish with the Apostles, but was preserved by continuous succession in their disciples, as proved by letters of Pope St. Clement and Urban I (though these letters are Pseudo-Isidorian in character), the writer continues: "We read in the Life of St. Augustine that when he was made priest, he instituted a monastery within the church and began to live with the servants of God according to the manner and rules constituted by the holy Apostles. Many therefore suppose that the Order of Regular Clerics, or Canons Regular, was not instituted by St. Augustine, but was either reformed by him or introduced by him into Africa and furnished with a special rule, Pius IV maintains that the Order of Regular Clerics was instituted by the Apostles, and this Benedict XII confirms in his preface to the Constitutions of the Canons Regular. There is no question as regards the continuance of this state from the time of St. Augustine to this time, although with great variety as far as various institutes are concerned." To this we may add that when a controversy arose between the Benedictine monks and the canons regular with regard to precedence, the question was settled by Pius V in favour of the canons, on account of their Apostolic origin. We may then conclude with the words of Cardinal Pie, who, addressing the canons regular of the Lateran Congregation, whom he had established at Beauchêne in his diocese, says: "These that are clothed in white robes, who are they, and whence come they? These Canons Regular, who are they, and whence do they come? Who they are and whence they come, I will tell you. Their origin is nothing else but the society and the common life of Jesus and His Apostles, the original model of community life between the bishop and his clergy. On that account they chiefly come from Hippo and from the home of Augustine, who has given them a Rule, which they still glory to observe."

The name *Austin* (or *Augustinian*) *Canons* is commonly used instead of *Canons Regular*, and there are some who think that Austin Canons are so styled because they were instituted by St. Augustine. This is a wrong notion. St. Augustine did not found the order of canons regular, not even those who are called Austin Canons. There were canons regular before St. Augustine. The various authorities quoted in this article prove it. All St. Austin did was to induce his clergy to live *secundum regulam sub sanctis Apostolis constitutam*, which he had seen practised at Milan, adding to the Apostolic Rule hitherto observed by clerics living in common, some regulations, afterwards called the "Rule of St. Augustine". Or, in the words of Pope Paschal II, in a Bull quoted by Pennott, "Vitæ regularis propositum in primitivâ ecclesiâ cognoscitur ab Apostolis institutum quam B. Augustinus tam gratanter amplexus est ut eam regulis informaret" (A regular mode of life is recognized in the Early Church as instituted by the Apostles, and adopted earnestly by Blessed Augustine, who provided it with new regulations)—"Hist. Tripart.", Lib. II, c. iv, 4. These regulations which St. Austin had given to the clerics who lived with him soon spread and were adopted by other religious communities of canons regular in Italy, in France, and elsewhere. When, in and after the eleventh century, the various congregations of canons regular were formed, and adopted the Rule of St. Augustine, they were usually called *Canonici Regulares Ordinis S. Augustini Congregationis . . .*, in England Austin Canons, or Black Canons. But there have always been canons regular who never adopted the Rule of St. Augustine. Giraldus Cambrensis mentions some in his day in England. In a word, canons regular may be considered as the genus, and Austin Canons as the species; or we may say that all Austin Canons are canons regular, but not all canons regular are Austin canons.

If further proofs of the Apostolic origin of the canonical order are desired, many may be found in the work of Abbot Cesare Benvenuti (see bibliography at end of this article), who century by century, from councils, Fathers, and other ecclesiastical sources, proves that from the first to the twelfth century there had always been clerics living in common according to the example of the Apostles. It will be enough to cite here the authority of Döllinger who, after saying that from the time of the Apostles there have been in the Church, virgins, laymen, and ecclesiastics named ascetics, continues: "At Vercelli the holy Bp. Eusebius introduced the severe discipline of the Oriental monks among his clergy both by word and example. Before the gate of Milan was a cloister for monks under the protection of St. Ambrose. . . . St. Augustine, when a priest, founded a cloister at Hippo, in which with other clerics he lived in humility and community of goods. When Bishop his episcopal residence was converted into a cloister for ecclesiastics" ("Eccl. History", tr. by the Rev. E. Cox, II, 270). To this again may be added, among many others, the words of Benedict XII, Eugenius IV, Pius IV, and Pius V, in their Bulls, all asserting almost in as many words, what has been here said. The following words, taken from the Martyrologium for canons regular and approved by the Congregation of Sacred Rites, will suffice for the purpose: "Ordo Canonicorum Regularium, qui in primævis Ecclesiæ sæculis Clerici nominabantur utque ait S. Pius V. in Bullâ (Cum ex Ordinum 14 Kal. Jan., 1570): 'ab Apostolis originem traxerunt, quique ab Augustino eorum Reformatore iterum per reformationis viam mundo geniti fuere', per universum orbem diffusus innumerabilium SS. agmine fulget" (The order of canons regular, who in the early ages of the Church were called clerics, and who, as St. Pius V says in the Bull "Cum ex Ordinum", 1570, derived their origin from the Apostles, and who later were born anew to the world, through a process of reformation, by their reformer, Augustine, being spread throughout the universe, are renowned for an army of innumerable saints).

Development.—This rule, which, in the words of Giraldus Cambrensis, "happily joins the canonical and clerical life together", was soon adopted by many prelates, not only in Africa, but elsewhere also. After the death of the holy Doctor, it was carried into Italy and France by his disciples. One of them, Pope Gelasius, about the year 492, re-established the regular life in the Lateran Basilica. From St. John Lateran (the Mother and Mistress of all Churches) the reform spread till at length the Rule was universally adopted by almost all the canons regular. It was in the same Lateran Basilica, tradition tells us, that St. Patrick, the future Apostle of Ireland, professed the canonical institute which he afterwards introduced, with the Christian Faith, into his own country. At the voice of the great apostle the Irish nation not only embraced Christianity, but many also, following his example, embraced the canonical life. On the authority of Sir James Ware, Canon Burke (Life and Labours of St. Augustine) asserts that "all the monasteries founded in Ireland by St. Patrick were for canons regular". This opinion is also maintained by Allemande, who affirms (Hist. monastique de l'Irlande) that "the Regular Canons of St. Augustine were so early or considerable in Ireland before the

general suppression of monasteries, that the number of houses they are said to have had seems incredible. They alone possessed, or had been masters of, as many houses as all the other orders together, and almost all the chapters of the cathedral and collegiate churches in Ireland consisted of canons regular". To these authorities we might add that of the Rev. R. Butler, who, in his notes to the "Registrum Omnium Sanctorum", expressly affirms that the "old foundations in Ireland were exclusively for Canons". We might also quote the words of Bishop Thomas de Burgo, who, in his "Hibernia Dominicana", does not hesitate to say that St. Patrick was a canon regular, and that, having preached the Christian Faith in Ireland, he established there many monasteries of the canonical institute. After this no one will think that the same writer exaggerates when he appends to his work a catalogue of 231 monasteries which at some time or other belonged to canons and canonesses regular. The Irish clerics became the most learned scholars in Europe. Ireland's seats of learning, monasteries, nunneries, and charitable institutions were unsurpassed either in number or excellence by those of any nation in the world. The Abbots or Priors of Christ Church and All Hallows in Dublin, of Connell, Kells, Athessel, Killagh, Newton, and Raphoe had seats in Parliament.

There seems very little doubt that the canonical institute was introduced into Scotland by St. Columba. This saint, called "monasteriorum pater et fundator", in reference to the numerous churches and monasteries built either by him or by his disciples in Ireland and Scotland, was formed to the religious life in the monastery of St. Finnian. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *anno* 565, relates that Columba, *Mass-preost* (Mass-priest), "came to the Picts to convert them to Christ", or, as another manuscript says: "This year, 565, Columba the Messa-preost, came from the parts of the Scots (Ireland) to the Britons to teach the Picts, and built a monastery in the island of Hy". To what order this monastery, founded by Columba, belonged, we may judge from other monasteries built by the saint in Ireland and Scotland. As we have already stated, St. Columba was the disciple of St. Finnian, who was a follower of St. Patrick; both then had learned and embraced the regular life which the great Apostle had established in Ireland. Moreover, such writers as Ware, de Burgo, Archdall, Cardinal Moran, Bower, expressly tell us that Columba built monasteries for canons regular in Ireland and Scotland. So, for instance, Ware, in his "Antiquitates Hiberniæ", writing of Derry, says: "St. Columba built [this monastery] for Canons Regular in the year 545. This monastery was a filiation of the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul at Armagh"—which, according to the same writer, had been founded by "St. Patrick for Canons Regular". Again, tradition places the first landing of the saint on leaving Ireland at Oronsay, and Fordun (Bower) notices the island as "Hornsey, ubi est monasterium nigrorum Canonicorum, quod fundavit S. Columba" (where is the monastery of Black Canons which St. Columba founded). Speaking of the very monastery built by the saint at Hy, another historian, Gervase of Canterbury, in his "Mappa mundi", informs us that the monastery belonged to the Black Canons.

It may be here the place to mention the opinion of some writers who think that the monasteries established by St. Columba in Scotland were for Culdees. It will be remembered that numerous opinions have been expressed concerning the origin and the institute of the Culdees, some calling them monks, some secular canons and hospitallers, and others going so far as to say that they were Independents, or Dissenters, nay even the forefathers of the modern Freemasons. The present writer, on the other hand, is of opinion that the Culdees originally, and some even to the very end, were nothing else but clerics living in common just as those St. Patrick had established in Ireland and St. Columba had introduced into Scotland.

At the time of the Reformation there were in Scotland at least thirty-four houses of canons regular and one of canonesses. These included six Premonstratensian houses, one Gilbertine, and one of the Order of St. Anthony. The others seem to have been chiefly of the Aroasian Congregation, first introduced into Scotland from Nostall Priory, in England. The chief houses were: St. Andrews, the Metropolitan of Scotland, founded by Angus, King of the Picts.—The church was at first served by Culdees, but in 1144 Bishop Robert, who had been a canon regular at Scone, established here members of his own community. The prior was mitred and could pontificate. In Parliament he had precedence of all abbots and priors.—Scone, founded by King Alexander I.—Here the Scottish kings were crowned. The stone on which the coronation took place was said to be that on which Jacob rested his head; it is now at Westminster, having been removed by Edward I. Tradition says that the Culdees were at Scone before Alexander brought canons regular from Nostall Priory in 1115. Holy Rood, of which King David was the founder, in 1128, for canons regular, in the "vail that lyis to the Eist frae the Castell, quhare now lyis the Cannongait", and which at that time was part of "ane gret forest full of hartis, hyndis, toddis and sicklike manner of beistis", as Bellenden, the translator of Bower, expresses it. This famous abbey was burnt down, at the instigation of John Knox, in 1544, but some efforts were made to restore Divine service in the chapel as late as 1688, for in that year Father G. Hay, a Scotch canon regular, of the French congregation, performed there a funeral, as he says, "in his habit with surplice and aulmess after the rites of Rome". Next the abbey was the Royal Palace, and we are told that the Scottish kings often went—

> Unto the saintly convent, with good monks to dine
> And quaff to organ music the pleasant cloister wine.

Many of the houses founded by St. Columba remained in possession of the canons till the time of the Reformation. Oronsay and Crusay were of the number.

Much valuable information concerning many of the canonical houses may be found in Fordun's Scoti-Chronicon, written before 1384 (ed. Skene, Edinburgh, 1871–72). As Walter Bower, its continuator and annotator, was a canon regular, and abbot of Inchcolm, he no doubt derived all his materials at first hand from the archives of the order, and thus many important particulars are related by him concerning the foundations of the houses, their inmates, and particular events.

There are not wanting writers who, on the authority of Jocelin, William of Malmsbury, "Gesta Pontificum", and others, are of opinion that the canonical order was established in Britain by St. Patrick, on his return from Rome to Ireland. Be this as it may, the Saxon conquerors of the country extirpated not only the religious establishments, but almost the very Faith of Christ from the land. The faithful either were obliged to dwell in the fastnesses of Wales or were made slaves. It was in these circumstances that Pope Gregory the Great sent to England St. Augustine with forty clerics, who according to the Bull of Pope Eugenius IV (quoted by Lingard in his Anglo-Saxon Church, I, iv), by which, in 1446, he restored the Lateran Basilica to the canons regular, formed a Canonical Institute. Speaking of the order founded by the Apostles and reformed by the holy Bishop of Hippo, the pope says: "Blessed Gregory commanded St. Augustine, the Bishop of England, to establish it as a new plantation among the nation entrusted to his care, and spread it to the utmost distant parts of the West." And William of

Coventry, in his Chronicle, A. D. 620, tells us that "Paulinus with twelve clerics was sent by the Pope to help Augustine". In the North also the disciples of St. Columba were preaching the Gospel and establishing the canonical order among the nation they were converting to Christ. The Roman and British clergy amalgamated, and we learn from English historians that most if not all the cathedral and large churches were served by regular clerics or canons regular till the tenth century, when they were replaced by Benedictine monks by royal authority, and sometimes by means even less lawful. Dr. Lingard clearly states that: "in many of these religious establishments the inmates had been Canons Regular from the beginning. In many they had originally been monks and had converted themselves into Canons, but all considered themselves bound by their rule to reside within the precincts of their monasteries, to meet daily in the church for the performance of divine service, to take their meals in the same hall, and to sleep in the same dormitory". In fact, this same historian is of opinion that St. Augustine and his companions were clerics living in common. Writing of the clergy in Anglo-Saxon times, Dr. Lingard says: "The chief resource of the Bishop lay in the Cathedral monastery, where the clergy were carefully instructed in their duties and trained in the exercise of their holy profession. They were distinguished by the name of Canons, because the rule which they observed had been founded in accordance with the canons enacted in different councils". And he adds this explanatory note from the "Excerptiones" of Egbert: "Canones dicimus regulas quas sancti Patres constituerunt in quibus scriptum est quomodo canonici, id est clerici regulares, vivere debeant" (By the term *canons* we designate those rules which the holy Fathers have laid down, in which it has been written how canons [*canonici*], i. e. regular clerics, ought to live). We have also the fact that in the twelfth century many churches served by secular canons, like Plympton, Twynham, Taunton, Dunnow, Gisburn, were given to canons regular, who, it would seem, were the original owners. This view is confirmed by the authorities of various historians. In his "History of the Archbishops" (ed. Stubbs, Rolls Series, London, 1876), Diceto tells us that at Dunstan's suggestion King Edgar "drove the clerics out of most of the churches of England and placed monks in their stead". In "Liber de Hyda" we find that canons had been introduced at Winchester by King Ethelred, and that Bishop Grimbald, a zealous reformer of the clergy, had established a community of clerics whose duty it was to perform the Divine Office. Speaking of Ælfric, a monk who had been elected Archbishop of Canterbury, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 995, remarks that when he came to his cathedral he was received by a community of clerics, when he would have preferred monks.

It would seem, then, that writers like Tanner, the modern editors of Dugdale's "Monasticon", and others, who think that the canons regular were introduced into England after the year 1100, or after the coming of William the Conqueror, may have been misled by the fact that it was only after the eleventh century that the canons regular were so styled generally; nevertheless these are the same ecclesiastics, until then commonly called religious, or regular, clerics. It is also true that, as elsewhere so in England, in the twelfth century there was a great revival in the canonical order on account of various congregations newly founded in France, Italy, and the Low Countries, and it was some of these new canons that came with the Conqueror; but this does not prove that the canonical life was unknown before. In England alone, from the Conquest to the death of Henry II, no fewer than fifty-four houses were founded where the canons regular were established. Colchester in 1096 was the first, followed ten years later by Holy Trinity in London. In 1100 Ralph Mortimer, by consent of Gerard, Bishop of Hereford, founded a canonical house at Wigmore, and in 1110 another house for Austin Canons was built at Haghmond. At Taunton a colony of secular priests became a monastery of canons regular. Secular canons were also replaced by canons regular at Twynham, Plympton, Waltham, and other places. In the period mentioned there were, among others, the foundations of the Austin houses at Dunmow, Thremhall, Southampton, Gisburn, Newnham in Bedfordshire, Norton in Cheshire, Stone in Staffordshire, Anglesey and Barnwell in Cambridgeshire, Berden in Essex. This was, no doubt, a period of great prosperity for the canonical order in England. But soon evil days came. There was first the Black Plague, and, like every other ecclesiastical institution, the canons regular were fairly decimated, and we may say that they never quite recovered. To remedy the evil Cardinal Wolsey thought it expedient to introduce a general reform of the whole canonical order in England. In the capacity of papal delegate, on 19 March, 1519, he issued the "Statuta", which were to be observed by all the Austin Canons. These ordinances, as Abbot Gasquet observes, are valuable evidence as to the state of the great Augustinian Order at that time in England. The statutes provide for the union of all the Austin Canons; for the assembly of a general chapter every three years; for various matters concerning obedience, poverty, and the general discipline of the cloister. Special regulations are given for the daily recitation of the Divine Office and singing of Masses. Directions are laid down for the reception and profession of novices, for uniformity in the religious habit, and sending young students to Oxford University. But troubled days soon came over the land, and these statutes, good though they were, could not keep off the evil times. The canonical houses were suppressed, and the religious dispersed, persecuted, little by little disappeared from the land altogether. Yet, in spite of the previous disasters, by Abbot Gasquet's computation ninety-one houses belonging to the canons regular were suppressed or surrendered at the time of the Reformation between 1538 and 1540, with one thousand and eighty-three inmates—namely, Austin Canons, fifty-nine houses and seven hundred and seventy-three canons; Premonstratensians, nineteen houses and one hundred and fifty-nine canons; Gilbertines, twenty houses and one hundred and fifty-one religious. This number of houses and religious does not include the lesser monasteries, with an aggregate of one house and five hundred monks and canons, nor the nuns of the various orders estimated at one thousand five hundred and sixty.

The best known canonical houses were: Walsingham, Waltham, St. Mary's Overy, Bolton, St. Bartholomew's Smithfield, Nostall, Bridlington, Bristol, Carlisle, Newbury, Hexham, Lanercost, Bodmin, Colchester, Dunstable, Merton, Kertmele, Llanthony, Plympton, St. Frideswide's at Oxford, Osney.

At Walsingham there was a famous shrine of Our Lady, a model of the Holy House of Nazareth, founded two hundred years before the miraculous removal to Loretto. Erasmus, writing in the sixteenth century, gives a vivid description of the shrine and the canons, its custodians. At Bourne Abbey lived from 1300 to 1340 Robert de Brunne, a canon regular, who has been styled the "Father of the English language". In his monastic seclusion he welded together the diverse dialects, which then divided shire from shire, into the grammatical structure which the language has since retained. Bridlington Priory, where William de Newbridge and several other historians lived, was also sanctified by the life, virtues, and miracles of its holy prior, John de Tweng, the last English saint to be canonized prior to the Reformation. He died in 1379. In 1386 a mandate was issued to col-

lect evidence with a view to canonization. The body was translated in 1405 "de mandato Domini Papæ", and Boniface XI by a Bull, the original of which was found in the Vatican Archives by J. A. Twemlow a few years ago, formally canonized him. The holy prior was a very popular saint in the North of England. A rich shrine had been built over his tomb, from which the people begged Henry VIII to withhold his hand; but all in vain. "Lest the people should be reduced in the offering of their money", the shrine was pulled down and destroyed. Sempringham saw the beginning by St. Gilbert, and the wonderful growth of the only pre-Reformation institute of distinctly English origin. Here, too, Peter de Langtoft, the historian, lived and wrote his well-known works. Within the walls of Merton Abbey Thomas of Canterbury, when a youth, received his education and made his profession as a canon regular before he was consecrated archbishop. Chic Priory, whence came William de Corbeil, Archbishop of Canterbury, was renowned for the learning of its religious clerics: "clerici litteraturâ insignes". Thurgarton was the home of that spiritual writer, Walter Hilton, who, about the year 1400, wrote the "Scala Perfectionis", usually attributed to some Carthusian monk. St. Frideswide's, founded for canons regular at Castle Tower by Robert d'Oiley, and translated to Osney in 1149, became, as Cardinal Newman tells us, "a nursery for secular students, subject to the Chancellor's jurisdiction". At Lilleshall Priory lived John Myrk, the author of "Instructions for Parish Priests", a work written in irregular couplets, doubtless that they might be easily committed to memory. It has been edited by the Early English Text Society. The following verses, where Myrk gives excellent and explicit directions for behaviour in church, are a fair sample of the author's style:—

> That when they do to Church fare,
> Then bid them leave their many words,
> Their idle speech and nice border [jests]
> And put away all vanity
> And say their *Pater Noster* and their *Ave.*
> None in the church stand shall,
> Nor lean to pillar nor to wall,
> But fair on knees they shall them set,
> Kneeling down upon the flat,
> And pray God with heart meek
> To give them grace and mercy eke.
> Suffer them to make no bere [noise]
> But aye to be in their prayer.

Some twenty-five years ago the canons regular of the Lateran Congregation returned to this Cornish town, where before the Reformation their brethren the Austin Canons had a beautiful priory in honour of St. Mary and St. Petrock. The new priory is now the residence of the provincial, or visitor, the noviciate-house for England, and the centre from which several Missions—as Truro, St. Ives, and Newquay—are served by canons regular.

Although when the storm of persecution came and the religious houses were either seized or surrendered, the canons regular were not as faithful to the Church and their profession as might have been desired, yet there were not wanting many who preferred to lay down their lives rather than betray their Faith or give up God's property. Of this number were W. Wold, Prior of Bridlington, the Sub-Prior of Walsingham, with sixteen canons, and Ven. Laurence Vaux. The canonical order is now represented in England by Premonstratensians at Crowley, Manchester, Spalding, and Storrington. The Canons Regular of the Lateran Congregation are at Bodmin, Truro, St. Ives, and Newquay, in Cornwall; at Spettisbury and Swanage, in Dorsetshire; at Stroud Green and Eltham, in London. Besides the occupations of the regular life at home and the public recitation of the Divine Office in choir, they are chiefly employed in serving missions, preaching retreats, supplying for priests who ask their service, and hearing confessions, either as ordinary or extraordinary confessors to convents or other religious communities.

The canonical order must have been introduced into the New World soon after the discovery of that country by Columbus. In fact, tradition tells us that some canons regular from Spain were his companions in one or other of his voyages. Certain it is that at the general chapter of the Lateran Congregation held at Ravenna in 1558, at the request of many Spanish canons, Don Francis de Agala, a professed canon regular from Spain, who for some ten years had already laboured in the newly-discovered country, was created vicar-general in America, with powers to gather into communities all the members of the canonical institute who were then dispersed in those parts, and the obligation to report to the authorities of the order. At present there are canons regular of the Lateran Congregation in the Argentine, and in Canada the Canons of the Immaculate Conception serve different missions. The Premonstratensian Canons also are in different places in South America.

Reforms and Congregations.—As we have already observed, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries a great reform and revival took place in the canonical order. A great number of congregations of canons regular sprang into existence, each with its own distinctive constitutions, grounded on the Rule of St. Augustine and the statutes which Blessed Peter de Honestis, about the year 1100, gave to his canons at Ravenna, where also he instituted the first sodality, called "The Children of Mary". In order to preserve uniformity and regularity among these numerous congregations, Pope Benedict XII, in the year 1339, issued his Bull "Ad decorem", which may be rather called a book of constitutions to be observed by all canons regular then existing. By this Bull the order, then extending through Europe and Asia, was divided into twenty-two provinces or kingdoms, among them being Ireland, England, and Scotland, forming each a province. The abbots and visitors were to be convened at a provincial chapter to be held in each province every four years. Visitors were to be elected, whose duty it was to make a canonical visitation of every house in their respective provinces. Minute regulations are laid down for the daily recitation or singing of the Divine Office in choir, clothings, professions, studies at the universities, expenses and other details in the clerical life, and the general discipline of the canons in the cloister. The Roman Martyrology mentions the existence of more than thirty-three different congregations of canons regular. The historians of the order number no fewer than fifty-four. It is evident that it would be quite impossible to give here even a short account of each in particular, therefore we shall content ourselves with making special mention of a few.

By common consent the Lateran Congregation, officially styled *Congregatio SS. Salvatoris Lateranensis*, stands first in antiquity and importance. As the title implies, this congregation takes its origin from the Roman Basilica of St. John Lateran, the pope's own cathedral. History, confirmed by the authority of Pontifical Bulls, informs us that Pope Silvester established in the basilica built by the Emperor Constantine clerics living in common after the manner of the Primitive Church. In the year 492, Gelasius, a disciple of St. Augustine, as we have already mentioned, introduced in the patriarchal basilica the regular discipline which he had learnt at Hippo. Pope Gregory the Great, Eugenius II, Sergius III, and Alexander II, all endeavoured to maintain the observance of the regular life established among the clergy of the basilica. As relaxation had crept in, the last named pope, at the request of St. Peter Damian, called some canons

from St. Frigidian at Lucca, a house of strict observance. The reform spread, till at length the houses that had embraced it were formed into one large congregation. In the eighteenth century the Lateran Congregation numbered forty-five abbeys and seventy-nine other houses in Italy, besides many affiliated convents of canonesses, monasteries, and colleges of canons regular outside of Italy. The canons regular served the Lateran Basilica from the time they were put in possession till 1391, when secular canons were introduced by Boniface VIII. Several attempts were made to restore the basilica to its original owners, and finally Pope Eugenius IV, in 1445, gave it over to them, an act which was confirmed by Nicholas I. But the arrangement did not last long, and eventually the canons regular were definitively displaced, and the basilica made over to secular canons. All that remains now to the canons regular is the name they derive from the basilica and a few other privileges, such as precedence over all the other religious orders and the faculty of saying all the Offices which are said by the Lateran Canons in their Church.

There are at present houses belonging to the Lateran Congregation in Italy, Poland, France, Belgium, England, Spain, and America. The congregation is divided into six provinces, each presided over by a visitor or provincial. The abbot general and procurator general reside in Rome at S. Pietro in Vincoli, where is also the directorate of the confraternity called "The Children of Mary". There are novitiate-houses, where young men are prepared for the order, in Italy, Belgium, Spain, England, and Poland. The proper habit of the Lateran Congregation is a white woollen cassock with a linen rochet, which is worn as an essential part of the daily dress. Their work is essentially clerical, the recitation of the Divine Office in church, the administration of the Sacraments, the preaching of the Word. In Italy they have charge of parishes in Rome, Bologna, Genoa, Fano, Gubbio, and elsewhere.

It is the opinion of Helyot and others that no Canons of the Holy Sepulchre existed before 1114, when some canons regular, who had adopted the Rule of St. Augustine, were brought from the West and introduced into the Holy City by Godfrey of Bouillon. On the other hand, Suarez, Mauburn, Ferreri, Vanderspeeten, and others, upholding the tradition of the canonical order, maintain that St. James the Less, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, established clerics living in common in the Holy City, where also, after the time of the crusaders, flourished the Congregation of the Holy Sepulchre. Driven away by the Moslems, the canons sought refuge in Europe, where they had monasteries, in Italy, France, Spain, Poland, and the Low Countries. In these several countries, with the exception of Italy, they continued to exist until the French Revolution. In Italy they seem to have been suppressed by Innocent VIII, who, in 1489, transferred all their property to the Knights of Malta. As regards men, the congregation seems now extinct, but it is still represented by Sepulchrine Canonesses, who have converts in Belgium, Holland, France, Spain, and England. According to Dugdale's "Monasticon", the canons had two houses in England, one at Thetford and the other at Warwick. By a Bull, dated 10 January, 1143, to be found in the "Bullarium Lateranense", Pope Celestine II confirms the church and the Canons Regular of the Holy Sepulchre in all the possessions they had received from Godfrey of Bouillon, King Baldwin, and other benefactors. Mention is also made in the Bull of several churches in the Holy Land and in Italy belonging to the canons. Cardinal de Vitry, a canon regular of Oignies, and Cardinal Patriarch of Jerusalem, who had lived in Palestine some years, relates that the canons served, amongst other churches, that of the Holy Sepulchre and those on Mount Sion and on Mount Olivet. The patriarch was also Abbot of the Holy Sepulchre, and was elected by the canons regular.

In the year 1109 the famous scholar and teacher, William de Champeaux, formerly Archdeacon of Paris, and afterwards a canon regular, opened, at the request of his disciples, in his monastery of St. Victor near the city, a school which, owing to the great reputation of the master for learning, soon drew crowds of students from many parts. Founded by a scholar, the monastery of St. Victor for many centuries was a centre of learning and virtue, or, as a French writer (Pasquier) says, "Les lettres y furent toujours logées à bonnes enseignes" (there, letters were always entertained at good inns). Here were formed men like Hugh, Richard, and Adam of St. Victor, all famous for their theological works and their piety. The last-named, Adam, has been called by Dom Guéranger "the greatest poet of the Middle Ages". It was Adam who, among his beautiful liturgical hymns, composed three admirable proses in honour of St. Thomas of Canterbury, beginning "Gaude Sion et latare", "Aquas plenas amaritudine", "Pia Mater plangat Ecclesia". The pious composer writes very feelingly of the holy martyr, whom he had heard and seen at St. Victor only sixteen months before his martyrdom. The archbishop, while at Paris to thank the king for his protection, wished also to visit the monastery of St. Victor, where at the time lived the saintly Richard. This visit took place on the octave of the Feast of St. Augustine, and the chronicler relates how the future martyr was joyously received by the community and was introduced into the chapter-room, where he made an address to the brethren from the text, "In pace factus est locus" (Ps. lxxv). This visit and conference of their holy brother (for it must be remembered that St. Thomas had made his profession as a canon regular) made a great impression, we are told, on all who were present, and they remembered it when they shortly after heard of his cruel death.

So great was the reputation of the monastery built by William de Champeaux that houses were soon established everywhere after the model of St. Victor's, which was regarded as their mother-house. At the death of Gilduin, the immediate successor of William, who had been made Bishop of Châlons, the Congregation already counted forty-four houses. From this congregation, in 1149, sprang another, that of Sainte-Geneviève, which in its turn became very numerous and, reformed as the Gallican Congregation, in the sixteenth century, by a holy man called Charles Faure, had, at the outbreak of the Revolution, no fewer than one hundred abbeys and monasteries in France. Both these congregations became extinct, as far as men are concerned, but the ancient congregation of St. Victor is still represented by a very old community of canonesses at Ronsbrugge, near Ypres, in Belgium. Some years ago the congregation was revived, with some modifications, by the Very Rev. Dom Goea, then Vicar-General of St. Claude in France, under the denomination of Canons Regular of the Immaculate Conception. Before their expulsion from France they served the ancient Abbey of St. Anthony in Dauphiné. They have now emigrated to Italy and to Canada. Their habit is a white woollen gown and linen rochet with a black cloak.

The Premonstratensian Congregation was founded at Prémontré, near Laon, in France, by St. Norbert, in the year 1120, and approved by Pope Honorius II in 1126. According to the spirit of its founder, this congregation unites the active with the contemplative life, the institute embracing in its scope the sanctification of its members and the administration of the sacraments. It grew large even during the lifetime of its founder, and now has charge of many parishes and schools, especially in Austria and Hungary. The Premonstratensians wear a white habit with white

cincture. They are governed by an abbot general, vicars, and visitors.

The origin of the Congregation of the Holy Cross appears to be uncertain, although all admit its great antiquity. It has been divided into four chief branches: the Italian, the Bohemian, the Belgian, and the Spanish. Of this last very little is known. The branch once flourishing in Italy, after several attempts at reformation, was finally suppressed by Alexander VII in 1656. In Bohemia there are still some houses of Croisier Canons, as they are called, who, however, seem to be different from the well-known Belgian Canons of the Holy Cross, who trace their origin to the time of Innocent III and recognize for their Father Blessed Theodore de Celles, who founded their first house at Huy, near Liège. These Belgian Croisier Canons have a great affinity with the Dominicans. They follow the Rule of St. Augustine, and their constitutions are mainly those compiled for the Dominican Order by St. Raymond of Pennafort. Besides the usual duties of canons in the church, they are engaged in preaching, administering the sacraments, and teaching. Formerly they had houses in Belgium, Holland, Germany, France, England, Ireland, and Scotland. Till some years ago they served missions in North America. At present they have five monasteries in Belgium, of which St. Agatha is considered the mother-house. To these Croisier Canons belongs the privilege, granted to them by Leo X, and confirmed by Leo XIII, of blessing beads with an indulgence of 500 days. Their habit was formerly black, but is now a white soutane with a black scapular and a cross, white and black, on the breast. In choir they wear in summer the rochet with a black almuce.

To St. Gilbert of Sempringham is due the honour of founding the only religious order of distinctly English origin. Having completed his studies in England and in France, he returned to the Diocese of Lincoln, where he began to labour with great zeal for the salvation of souls, becoming a canon regular in the monastery of Bridlington. But finding that the discipline of the order was not strictly observed, he conceived, in 1148, the idea of introducing a reform in those regions. After much prayer, thought, and taking advice from holy men, he came to the conclusion that it was necessary to establish a new congregation, composed of both men and women, who should live under the same roof, though of course separated. This idea he put into execution, giving the rule of St. Benedict to the women and that of canons regular to the men, with special and carefully elaborated constitutions for both. The Gilbertine Congregation spread especially in the North of England, and, as already stated, at the time of the general dissolution it had twenty houses and one hundred and fifty-one religious. At the temporary University of Stamford, Sempringham Hall, founded by Robert Lutrell in 1292, was especially for the students of the Gilbertine Congregation.

The canons regular, usually called monks, whom visitors find serving at the Hospice on the Great St. Bernard, belong to the Congregation of St. Augustine, St. Bernard, and St. Nicholas, as it is officially called. They were established on this famous pass of the Alps by Bernard of Menthon, a canon regular of Aosta, about the year 969, according to some, or later, according to others. The religious institute in such a place was only meant by the founder for the convenience of pilgrims and travellers who cross the Alps at a point always full of dangers. The hospice, the canons, their work are too well known to need more than a short mention here. Besides lay brothers and servants, there are always at the hospice about fifteen canons, who come from Martigny, their mother-house, where also resides the superior general of the congregation. Some canons have charge of the hospice on the Simplon Pass, and a certain number of parishes in the Canton Valais are served by canons of the same congregation.

The origin of the Windesheim Congregation is due to Gerard Groot, a zealous preacher and reformer of the fourteenth century, at Deventer in the Low Countries. Touched by his preaching and example, many poor clerical students gathered around him and, under his direction, "putting together whatever they earned week by week, began to live in common". Such was the beginning of the institute known as that of the "Brothers and Sisters of the Common Life". This institution spread rapidly, and in a short time nearly every town in Holland and the adjacent countries contained one or more houses of "The New Devotion", as it was then called. But difficulties were not wanting. The members of "The New Devotion" were not bound together by any vows, and the institute had received no formal approval from the ecclesiastical authorities. Groot foresaw that the only safeguard for the continuance of the new institute was to affiliate it in some way to some great religious order already approved by the Church, to the authority of which the "devout brethren and sisters" might look for guidance and protection. Having heard of the famous Blessed John Ruysbrock, prior of a house of canons regular at Groendael near Brussels, he went to visit and consult him. Deeply edified by what he saw and heard there, Gerard Groot resolved to place this new institute under the spiritual guidance of the canons regular. The execution of this resolve was left by Gerard Groot, at his death, to his beloved disciple, Florentius Radewyn. A beginning was soon made, and the foundation of the first house laid at Windesheim, near Zwolle. This became the mother-house of the famous congregation, which, only sixty years after the death of Groot, possessed in Belgium alone more than eighty well-organized monasteries, some of which, according to the chronicler John Buschius, who had visited them all, contained as many as a hundred, or even two hundred, inmates. The congregation continued in its primitive fervour until the devastations of the Reformers drove it from its native soil, and it was at last utterly destroyed during the French Revolution. To this double institute the Church owes many pious and learned men—as Raymund Jordan, called Idiota, John Ruysbrock, Mauburn, Garetius, Latomus, and Erasmus. Some, like St. John Ostervick, canonized by Pius IX, shed their blood rather than deny their Faith. Chief among these learned and holy men stands Thomas à Kempis, who when still a youth joined the institute, and knew the saintly Florentius and the first founders of the congregation.

Although the canonical order possessed so many houses in Ireland before the dissolution by Henry VIII; yet, on account of the persecution, little by little it appears to have languished, and by 1620 to have been nearly extinct; it somewhat revived, however, for canons regular were once more to be found in the country not long after this. It is not improbable that at the outbreak of the persecution, like many members of other religious orders, some of the Irish canons may have retired to foreign monasteries and maintained a quasi-independent existence, and have been joined by others of their compatriots who were desirous of entering the canonical institute. In 1645 Dom Thaddeus O'Conel was butchered at Sligo by the Scotch Puritans together with the Archbishop of Tuam, Malachy O'Quechly. At the commencement of 1646 the canons were sufficiently numerous to be formed by Innocent X into a separate congregation, that of St. Patrick, and this congregation, as the same pope declared, inherited all the rights, privileges, and possessions of the old Irish canons. In the year 1698 the Irish Congregation, by a Bull of Innocent XII, was affiliated and aggregated to the Lateran Congregation. From the moment the union was made the two congregations formed but one, and the members

of each enjoyed all the rights and privileges of the other. The constitutions of the Lateran Congregation were adopted with some little modification by the Irish. In 1703 Dom Milerius Burke, Abbot of St. Thomas, Dublin, was appointed by the abbot general, Clappini, with the approval of Clement XI, vicar-general in the three kingdoms. In 1735 the Irish canons were claiming before the Congregation of Propaganda their right to several churches, parishes, and houses. The cause was settled in their favour, but there were many difficulties, and they could get possession of only a few. In the "Spicilegium Ossoriense" (III, 148) we find that Henry O'Kelly, a canon regular, obtained from Pope Benedict XIII letters in virtue of which he not only called himself Abbot of St. Thomas, Dublin, but also claimed the parochial rights over a great part of the city, without any dependence upon the metropolitan. The last canon of the Irish Congregation died towards the beginning of the nineteenth century. But the Irish Congregation having been united, as we have stated, with the Lateran, all its rights and privileges still survive in the last-named.

The Austrian Congregation, formed in 1907, is composed of the various ancient monasteries, abbeys, and collegiate churches of canons regular in Austria. These are St. Florian, Klosterneuburg, Herzogenburg, Reichersburg, Voran, Neustift. The president of this new congregation is the Abbot of St. Florian.

Other more or less distinct congregations now no longer in existence have been those of St. Rufus, founded in 1039, and once flourishing in Dauphiné; of Aroasia (Diocese of Arras, in France), founded in 1097; Marbach (1100); of the Holy Redeemer of Bologna, also called the Renana (1136), now united to the Lateran Congregation; of the Holy Spirit in Sassia (1198); of St. George in Alga, at Venice(1404); of Our Saviour in Lorraine, reformed in 1628 by St. Peter Fourier.

CANONESSES REGULAR.—To most religious orders and congregations of men convents of nuns are related, following the same rules and constitutions. There are canonesses regular, as well as canons regular. The Apostolic origin is common to both. As Suarez says, "with regard to origin and antiquity the same is to be said of orders of women both in general and in particular as of orders of men. The one generally began with the other. St. Basil in his rules addresses both men and women. And St. Augustine founded his first monastery for women in Africa at Tagaste". Most, if not all, of the congregations which go to form the canonical order had, or still have, a correlative congregation for women. In Ireland St. Patrick instituted canons regular, and St. Bridget was the first of numberless canonesses. The monasteries of the Gilbertine Congregation were nearly always double, for men and women. As with the canons, so also among the canonesses, discipline and love of community life now flourished now languished, so that in the tenth and eleventh centuries many of them became *canonicæ sæculares* and, though living in the same house, no longer cherished the spirit of religious poverty or kept a common table.

On the other hand many communities of canonesses willingly took the name and the rule of life laid down for the congregations of regular canons. There still exist in Italy, France, Spain, Belgium, Holland, England, Germany, Africa, America, nuns and convents belonging to the Lateran or to some other congregation of canons regular. The contemplative life is represented by such convents as Newton Abbot in England, Sta. Pudenziana at Rome, Sta. Maria di Passione at Genoa, Hernani in Spain, St. Trudo at Bruges. The Hospitalarians were till lately well represented in France with convents of canonesses at Paris, Reims, Laon, Soissons, and elsewhere.

Occupied in the education of children, there are, besides some of the ancient convents of canonesses of various congregations, the canonesses of the Congregation of Notre Dame, instituted in 1597 at Mattaincourt, in Lorraine, by St. Peter Fourier. This congregation, whose object is the gratuitous education of poor girls, spread rapidly in France and Italy. There are now convents of Notre Dame in France, Belgium, Holland, Austria, Germany, Italy, and Africa. In France alone, until the persecution of 1907, they had some thirty flourishing communities and as many schools for externs and boarders. Driven away from France, some have taken refuge in England, like those of the famous convent of Les Oiseaux, Paris, who are now at Westgate, and those of Versailles who have settled at Hull. With some modifications the work was soon introduced into the New World in a remarkable way. The canonesses of the convent at Troyes had for some time earnestly desired to carry on their institute in Canada. Circumstances, however, prevented their going, but at their request Margaret Bourgeoys, the president of the confraternity attached to their convent, gladly crossed the ocean. In 1657 she opened a school at Montreal, in which, in accordance with the rules laid down by Peter Fourier, the poor were taught gratuitously. The school was a great success. Margaret returned to France to ask for helpers, and found them among her sisters, the Children of Mary of Troyes. Returning to Canada with four fellow-workers, and soon followed by others, she opened a school for boarders as well as a day school. In 1676 these pious women were formed into the "Congregation of Notre Dame". Margaret died in 1700 and has since been declared venerable. The work she had transferred to Canada is still flourishing. At her death there were ten houses in the Dominion; there are now more than a hundred spread over the whole of North America under a superior general, who resides at the mother-house, Montreal.

In 1809 Bishop Wittmann founded, in Bavaria, "The Poor Sisters of the Schools of Notre Dame", an institute similar to that founded by St. Peter Fourier. This association is now widespread in Europe and in America, and has done excellent work in the field of education.

There are English canonesses at Bruges, and at Neuilly, near Paris. In England there is a convent of the Holy Sepulchre at New Hall, with a flourishing school, originally at Liège; also a filiation of that at Bruges, at Hayward's Heath, with a large school; at Newton Abbot a numerous community, with a colony at Hoddesdon, devoted to the contemplative life and the Perpetual Adoration. This last convent is, as it were, a link with the pre-Reformation canonesses, through Sister Elizabeth Woodford, who was professed at Barnham Priory, Bucks, 8 December, 1519. When the convent was suppressed, in 1539, she was received for some time into the household of Saint Thomas More. Later on she went to the Low Countries and was received into the convent of canonesses regular at St. Ursula's, Louvain, of the Windesheim Congregation. So many English ladies, daughters and sisters of martyrs, like Ann Clitheroe, Margaret Clement, Eleanor and Margaret Garnet, followed her that, in 1609, they formed an English community, St. Monica's, Louvain. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, this community of English canonesses returned to England, first to Spettisbury, afterwards to their present home at Newton Abbot. The chronicles of this ancient convent are being published, and two very interesting volumes have already appeared.

Bullarium Lateranense (Rome, 1727); PENNOTTO, *Generalis Sacri Ordinis Clericorum-Canonicorum Historia Tripartita* (Rome, 1642); AMORT, *Vetus disciplina canonici sæcularis et regularis;* BENVENUTI, *Discorso storico-teologico della vita commune dei Chierici dei primi dodici secoli della Chiesa* (1728); MOLINET, *Sur l'origine et l'antiquité des chanoines séculiers et réguliers;* PISANI, *Notice historique sur l'Ordre des Chanoines*

Réguliers (Louvain, 1874); Bonneau, *Simple Notice sur l'Ordre Apostolique des Chanoines Réguliers* (Louvain, 1892); Gautier, *Œuvres poétiques d'Adam de St. Victor* (Paris, 1858); Scully, *Life of the Ven. Thomas à Kempis* (London, 1901); *Journal of Theological Studies* (London, 1904), V; Reeves (ed.), *Life of St. Columba, Founder of Hy, Written by Adamnan* (Edinburgh, 1874); Suarez, tr. Humphrey, *The Religious State:* Randolph, *Abbeys around London* (London, 1899); Hamilton (ed.) *Chronicle of the English Canonesses, Louvain* (London, 1905); Hermans, *Annales Canonicorum Reg. Ordinis S. Crucis* (Bois-le-duc, 1858); Helyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires* (Paris, 1714); Miræus, *Origines Canonic. Regularium* (Cologne, 1615); *De Collegiis Can. Reg.* (Cologne, 1615); *Codex regular. et constit. Can. Reg.* (Antwerp, 1638).

A. Allaria.

Canons Regular of the Immaculate Conception.—A congregation founded in the department of Isère, at Saint-Antoine, France, by the Abbé Dom Adrien Gréa, and approved by Pius IX and Leo XIII, in three rescripts, 1870, 1876, and 1887. Its members have undertaken the restoration of canonical life with its primitive observances, the recitation of the whole of the Divine Office day and night, perpetual abstinence and the fasts of early days. Their object is to unite the practices of ordinary religious life to clerical functions, principally in the administration of clerical duties and the education of young clerics. The mother-house is at Saint-Antoine, but following the French laws of 1901 and the persecution which was the consequence thereof, the community was transferred to Andora Stazione, in the province of Genoa, Italy. The congregation has houses in France, Switzerland, Italy, Scotland, and in Canada, where it was established in 1891, at Nomingue in Ottawa and at St. Boniface in Manitoba. There are four establishments in the Diocese of Ottawa, six in that of St. Boniface, two in Saskatchewan and one in Prince Albert. The community is composed of eight priests and major clerics, and of about as many scholastics, postulants and lay brothers. The priests are successfully employed in colonization and the education of youth.

Le Canada Ecclésiastique (Montreal, 1907).

Elie J. Auclair.

Canopus, a titular see of Egypt. Its old Egyptian name was Pekuat; the Greeks called it Kanobos, or Kanopos, after a commander of a Greek fleet buried there. The city stood in the seventh *Nomos* (Menelaites, later Canopites), not far from the Canopic mouth. It had many martyrs in the persecution of Diocletian, among others St. Athanasia with her three daughters, and Sts. Cyrus and John. There was here a monastery called Metanoia, founded by monks from Tabennisi, where many patriarchs of Alexandria took shelter during the religious quarrels of the fifth century. Two miles east of Canopus was the famous heathen temple of Manouthin, afterwards destroyed by monks, and a church on the same spot dedicated to the Evangelists. St. Cyril of Alexandria solemnly transported the relics of the holy martyrs Cyrus and John into the church, which became an important place of pilgrimage. It was here that St. Sophronius of Jerusalem was healed of an ophthalmy that had been declared incurable by the physicians (610–619), whereupon he wrote the panegyric of the two saints with a collection of seventy miracles worked in their sanctuary (Migne, P. G., LXXXVII, 3379–676).

Canopus formed, with Menelaus and Schedia, a see subject to Alexandria in Ægyptus Prima; it is usually called Schedia in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum". Two titulars are mentioned by Lequien (II, 415), one in 325, the other in 362. The modern Arabic name is Aboukir, "Father Cyrus", in honour of the first of the two celebrated martyrs. It is to-day a village with 1000 inhabitants, at the end of a little peninsula north-east of Alexandria. It has a trade in quails, which are caught in nets hung along the shore. Off Aboukir, 1 August, 1798, the French fleet was destroyed within the roads by Nelson; 25 July, 1799, Bonaparte destroyed there a Turkish army 18,000 strong; and on 8 March, 1801, the French garrison of 1800 men was defeated by 20,000 English and Turks commanded by Abercromby.

Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878), I, 501.

S. Vailhé.

Canopy, in general, is an ornamental covering of cloth, stone, wood, or metal, used to crown an altar, throne, pulpit, statue, etc. In liturgical language, the term is commonly employed to designate (a) the structure covering an altar, formerly fitted with curtains and supported on four pillars; (b) the covering suspended over the throne occupied by dignitaries of the Church or princes; (c) the covering under which the Blessed Sacrament is sometimes borne in processions etc. In medieval times altars were protected by a covering then called a ciborium (see the article Altar, under sub-title *Ciborium*), but now known as a baldachinum (q. v.), or canopy, which survives at the present day as a feature of certain styles of architecture. When an altar had no ciborium it was covered with a cloth called a dais. As a mark of distinction bishops and higher prelates have a right to a covering over the thrones which they occupy at certain ecclesiastical functions. This is called a canopy. It is sometimes granted by special privilege to prelates inferior to bishops, but always with limitations as to the days on which it may be used and the character of its ornamentation. When bishops assist at solemn functions in the churches of regulars the latter are bound to provide the episcopal seat with a canopy (Cong. of Bishops and Regulars, 1603). Princes enjoy similar privileges, but their seats should be outside the sanctuary, and regulated in accordance with custom. The colour of the canopy should correspond with that of the other vestments. Two kinds of canopy are employed in processions of the Blessed Sacrament. One of small dimensions and shaped like an umbrella—except that it is flat and not conical—is called an *ombrellino*. It is provided with a long staff by which it is held. The other, called a *baldacchino*, is of more elaborate structure and consists, in main outline, of a rectangular frame-work of rich cloth, supported by four, six, or eight staves by which it is carried. In both cases the covering consists of cloth of gold, or silk of white colour. The *ombrellino* is used for carrying the Blessed Sacrament to the sick and for conveying it from the altar to the *baldacchino*. The latter is used for all public processions, when it is borne by nobles of the highest rank, the more worthy holding the foremost staves. It is forbidden to carry relics of the saints under the *baldacchino*, but this honour may be given to those of the Sacred Passion (Cong. of Rites, May, 1826).

External Pulpit at Prato, by Donatello and M. Bartolommeo

Cæremoniale Episcoporum, (Rome, 1902), passim; Du Cange, *Glossarium Latinitatis*, s. vv. *Conopeum, Ciborium, Baldachinum* (Venice, 1738); Pugin, *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornaments*, s. v. *Canopy* (London, 1868); Bourassé, *Dictionnaire*

d'archéologie sacrée, s. v. *Baldaquin* (Paris, 1851); KRAUS, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst* (Freiburg im Br., 1896), I, 372 etc.

PATRICK MORRISROE.

Canosa, DIOCESE OF. See BARI.

Canossa, a former castle of Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, in the foothills of the Apennines, about eighteen miles from Parma, where took place the dramatic penance of King Henry IV of Germany in presence of Pope Gregory VII. The king, excommunicated 22 February, 1076, would have been utterly abandoned by the inimical German princes unless within a year he made peace with the pope. Early in January, 1077, the latter was on his way to the diet called to meet at Augsburg, 2 February, when he heard that Henry had crossed Mont Cenis. Fearing for his person, he took refuge in the impregnable and almost inaccessible burg of Canossa, the hereditary stronghold of his friend and protectress, Matilda. The king, however, was really intent on performing the penance necessary to lift the excommunication, by which diplomatic step the plans of his enemies in Germany would be nullified. For three days (25–27 January) he stood constantly before the castle gate, in the dress of a penitent, beseeching with many tears the pope's forgiveness. Gregory finally yielded, moved by the royal compunction and by the importunities of his royal entourage, among them Matilda. He received Henry back into the communion of the Church, and promised to promote his reconciliation with the German princes. But the king soon violated his solemn oath to comply with the pope's conditions, and renewed the conflict. The story, as narrated above, is told by Gregory himself (Reg. Ep., IV, 12), in a letter to the princes of Germany explanatory of the event of Canossa. The contemporary chronicler, Lambert of Hersfeld, asserts that at the Mass of reconciliation the pope, when about to give communion to Henry, took himself one half of the Sacred Host and challenged the king to take the other as an ordeal. Modern historians deny the truth of this assertion.

RUINS OF THE CASTLE, AFTER A DRAWING BY F. PRELLER, THE YOUNGER

The penance of Henry was, in reality, only a personal humiliation, and not a degradation of the royal office; nor was it in that form imposed by the pope, nor did the king spend three days and nights in his bare shirt without food and without shelter (Hergenröther, "Kirchengeschichte", ed. Kirsch, II, 361). The ruins of Canossa are now within the Commune of Ciano d'Enza, some shapeless fragments of broken walls that rise on rocky buttresses above a sea of hardened brown mud, "twisted and tossed and contorted into the most hideous of crevasses" (Hare). The castle-well and "gate of penance" alone remain.

HARE. *Cities of Northern Italy* (London, 1896), II, 245–49; BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (Munich, 1906), I, 830; KNÖPFLER, *Die Tage von Tribur und Canossa*, in *Hist. Polit. Blätter* (1884), XCIV, 209, 381; GOSSELIN, *Temporal Power of the Pope in the Middle Ages* (Baltimore, 1853), II; HERGENRÖTHER, *Church and State* (tr., London, 1872).

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Canova, ANTONIO, the greatest Italian sculptor of modern times, b. at Possagno, in the province of Treviso, 1 November, 1757; d. at Venice 13 October, 1822. Educated by his grandfather, Pasino Canova, a stone-cutter of unusual ability, the boy could model in clay and carve little marble shrines before he was ten. The attention of Senator Giovanni Falieri was attracted to the child, whom he placed with the sculptor Torretto at Bassano, where he worked for two years. Canova then went back to his grandfather; but Falieri's sons interceded for their playmate, and the boy-artist was invited to the palace in Venice. After one year under Torretto's nephew, he spent the next four years in independent efforts. He owed his first workshop to the kindness of certain monks who gave him a vacant cell for a studio. In his sixteenth year he modelled his first statue, "Eurydice"; three years later he produced the "Orpheus", both now in the Villa Falieri at Asolo. Then came the "Dædalus and Icarus", a remarkable group, dramatic and full of movement (Venice Academy). In 1780 Canova went to Rome, where he came into contact with the antique from which his talent received fresh energy, and he applied himself earnestly to its study. "Theseus and the Minotaur" (1782) is one of his best works (Volksgarten, Vienna). In 1787 the young sculptor executed the monument to Clement XIV in the church of the Santi Apostoli at Rome. The noble figure of the pontiff is seated, the right hand stretched forth in benediction. His next work was the elaborate tomb of Clement XIII in St. Peter's, with the admirable "Lions of Canova" at the base.



ANTONIO CANOVA

In 1793 he did the Cadenabbia "Psyche and Cupid", a graceful composition of exquisite lines; and in 1796 the life-size "Kneeling Magdalen" (Cadenabbia) and the "Hebe" (Berlin). The year following saw the "Psyche and Cupid" of the Louvre. In 1800 Canova made the "Perseus" which stands grouped with his two boxers, "Kreugas and Damoxenus", in the Gabinetto Canova of the Vatican Gallery.

In 1802, by special request of Napoleon I, he went to Paris and modelled a colossal figure of the emperor, holding a Victory in his hand (Apsley House, London). His "Bust of Napoleon" is in the Corcoran Gallery, Washington. Some years later Canova modelled a noble statue of Napoleon's mother in antique garb; one of Marie Louise as "Concord" (Parma) and the reclining portrait of Pauline Bonaparte, wife of Prince Borghese, as "Venus Victrix" (Villa Borghese, Rome). The colossal, boyish "Palamedes" for the Villa Carlotta, Cadenabbia (1804), was followed next year by the "Venus from the Bath" (Pitti Palace, Florence). At the same time Canova was engaged upon the monument for the Archduchess Maria Christina, a group of nine mourning figures entering a mausoleum (church of the Augustinians, Vienna), and travelled to Austria to superintend the setting up of the work. In 1807 he executed the "Bust of Pius VII", one of his most notable achievements in portraiture. The number of his productions is so large that it is impossible to mention minor ones. Some of his lighter subjects, "his leisures" he called them, are well known, e. g. the "Dancing Girls". In 1814 he produced the "Three Graces".

TOMB OF THE ARCHDUCHESS MARIA CHRISTINA—CANOVA

AUGUSTINIAN CHURCH, VIENNA

In 1815 Canova went to Paris, as the pope's envoy, to negotiate for the return of the art treasures carried away from Italy by Napoleon in his campaign, and conducted his mission so successfully that a large part of the spoils was recovered. In acknowledgment of his services he was created Marquis of Ischia, with an income attached to the title. The pope in person inscribed the sculptor's name in the Golden Book of Roman Nobles. Canova, about this time, blocked out his colossal statue of Religion holding a cross and unveiling a circular relief on which was the figure of the Lamb. Owing to its huge size the "Religion" found no place; it was repeated on a lesser scale for Lord Brownlow. In 1817 came the charming "Infant St. John" and the tomb for the Stuart princes in St. Peter's. In 1818 Canova was commissioned to make a heroic statue of Washington for the State House, Raleigh, N. C. He clothed him as a Roman warrior but the head was mild and full of dignity. The "Recumbent Magdalen", for the Earl of Liverpool, was one of the sculptor's latest works, as was also the "Pius VI" (in the *Confessio* at St. Peter's), whose uplifted face and joined hands are full of a religious exaltation. A colossal bust of his friend and biographer, Count Cicognara, was the last work from his hand.

Canova was buried at his native Possagno, where he had spent large sums in erecting a memorial church, in imitation of the Parthenon and Pantheon. His bronze "Pietà" is there, also the "Descent from the Cross", one of his few paintings, coloured in the manner of the early Venetians. Leo XII gave him a monument in the Capitol (Rome); and a design which the master had made for Titian's tomb was used for his own in S. Maria dei Frari, Venice. Canova's main glory rests on his classic subjects; he did not wholly escape the affectation and artificiality of his day, but his best sculptures are noble in conception and form, full of grace, tranquil beauty, and elegance. He lifted the art of sculpture from the low condition to which it had fallen in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. His finish was peculiarly soft and velvet-like, the flesh having an appearance of bloom. His friends have denied that he used acids to produce this effect. It should be noted, however, that very different estimates have been formed of his work, especially of his religious subjects. In character Canova was gentle, modest, of a religious nature, and of the most unwearying generosity. He was an indefatigable worker, and employed in beneficence, especially for the advancement of young artists, the wealth which flowed in upon him. He received many honours: orders of chivalry, membership in the French Institute, and a perpetual presidentship of the Roman Academy of St. Luke. He was never married, and the name is said to be extinct, save as borne by the descendants of his stepbrothers called Satori-Canova.

CICOGNARA, *Biografia di Antonio Canova* (Venice, 1823); ALBRIZZI, *Opere di Scultura e di Plastica di Antonio Canova descritte* (Venice, 1809); MEYER, *Canova* (Leipzig, 1898).

M. L. HANDLEY.

Cantabrigiensis Codex. See CODEX BEZÆ.

Cantate Sunday, a name given to the fourth Sunday after Easter, from the first word of the Introit at Mass on that day—"Cantate Domino novum canticum", Sing ye to the Lord a new song—similar to the names *Gaudete* and *Lætare* Sundays, assigned to the third Sunday of Advent and the fourth of Lent. These names, which are as old probably as the twelfth century, appear to have been in common use in the Middle Ages and to have been employed to signify the date in secular affairs as well as ecclesiastical. John of Salisbury, Bishop of Chartres (d. 1182), is one of the earliest writers to use the name.

GUÉRANGER, *Liturgical Year* (Worcester, s. d.); HAMPSON, *Medii ævi Kalendarium, or Dates, Charters and Customs of the Middle Ages* (London, 1841), II, 40.

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Canterbury (CANTUARIA—Roman name, DUROVERNUM, whence, in Anglo-Saxon times, DUROVERNIA), ANCIENT DIOCESE OF (CANTUARIENSIS), the Mother-Church and Primatial See of All England, from 597 till the death of the last Catholic Archbishop, Cardinal Pole, in 1558.

FOUNDATION OF THE SEE.—When St. Augustine was sent to evangelize England by St. Gregory the Great, he found an opening for his labours in the fact that Æthelburga or Bertha, Queen of Æthelberht, King of Kent, was a Christian and a disciple of St. Gregory of Tours. This led him to Canterbury, where he converted the king and many thousands of Saxons in 597, the very year of his landing. Though St. Gregory had planned the division of England into two archbishoprics, one at London and one at York, St. Augustine's success at Canterbury explains how the southern archiepiscopal see came to be fixed there instead of at London. The first beginnings of the diocese are told by St. Bede (Hist. Eccl., I, xxxiii). "When Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury, assumed the episcopal throne in that royal city, he recovered therein, by the King's assistance, a church which, as he was told, had been constructed by the original labour of Roman believers. This church he consecrated in the name of the Saviour, our God and Lord Jesus Christ, and there he established an habitation for himself and all his successors".

SEAL OF ST. ANSELM, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

THE ARCHBISHOPS.—There were in all sixty-eight archbishops during the period, just short of a thousand years, in which Canterbury was the chief Catholic see in England. In the following list the dates of some of the earlier prelates cannot be regarded as critically certain, but are those usually given. Those marked with an asterisk became cardinals.

St. Augustine, 597–604.
St. Laurence, 604–619.
St. Mellitus, 619–624.
St. Justus, 624–627.
St. Honorius, 627–653.
St. Deusdedit, 655–664.
St. Theodore, 668–690.
St. Berhtwald, 693–731.
St. Tatwin, 731–734.
Nothelm, 735–740.
Cuthbert, 741–758
Bregwin, 759–765.
Jaenberht, 766–790.
Ethelhard, 793–805
Wulfred, 805–832
Feologild, 832–
Ceolnoth, 833–870
Ethelred, 870–889.
Plegmund, 890–914
Athelm. 914–923.
Wulfhelm, 923–942.
St. Odo, 942–958.
Alfsin, 959–959.
St. Dunstan, 960–988.
Ethelgar, 988–989.
Sigeric, 990–994.
Elfric, 995–1005.
St. Ælphege, 1005–1012.
Living, 1013–1020.
St. Ethelnoth, 1020–1038.
St. Eadsi, 1038–1050.
Robert, 1051–1052.
Stigand, 1052–1070.
Lanfranc, 1070–1089.
St. Anselm, 1093–1109.
Ralph d'Escures, 1114–1122.
William de Corbeuil, 1123–1136.
Theobald, 1139–1161.
St. Thomas Becket, 1162–1170.
Richard, 1174–1184.
Baldwin, 1185–1190.
Hubert Walter, 1193–1205.
Stephen Langton,* 1207–1228.
Richard Grant, 1229–1231.

St. Edmund Rich, 1234–1240.
Boniface of Savoy, 1245–1270.
Robert Kilwardby,* 1273–1279.
John Peckham, 1279–1292.
Robert Winchelsey, 1294–1313.
Walter Reynolds, 1313–1327.
Simon Meopham, 1328–1333.
John Stratford, 1333–1348.
Thomas Bradwardine, 1349–1349.
Simon Islip, 1349–1366.
Simon Langham,* 1366–1368.
William Whittlesey, 1368–1374.
Simon Sudbury, 1375–1381.
William Courtenay, 1381–1396.
Thomas Arundel, 1396–1414.
Henry Chicheley,* 1414–1443.
John Stafford,* 1443–1452.
John Kemp,* 1452–1454.
Thomas Bourchier,* 1454–1486.
John Morton,* 1486–1500.
Henry Dean, 1502–1503.
William Warham, 1503–1532.
Thomas Cranmer, 1533–1556.
Reginald Pole,* 1556–1558.

Of this list seventeen archbishops were recognized as saints, nine were cardinals, and twelve became Lord Chancellors of England. The full title of the archbishop was Primate of all England, Metropolitan of the Province, and Diocesan of the Diocese. In documents he was described as Archbishop *providentiâ divinâ*, instead of *permissione divinâ*, as was usual with other bishops.

Metropolitan Rights.—The organization of the province was, of course, a matter of gradual growth, and therefore the number and the names of the suffragan sees in the earlier periods vary very much, as does the extent of the metropolitan jurisdiction. At the height of its power Canterbury counted seventeen suffragan sees: Bangor, Bath and Wells, Chichester, Coventry and Lichfield, Ely, Exeter, Hereford, Llandaff, Lincoln, London, Norwich, Rochester, St. Asaph, St. David's, Salisbury, Winchester, and Worcester. To these were added five of the six sees founded under Henry VIII in 1541 and afterwards recognized by the Holy See under Mary (1553–1558), viz., Bristol, Gloucester, Oxford, Peterborough, and Westminster. Several of these bishops acted on state occasions as the *curia* of the archbishop. Thus the Bishop of London acted as his dean; Winchester was his chancellor; Lincoln his vice-chancellor; Salisbury his precentor; Worcester his chaplain; and Rochester his cross-bearer. Even the Archbishop of York was not exempt from his jurisdiction, and these metropolitan rights also extended to Irish bishops (see Wharton, "Anglia Sacra", for instances) and to the clergy of Normandy, Gascony, and Aquitaine, as long as these provinces formed part of the English dominions. The archbishop enjoyed perpetual legatine power, being *Apostolicæ Sedis legatus natus*, and in councils abroad he took precedence of other archbishops, having the right to a special place "at the Pope's right foot". In England he was the ordinary of the royal court, wherever held, and the king and queen were regarded as his parishioners. He had the right of crowning and anointing the sovereign, a privilege confirmed by a Bull of Alexander III. He was the first peer of the realm, with precedence over all dukes not of the blood royal. He had the right of confirming the election of all suffragan bishops, and of consecrating them, and in the case of Rochester he enjoyed the patronage of the see, having the nomination of the bishop and the right to the temporalities during all vacancies. He also possessed many churches and parishes in the dioceses of London, Winchester, Norwich, Lincoln, Chichester, and Rochester. There were over eighty such benefices, all of which were exempt from the jurisdiction of their proper bishops and subject to him. The archbishop alone had the right of summoning a provincial synod.

The Diocese.—The diocese itself was not of great extent, consisting only of part of the County of Kent. There were 257 parishes, and only one archdeaconry for the whole diocese. The archbishop's palace was at Canterbury on the west side of the cathedral. The archbishop owned more than twenty manors in Kent alone, including the castle of Saltwood. The London residence, in later times, was at the Manor of Lambeth, while Otford was the most favoured country seat.

The Cathedral.—The consecration by St. Augustine of an existing Roman basilica has been described in the words of the Ven. Bede. This building, with additions and alterations, continued till 1067, when, with the adjacent monastery, it was destroyed by fire. In 1070 Lanfranc began to rebuild it on a considerable scale, but no trace of his work remains visible. But the present nave and western towers still rest on his foundations, and in fact the existing

Cathedral Cloisters, Canterbury

cathedral covers as nearly as possible the same ground, with the addition of the retro-choir. Parts of the crypt and some of the monastery ruins also belong to his period. A new choir, afterwards known as the "glorious choir of Conrad", was begun in 1096, finished in 1130, and burnt in 1174, though two chapels and part of the crypt survive. The present choir, begun by William of Sens and continued by William the Englishman, was finished in 1184, and is the earliest specimen of Transitional architecture, as well as being the longest choir in England (180 feet). In 1378 Lanfranc's nave was pulled down, and the present nave was begun by Prior Chillendon. At the same date the chapter house and cloisters were finished. Finally the cathedral was completed, about 1495, by the erection of the great central tower 235 feet high. The total length of the cathedral is 522 feet, the breadth of the nave and aisles 71 feet. The building illustrates in itself almost all the varieties of Gothic, though Early English and Perpendicular predominate.

History of the See.—Before England had acquired national unity, the foundation of the see had given it ecclesiastical unity. Older than any national institution, its history is inseparably bound up with that of the country, and the barest outline exceeds our space. The formation of the diocese was monastic, taking its rise from the Monastery of Christ Church, and the ecclesiastical organization grew by means of the great religious houses at Dover, Lyminge, Folkestone, Minster in Sheppy, Minster in Thanet, Reculver, and the great rival monastery in Canterbury of Sts. Peter and Paul, afterwards St. Augustine's. Throughout the subsequent history the archbishops could not deal with archiepiscopal

THE CATHEDRAL, CANTERBURY

property without the concurrence of the monastic chapter, and the efforts of the archbishops to rid themselves of the control of the Canterbury monks gave rise to the frequent disputes between prelate and chapter that recur throughout the history of the diocese. From these foundations as centres the parochial system gradually spread. Another characteristic was the purely Roman character of the Church in Kent. It was free from all such conflicts with Celtic Christianity as took place in the North, and in liturgy it never developed a local use, but followed the Roman Rite that St. Augustine had introduced. The first five archbishops were all Romans, St. Deusdedit being the first Englishman to rule the see. He was succeeded by St. Theodore, a Greek, one of the greatest of the archbishops, who travelled throughout England, and organized the primatial power and metropolitan jurisdiction. He was followed by a line of monastic prelates, chiefly local administrators. Under one of these, Jaenberht (766–790), during the supremacy of Mercia, the very primacy was threatened by the establishment of an Archbishopric of Lichfield, but this did not last. After Alfred's time came several archbishops translated from other sees, and bringing wider knowledge, so that the see grew in authority until it rose to its height during the episcopate of St. Dunstan, whose genius marked an epoch in diocesan, as in national, history. Under him the influence of Canterbury was felt throughout the land. While relying chiefly on the work of the greater monasteries, he also encouraged the secular clergy, whose parochial settlements always followed the missionary work begun from the houses of the regulars. St. Ælphege, murdered by the Danes in 1012, added the glory of martyrdom to the chair of Canterbury. The last of the Saxon prelates was Stigand, regarded as uncanonical because he had received his pallium from an antipope, and he was finally dispossessed by William the Conqueror in 1070. Until this time there had been a sort of auxiliary bishop, or chorepiscopus, with the title "Bishop of St. Martin's", who held the church of that name at Canterbury, and whenever the archbishop was absent filled his place. The last of these prelates was Godwin, who died in 1065. The new archbishop, Lanfranc, refused to continue the arrangement. Lanfranc introduced the prebendal system at Canterbury, and reorganized the arrangement of property, dividing off that of the archbishop from that of the monastery, with the result that from that time the close bond that had previously existed between them disappeared. Thenceforth, too, the Archbishops of Canterbury became absorbed in the wider duties of primate, as is seen in the episcopate of St. Anselm, who contested with the king the rights of the Church involved in the question of investitures.

The widened sphere of archiepiscopal activity was signalized when the pope appointed Theobald (1139–1161) as *legatus natus*. He was succeeded by St. Thomas of Canterbury, whose long struggle was crowned by martyrdom in 1170. Henceforth Canterbury, as the place of his shrine, entered on new glories, becoming famous through all Christendom for the miracles wrought at the tomb, the devotion of the pilgrims, and the splendour of the shrine. The next archbishop, Richard, had to maintain the primacy of Canterbury against the claims of York, the question being finally compromised by the pope, who gave York the title "Primate of England" and Canterbury that of "Primate of All England". Succeeding archbishops played prominent parts as statesmen, notably Hubert Walter and Stephen Langton, the latter taking the leading part in obtaining Magna Charta from King John. Endless disputes with the monks and fruitless struggles against papal exactions and royal abuses marked the short and unhappy episcopate of St. Edmund of Canterbury (1234–1240), the last of the canonized archbishops. From his time to the Reformation the archbishops were men distinguished in many ways, under whom the privileges and power of the diocese were constantly increased. The tradition was not reversed till the time of Cranmer, who, like his predecessors, received his pallium from the pope, but considered that he held the archbishopric from the king. Having broken his own vow of celibacy, he easily divorced the king from Queen Catherine. He allowed the shrine of St. Thomas to be desecrated and plundered in 1538, and in 1541 he ordered the tombs of all the canonized archbishops to be destroyed. Much of the property of the see he was forced to surrender to the king. In 1539 the two great monasteries of Christ Church and St. Augustine's had been suppressed, and their property seized. By his office Cranmer was the head of the Church in England, but under Henry he helped to despoil it, and under Edward he led the reforming party against it, abolishing the Mass, and stripping the churches. The spiritual and material ruin thus accomplished could not be effectually remedied during the brief episcopate of Cardinal Pole (1556–1558). This prelate did all that was possible in so short a time, but his death, which took place on the 17th of November, 1558, brought to a close the line of Catholic archbishops. With the accession of Elizabeth—which took place on the same day—the new state of things, which has continued to the present time, was begun. Canterbury, as a city, has never recovered from the loss of St. Thomas's shrine and the destruction of the two great monasteries, but the cathedral still remains, one of the finest buildings in the country, as a witness to its former glory.

The arms of the see were: Sapphire, an episcopal staff in pale, Topaz, and ensigned with a cross patée Pearl, surmounted of a pall of the last, charged with four crosses, formée, fitchée, Diamond, edged and fringed as the second.

SOMNER, *Antiquities of Canterbury* (1640); BATTELY, Enlarged *Edition of Somner's Antiquities* (London, 1703); DART, *History of Cathedral Church of Canterbury* (1726); HASTED, *History of the City of Canterbury* (Canterbury, 1799); WILLIS; *Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral* (London, 1843); STANLEY, *Historical Memorials of Canterbury* (London, 1855); HOOK, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (1865–75); WALCOTT, *Memorials of Canterbury* (1868); *Historical MSS. Commission Fifth Report* (1876), *Eighth do.* (1881), and *Ninth do.* (1883); JENKINS, *Canterbury*, in *Diocesan Histories* (London, 1880); SMITH, *Chronological History of Canterbury* (Canterbury, 1883); *Literæ Cantuarienses* in *R. S.* (London, 1887–1889), and several other volumes in the same series; WITHERS, *Canterbury: the Cathedral and See* (London, 1896); COX, *Canterbury* (London, 1905); KENT ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY, *Archæologia Cantiana*, 27 vols. (1858–1905).

EDWIN BURTON.

Canticle.—Although the word is derived from *canticulum*, dim. of *canticum*, a song (Lat. *canere*, to sing), it is used in the English Catholic translation of the Bible as the equivalent of the Vulgate *canticum* in most, but not all, of the uses of that word; for where *canticum* is used for a sacred song, as in the ten canticles found in the Breviary (as given below), it is always rendered "canticle", whilst in other connexions (e. g. Gen., xxxi, 27, secular songs; Job, xxx, 9, song of derision; Is., xxiii, 15, "harlot's song") it is rendered "song". The Authorized Version does not make such a distinction, but regularly translates from the Hebrew and the Greek "song". From the Old Testament the Roman Breviary takes seven canticles for use at Lauds, as follows: (1) On Sundays and Festivals, the "Canticle of the Three Children" (Dan., iii, 57). (2) On Mondays, the "Canticle of Isaias the Prophet" (Is., xii). (3) On Tuesdays, the "Canticle of Ezechias" (Is., xxxviii, 10–20). (4) On Wednesdays, the "Canticle of Anna" (I Kings, ii, 1–10). (5) On Thursdays, the "Canticle of Moses" (Exod., xv, 1–19). (6) On Fridays, the "Canticle of Habacuc" (Hab., iii, 2–19). (7) On Saturdays, the "Canticle of Moses" (Deut., xxxii,

1–43). These canticles take the place of a fourth psalm at Lauds. From the New Testament the Breviary takes the following: (8) At Lauds, the "Canticle of Zachary" (Luke, i, 68–79), commonly referred to as the "Benedictus" (from its first word). (9) At Vespers, the "Canticle of the Bl. Mary Virgin" (Luke, i, 46–55), commonly known as the "Magnificat" (from its first word). (10) At Complin, the "Canticle of Simeon" (Luke, ii, 29–32), commonly referred to as the "Nunc dimittis" (from the opening words).

These three canticles are sometimes referred to as the "evangelical canticles", as they are taken from the Gospel of St. Luke. They are sung every day (unlike those from the Old Testament, which, as is shown above, are only of weekly occurrence). They are placed not amongst the psalms (as are the seven from the Old Testament), but separated from them by the Chapter, the Hymn, the Versicle and Response, and thus come immediately before the Prayer (or before the *preces*, if these are to be said). They are thus given an importance and distinction elevating them into great prominence, which is further heightened by the rubric which requires the singers and congregations to stand while they are being sung (in honour of the mystery of the Incarnation, to which they refer). Further, while the "Magnificat" is being sung at Solemn Vespers, the altar is incensed as at Solemn Mass. [For variety of ceremonial and of usage, and explanations of the symbolism of its assignment to Vespers, see Migne, Encyclopédie théologique, VIII (Liturgie) 745–7.] All three canticles are in use in the Greek and Anglican churches. In the Breviary the above-named ten canticles are provided with antiphons and are sung in the same eight psalm-tones and in the same alternating manner as the psalms. To make the seven taken from the Old Testament suitable for this manner of singing, nos. 2–7 sometimes divide a verse of the Bible into two verses, thus increasing the number of Breviary verses. No. 1, however, goes much farther than this. It uses only a portion of the long canticle in Daniel, and condenses, expands, omits, and interverts verses and portions of verses. In the Breviary the canticle begins with verse 57, and ends with verse 56 (Dan., iii); and the penultimate verse is clearly an interpolation, "Benedicamus Patrem, et Filium . . ." In addition to their Breviary use some of the canticles are used in other connexions in the liturgy; e. g. the "Nunc dimittis" as a tract at the Mass of the Feast of the Purification (when 2 February comes after Septuagesima); the "Benedictus" in the burial of the dead and in various processions. The use of the "Benedictus" and the "Benedicite" at the old Gallican Mass is interestingly described by Duchesne (Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution, London, 1903, 191–196). In the Office of the Greek Church the canticles numbered 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 are used at Lauds, but are not assigned to the same days as in the Roman Breviary. Two others (Is., xxvi, 9–20, and Jonas, ii, 2–9) are added for Friday and Saturday respectively.

The ten canticles so far mentioned do not exhaust the portions of Sacred Scripture which are styled "canticles". There are, for example, those of Debbora and Barac, Judith, the "Canticle of Canticles", and many psalms (e. g. xvii, 1, "this canticle"; xxxviii, 1, "a canticle of David"; xliv, 1, "a canticle for the beloved"; and the first verse of Pss. lxiv, lxv, lxvi, lxvii, etc.). In the first verse of some psalms the phrase *psalmus cantici* (the psalm of a canticle) is found, and in others the phrase *canticum psalmi* (a canticle of a psalm). Cardinal Bona thinks that *psalmus cantici* indicated that the voice was to precede the instrumental accompaniment, while *canticum psalmi* indicated an instrumental prelude to the voice. This distinction follows from his view of a canticle as an unaccompanied vocal song, and of a psalm as an accompanied vocal song. It is not easy to distinguish satisfactorily the meanings of psalm, hymn, canticle, as referred to by St. Paul in two places (see CONGREGATIONAL SINGING). *Canticum* appears to be generic —a song, whether sacred or secular; and there is reason to think that his admonition did not contemplate religious assemblies of the Christians, but their social gatherings. In these the Christians were to sing "spiritual songs", and not the profane or lascivious songs common amongst the pagans. These spiritual songs were not exactly psalms or hymns. The hymn may then be defined as a metrical or rhythmical praise of God; and the psalm, an accompanied sacred song or canticle, either taken from the Psalms or from some less authoritative source (St. Augustine declaring that a canticle may be without a psalm, but not a psalm without a canticle).

In addition to the ten canticles enumerated above the Roman Breviary places in its index, under the heading "Cantica", the "Te Deum" (at the end of Matins for Sundays and Festivals, but there styled "Hymnus SS. Ambrosii et Augustini") and the "Quicumque vult salvus esse" (Sundays at Prime, but there styled "Symbolum S. Athanasii", the "Creed of St. Athanasius"). To these are sometimes added by writers the "Gloria in excelsis", the "Trisagion", and the "Gloria Patri" (the Lesser Doxology). In the "Psalter and Canticles Pointed for Chanting" (Philadelphia, 1901), for the use of the Evangelical Lutheran Congregations, occurs (p. 445) a "Table of the Canticles" embracing Nos. 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, besides certain psalms, and the "Te Deum" and "Venite" (Ps. xciv, used at the beginning of Matins in the Roman Breviary). The word *Canticles* is thus seen to be somewhat elastic in its comprehension. On the other hand, while it is used in common parlance in the Church of England to cover several of the enumerated canticles, the Prayer Book applies it only to the "Benedicite", while in its Calendar the word *Canticles* is applied to what is commonly known as the "Song of Solomon" (the Catholic "Canticle of Canticles", Vulgate, "Canticum canticorum").

For references to the several canticles from the Old Testament and New Testament in liturgical use, see THOMASIUS, *Opera Omnia* (Rome, 1754), VII, index, s. v. *Canticum;* also, for *Benedictus, Benedicite, Magnificat, Nunc dimittis*, GROVE, *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, s. vv. See BENEDICTUS, MAGNIFICAT, NUNC DIMITTIS.

H. T. HENRY.

Canticle of Canticles (Heb. שיר השירים, Gr. Ἆισμα ᾀσμάτων, *Canticum canticorum*), one of the three books of Solomon, contained in the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Christian Canon of the Scriptures. According to the general interpretation the name signifies "most excellent, best song". (Cf. the similar forms of expression in Ex., xxvi, 33; Ezech., xvi, 7; Dan., viii, 25, used throughout the Bible to denote the highest and best of its kind.) Some commentators, because they have failed to grasp the homogeneousness of the book, regard it as a series or chain of songs.

CONTENTS AND EXPOSITION.—The book describes the love for each other of Solomon and the Sulamitess (שולמית) in lyrico-dramatic scenes and reciprocal songs. One part of the composition (iii, 6—v, 1) is clearly a description of the wedding-day. Here the two chief personages approach each other in stately procession, and the day is expressly called the wedding-day. Moreover the bridal wreath and the bridal bed are referred to, and six times in this section of the song, although never before or after, the word *spouse* is used. All that has preceded is now seen to be preparatory to the marriage, while in what follows the Sulamitess is the queen and her garden is the garden of the king (v, 1–vi, 7 sq.), although such expressions as "friend", "beloved", and "dove", are common. Along with the assurances of love for each other, there

is a continually progressive action that represents the development of the warm friendship and affection of the pair, then the bridal union and the married life of the royal couple. The bride, however, is exhibited as a simple shepherdess, consequently, when the king takes her, she has to undergo a training for the position of queen; in the course of this training occur various trials and sorrows (iii, 1; v, 5 sqq.; vi, 11—Heb., 12).

Various meanings have been attributed to the contents of the song. Before the sixteenth century tradition gave an allegorical or symbolical meaning to the love of Solomon for the Sulamitess. The view held by the Jewish Synagogue was expressed by Akiba and Aben Ezra; that held by the Church, by Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, and Jerome. An opinion opposed to these found only isolated expression. Akiba (first century after Christ) speaks severely of those who would strike the book from the Sacred Canon, while St. Philastrius (fourth century) refers to others who regarded it not as the work of the Holy Ghost but as the composition of a purely sensuous poet. Theodore of Mopsuestia aroused much indignation by declaring the Canticle of Canticles to be a love-song of Solomon's, and his contemptuous treatment of it gave great offence (Mansi, Coll. Conc., IX, 244 sqq.; Migne, P. G., LXVI, 699 sqq.). At the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople (553), Theodore's view was rejected as heretical, and his own pupil, Theodoret, brought forward against him the unanimous testimony of the Fathers (Migne, P. G., LXXXI, 62). Theodore's opinion was not revived until the sixteenth century, when the Calvinist Sébastien Castalion (Castalio), and also Johannes Clericus, made use of it. The Anabaptists became partisans of this view; later adherents of the same opinion were Michaelis, Teller, Herder, and Eichhorn. A middle position is taken by the "typical" exposition of the book. For the first and immediate sense the typical interpretation holds firmly to the historical and secular meaning, which has always been regarded by the Church as heretical; this interpretation gives, however, to the "Song of Love", a second and higher sense. As, namely, the figure of Solomon was a type of Christ, so is the actual love of Solomon for a shepherdess, or for the daughter of Pharaoh, intended as a symbol of the love of Christ for His Church. Honorius of Autun and Luis of Leon (Aloysius Legionensis) did not actually teach this view, although their method of expression might be misleading (cf. Cornelius a Lapide, Prol. in Canticum, c. i). In earlier times reference was often made to a first and literal meaning of the words of a text, which meaning, however, was not the real sense of the context as intended by the author, but was held to be only its external covering or "husk". Entirely dissimilar to this method is the typical exposition of modern times, which accepts an actual double meaning of the text, the two senses being connected and intended by the author. Bossuet and Calmet may, perhaps, be regarded as holding this view; it is unmistakably held by the Protestant commentators Delitzsch and Zöckler, as also by Kingsbury (in The Speaker's Commentary) and Kossowicz. A few others hold to this view, but the number does not include Lowth (cf. De sacrâ poesi Hebr. præl., 31). Grotius makes it evident, not so much in words as in the method of exposition, that he is opposed to a higher interpretation. At the present day most non-Catholics are strongly opposed to such an exposition; on the other hand most Catholics accept the allegorical interpretation of the book.

Exposition of the Allegory.—The reasons for this interpretation are to be found not only in tradition and the decision of the Church, but also in the song itself. As long as the effort is made to follow the thread of an ordinary love-song, so long will it be impossible to give a coherent exposition, and many despair of ever obtaining a successful interpretation. In the commentary of the present writer, "Comment. in Eccl. et Canticum Canticorum" (Paris, 1890), a number of examples are given of the typical and of the purely secular interpretations, and besides these, in treating of each of the larger divisions, the varying methods of exposition are carefully investigated. The proper connection of scenes and parts can only be found in the realm of the ideal, in allegory. In no other way can the dignity and sanctity befitting the Scriptures be preserved and the striking title, "Song of Songs", receive a satisfactory explanation. The allegory, however, can be shown as possible and obvious by means of numerous passages in the Old and the New Testament, in which the relation of God to the Synagogue and of Christ to the Church or to the adoring soul is represented under the symbol of marriage or betrothal (Jer., ii, 2; Ps. xliv; Heb., xlv; Osee, ii, 19 sqq.; Ezech., xvi, 8 sqq.; Matth., xxv, 1 sqq.; II Cor., xi, 2; Eph., v, 23 sqq.; Apoc., xix, 7 sq., etc.). A similar manner of speaking occurs frequently in Christian literature, nor does it appear forced or artificial. The testimony of Theodoret to the teaching of the Early Church is very important. He names Eusebius in Palestine, Origen in Egypt, Cyprian in Carthage, and "the Elders who stood close to the Apostles", consequently, Basil, the two Gregorys, Diodorus, and Chrysostom, "and all in agreement with one another". To these may be added Ambrose (Migne, P. L., XIII, 1855, 1911), Philastrius (Migne, P. L., XII, 1267), Jerome (Migne, P. L., XXII 547, 395; XXIII, 263), and Augustine (Migne, P. L., XXXIV, 372, 925; XLI, 556). It follows from this, that the typical interpretation, also, contradicts tradition, even if it does not come within the decree pronounced against Theodore of Mopsuestia. This method of exposition has, moreover, very few adherents, because the typical can only be applied to separate individuals or things, and cannot be used for the interpretation of a connected text which contains only one genuine and proper meaning. The foundation of the typical interpretation is destroyed at once when the historical explanation is held to be indefensible.

In the allegorical interpretation of the song, it makes no essential difference whether the bride is taken as a symbol of the Synagogue, that is, of the congregation of the Old Covenant or of the Church of God of the New Covenant. In truth, the song turns aside from both; by the spouse should be understood human nature as elected (*electa, elevata*, sc. *natura humana*) and received by God. This is embodied, above all, in the great Church of God upon earth, which God takes to Himself with the love of a bridegroom, makes the crowning point of all His external works, and adorns with the bridal ornament of supernatural grace. In the song the bride is not reproached with sins and guilt but, on the contrary, her good qualities and beauty receive high praise; consequently, the chosen community of God appears here under that form which is, according to the Apostle, without spot or blemish (Eph., v, 27). It is plain that the Canticle of Canticles finds its most evident application to the most holy Humanity of Jesus Christ, which is united in the most intimate bond of love with the Godhead, and is absolutely spotless and essentially sanctified; after this to the most holy Mother of God as the most beautiful flower of the Church of God. (In regard to a twofold sense of this kind in the Scriptures, cf. "Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 1903, p. 381.) The soul that has been purified by grace is also in a more remote yet real sense a worthy bride of the Lord. The actual meaning of Canticles is not, however, to be limited to any one of these applications, but is to be appropriated to the elected "bride of God in her relation of devotion to God".

As a matter of fact, the spiritual interpretation of the song has proved a rich source for mystical theology and asceticism. It is only necessary to call to mind the best of the old commentaries and interpretations of the book. There are still in existence fifteen homilies by St. Gregory of Nyssa on the first six chapters (Migne, P. G., XLI, 755 sqq.). The commentary of Theodoret (Migne, P. G., LXXXI, 27 sqq.) is rich in suggestion. In the eleventh century Psellus compiled a "Catena" from the writings of Nilus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus (Auctar. bibl. Patr., II, 681 sqq.). Among the Latins Ambrose made such frequent use of the Canticle of Canticles that a whole commentary may be developed from the many applications, rich in piety, that he made of it (Migne, P. L., XV, 1851 sqq.). Three commentaries are to be found in the works of Gregory the Great (Migne, P. L., LXXIX, 471 sqq., 905; CLXXX, 441 sqq.). Apponius wrote a very comprehensive commentary which, even as late as 1843, was republished at Rome. The Venerable Bede prepared the matter for a number of smaller commentaries. The elaborate exposition by Honorius of Autun of the book in its historical, allegorical, tropological, and anagogical meanings deserves special mention. The eighty-six homilies left by St. Bernard are universally known. Gilbert of Hoyland added to this number forty-eight more. The greatest of the saints enkindled their love for God on the tender expressions of affection of Christ and His bride, the Church, in the Canticle of Canticles. Even in Old Testament times it must have greatly consoled the Hebrews to read of the eternal covenant of love between God and His faithful people.

Within certain limits the application to the relation between God and the individual soul adorned with supernatural grace is self-evident and an aid to virtuous living. The bride is first raised by the bridegroom to a relation of complete affection, afterwards betrothed or married (iii 6–v, 1), and, finally, after a successful activity (vii, 12 sq.; viii, 11 sq.), is received into the heavenly dwellings. A life of contemplation and activity bound up with painful trials is the way there. In the Breviary and Missal the Church has repeatedly applied the song to the Mother of God (see B. Schäfer in Komment., p. 255 sqq.). In truth the bride adorned with the beauty of spotless purity and deep affection is a figure most appropriate to the Mother of God. This is the reason why St. Ambrose in his book, "De virginibus", so repeatedly and especially quotes Canticles. Finally, the application of the song to the history of the life of Christ and of the Church offers pious thought rich material for contemplation. In doing this the natural course of the song can, in some measure, be followed. At His entrance into life, and especially at the time of His public activity as a teacher, the Saviour sought the Church, His bride, and she came lovingly towards Him. He united Himself with her at the Cross (iii, 11); the Church itself makes use of this thought in a number of offices. The affectionate conversations with the bride (to ch. v, 1) take place after the Resurrection. What follows may be referred to the later history of the Church. A distinction should be made in such methods of interpretation, however, between what may be accepted as certain or probable in the context and what pious contemplation has, more or less arbitrarily, added. For this reason it is important to ascertain more exactly than was done in earlier times the genuine and true sense of the text.

Literary Form of the Song.—Both the traditional poetic accentuation and the language used to express the thoughts show the book to be a genuine poem. The attempt has been made in various ways to prove the existence of a definite metre in the Hebrew text. The opinion of the present writer is that a six-syllable trochaic metre may be applied to the original Hebrew version (De re metricâ Hebræorum, Freiburg, Baden, 1880). The essentially lyrical character of the song is unmistakable. But as various voices and scenes appear, neither should the dramatic character of the poem fail of recognition; it is, however, evident that the development of an external action is not so much the intention as the unfolding of the lyrical expression of feeling under varying circumstances. The cantata form of composition is suggested by the presence of a chorus of the "daughters of Jerusalem" though the text does not indicate clearly how the words are divided among the various characters. This accounts for the theory put forward at times that there are different personages who, as bride and bridegroom, or as lovers, talk with, or of, each other. Stickel in his commentary assigns three different persons to the rôle of the bridegroom, and two to that of the bride. But such arbitrary treatment is the result of the attempt to make the Canticle of Canticles into a drama suitable for the stage.

Unity of the Canticle.—The commentator just mentioned and other exegetes start from the natural conviction that the poem, simply called the Song of Songs and handed down to posterity as a book, must be regarded as a homogeneous whole. It is evident that the three clearly distinguished rôles of bridegroom, bride, and chorus maintain their plainly defined characters from beginning to end; in the same way certain other designations, as "beloved", "friend", etc., and certain refrains keep recurring. Moreover, several parts apparently repeat one another, and a peculiar phraseology is found throughout the book. The attempt has however been made to resolve the poem into separate songs (some twenty in all); this has been tried by Herder, Eichhorn, Goethe, Reuss, Stade, Budde, and Siegfried. But it has been found exceedingly difficult to separate these songs from one another, and to give to each lyric a meaning distinctly its own. Goethe believed this impossible, and it is necessary to resort to a working over of the songs by the person who collected them. But in this everything would depend on a vague, personal impression. It is true that a mutual dependence of all the parts cannot be maintained in the secular (historical) interpretation. For, even in the historical hypothesis, the attempt to obtain a flawless drama is successful only when arbitrary additions are made which permit the transition from one scene to another; but these interpolations have no foundation in the text itself. Tradition also knows nothing of genuine dramatic poetry among the Hebrews, nor is the Semitic race more than slightly acquainted with this form of poetry. Driven by necessity, Kämpf and others even invent double rôles, so that at times other personages appear along with Solomon and the Sulamitess; yet it cannot be said that any one of these hypotheses has produced a probable interpretation of the entire song.

Difficulties of Interpretation.—*Allegorical.*—All the hypotheses of the above-mentioned kind owe their origin to the prevalent dislike of allegory and symbolism. It is well known how extremely distasteful poetic allegory is to our age. Nevertheless allegory has been employed at times by the greatest poets of all ages. Its use was widespread in the Middle Ages, and it was always a preliminary condition in the interpretation of the Scriptures by the Fathers. There are many passages in the Old and New Testaments which it is simply impossible to understand without allegory. It is true that the allegorical method of interpretation has been greatly misused. Yet the Canticle of Canticles can be proved to be a flawlessly consecutive poem by the employment of rules for poetical allegory and its interpretation which are fixed and according to the canons of art. The proof of the correctness of the interpretation lies in such a combination of all the parts of the song into a homogeneous whole. The dramatic form, as far as it can

be plainly seen in the traditional text, is not destroyed by this method of elucidation; indeed a number (four to seven) of more or less independent scenes must be recognized. In separating these scenes from one another the Jewish or Syrian bridal customs may be taken into consideration, as has been done, especially, by Budde and Siegfried, if the result is the simplifying of the explanation and not the distortion of the scenes, or other acts of caprice. An attempt has been made in the commentary (p. 388 sqq.) of the present writer to give in detail the determinative rules for a sound allegorical interpretation.

Historical.—According to Wetzstein, whom Budde and others follow, the book should be regarded as a collection of short songs such as are still used by the bedouins of Syria in the "threshing-board". The features of similarity are the appearance of the bridal pair for seven days as king and queen, the immoderate praise of the two, and the dance of the queen, during which she swings a sword to the accompaniment of a song by the chorus. Bruston and Rothstein have, however, expressed doubts as to this theory. In Solomon's song the bride, in reality, does not appear as a queen and does not swing a sword; the other traces of similarity are of so general a character that they probably belong to the wedding festivities of many nations. But the worst is that the essential songs avowedly do not stand in the proper order. Consequently it is presupposed that the order of succession is accidental. This opens wide once more the door to caprice. Thus, as what is said does not fit this theory, it is claimed that a collector, or later redactor, who misunderstood various matters, must have made small additions with which it is impossible now to do anything. Others, as Rothstein in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, presuppose that the collector, or rather the redactor, or even the author, had a dramatic end in view, as life and motion and action are, taken all together, unmistakable.

It is accepted (at least for the present form of the poem) that the book presents a pastoral poem in dramatic or, at least, melodramatic form. The poem, according to this theory, shows how a beautiful shepherdess keeps her betrothal vow to her lover of the same rank in life notwithstanding the allurements and acts of violence of a king. But this shepherd has to be interpolated into the text, and not much can be said for the imaginary faith kept with the distant lover, as the Sulamitess, in the middle section of the Song of Solomon, gives herself willingly to the king, and no reason is apparent in the text why her boundless praise should not be intended for the present king and not for an absent lover. Stickel overcomes the great difficulties which still remain in a very arbitrary manner. He allows a second pair of lovers to come suddenly forward; these know nothing of the chief personages and are employed by the poet merely as an interlude. Stickel gives this pair three short passages, namely: i, 7 sq.; i, 15–ii, 4; iv, 7–v, 1. Moreover in these hypotheses appears the difficulty which is ever connected with the historical interpretation, that is, the lowering of the song which is so highly prized by the Church. The historical interpretation transforms it into ordinary love-scenes, in various moments of which, moreover, a fiery, sensuous love breaks forth. For the same expressions which, when referred allegorically to Christ and the Church, announce the strength of the love of God, are under ordinary conditions the utterances of a repellent passion.

AGE AND AUTHOR OF THE CANTICLE.—Tradition, in harmony with the superscription, attributes the song to Solomon. Even in modern times quite a number of exegetes have held this opinion: among Protestants, for example, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Zöckler, and Keil. De Wette says: "The entire series of pictures and relationships and the freshness of the life connect these songs with the age of Solomon." The song evidences the love of Solomon for nature (it contains twenty-one names of plants and fifteen of animals), for beauty and art, and for regal splendour; bound up with this latter is an ideal simplicity suitable to the type of character of the royal poet. There is also evident a strain of the most tender feeling and a love of peace which are well in keeping with the reputation of Solomon. The somewhat unusual language in connexion with the skilful and brilliant style point to a well-practised writer. If some Aramaic or foreign expressions are to be found in the song, in relation to Solomon, such cannot cause surprise. It is remarkable that in Proverbs the fuller form of the relative is always used, while in Canticles the shorter form is employed, the one used earlier in the song of Debbora (ש). But in the same way Jeremias used the ordinary form in his prophecies, while in the Lamentations he repeatedly employed the shorter. The point is raised that Tirzah (vi, 4–Heb.) is mentioned along with Jerusalem as the capital of the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes. The comparison, though, is made only as to beauty, and Tirzah had, above all, a reputation for loveliness. Many other commentators, as Böttcher, Ewald, Hitzig, and Kämpf, put the composition of the book in the time directly after Solomon. They assert that the action of the poem takes place in the northern part of Palestine, that the author is especially well acquainted with this section of the country, and writes in the form of the language used there. It is further said that Tirzah could only be compared with Jerusalem at the time when it was the capital of the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes, that is, after the age of Solomon but before the time when Samaria was the capital of the Northern Kingdom. All these reasons, however, have more subjective than objective value. No more convincing, finally, are the reasons that cause others to place the book in post-Exilic times; among such exegetes may be mentioned: Stade, Kautzsch, Cornill, Grätz, Budde, and Siegfried. They support their theory by reference to many peculiarities of language and believe they even find traces of Greek influence in the song; but for all this there is a lack of clear proof.

Condition of the Hebrew Text.—Grätz, Bickell, Budde, and Cheyne believe that they have been able to prove the existence of various mistakes and changes in the text. The passages referred to are: vi, 12; vii, 1; iii, 6–11; for alterations of the text see chapters vi and vii.

ERMONI, in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, gives an outline of the discussions about the book; the Protestant commentaries are exhaustively treated in ROSENMÜLLER, *Scholia in V. T.*, IX, and in STRACK, *Einleitung in d. A. T.* (6th ed., 1906); ZÖCKLER, *Das Hohelied* in LANGE, *Bibl. Werk* (1868), tr. GREEN; RIEDEL, *Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes in der jüdischen Gemeinde und der griechischen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1898). The most important commentators are: seventh century, APPONIUS, XII vols., complete edition (Rome, 1843); eighth century, BEDE in *P. L.*, XCI, 1065 sqq.; twelfth century, HONORIUS OF AUTUN and ST. BERNARD (in 86 homilies); thirteenth century, ST. THOMAS AQUINAS; seventeenth century, TITELMANN, GHISLIERI, SANCHEZ, CORNELIUS A LAPIDE, BOSSUET. Modern commentaries in America: GRIFFIS, *The Lily among the Thorns* (Boston, 1890); TERRY, *The Song of Songs* (Cincinnati, 1893); MERRILL, *Song of Songs* (Philadelphia, 1905). In England: RAINSFORD, *The Song of Solomon* (London, 1892); REDFORD, *Song of Solomon* (London, 1893); ADENAY, *The Song of Solomon and Lamentation* (London, 1895); HARPER, *The Song of Solomon* in *Cambridge Bible* (1902); MARGOLIOUTH, *Song of Solomon* in *Temple Bible* (1902); FALCONER, *The Maid of Shulam* (London, 1905). In France: LE HIR, *Le Cantique des Cantiques* (Paris, 1883); MEIGNAN, *Salomon, son règne, ses écrits* (Paris, 1890); GIETMANN, *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten et Canticum Canticorum* (Paris, 1890); RÉVEILLAUD, *Le sublime Cantique* (Paris, 1895). In Germany, Catholic commentaries: SCHÄFER, *Das Hohelied* (Münster, 1876); TIEFENTHAL, *Das Hohe Lied* (Kempten, 1889); SCHOLZ, *Kommentar über das Hohelied und Ps. XLV* (Leipzig, 1904); Protestant commentaries: DELITZSCH, *Hohes Lied und Koheleth* (Leipzig, 1875); KÄMPF, *Das Hohelied* (3rd ed., Prague, 1884); STICKEL, *Das Hohelied* (Berlin, 1888); BUDDE, *Das Hohelied* in *Kurzer Handkommentar* (Freiburg, 1898); SIEGFRIED, *Prediger und Hoheslied* (Göttingen, 1898).

G. GIETMANN.

Cantigern. See KENTIGERN.

Cantius, JOHN, ST., See JOHN CANTIUS, ST.

Cantor, the chief singer (and sometimes instructor) of the ecclesiastical choir, called also precentor. His duties and qualifications have varied considerably according to time and place; but generally he must be ready to lead all the singing in church, to start any chant, and be watchful to prevent or correct mistakes of singers placed under him. He may be responsible for the immediate rendering of the music, showing the course of the melody by movements of the hand. The chief singer of the Gregorian *Schola Cantorum* was called *Prior scholæ* or *Primicerius*. In medieval cathedrals the cantor was master of music and chant, but also commonly one of the dignitaries of the chapter. In the fourteenth century the cantor in many churches began to delegate his instruction of the singers to a master of music. After the introduction of harmonized music some duties naturally fell to the conductor or choir-master, who might be a layman. The cantor's place in church is on the right of the choir, and immediately on his left stands his assistant, formerly called the "succentor". In ruling the choir the cantor very commonly carried a staff as the mark of his dignity. This custom still survives in some places.

GERBERT, *De cantu et musicâ sacrâ* (St Blasien, 1774); BÄUMER, *Histoire du Bréviaire* (Paris, 1905); MEES, *Choirs and Choral Music* (London, 1901); DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship* (London, 1904); WAGNER, *History of Plain Chant* (London, 1907).

WILFRID G. A. SHEBBEARE.

Cantù, CESARE, Italian historian and poet, b. at Brivio, 8 December, 1807; d. at Milan, 11 March, 1895. He was at first a student of theology, but left the seminary without completing the course, not feeling himself called to the priesthood. After this he turned his attention to literature, and taught the Italian language and literature at Sondrio in 1823, at Como in 1827, and at Milan in 1832. While at Como Cantù wrote a tale in verse called "Algiso o la lega Lombarda" (1828), which attracted well-deserved attention; the "Storia della città e della diocesi di Como" (2 vols., Milan, 1829–1832) made him still better known. Shortly afterwards appeared "Ragionamenti sulla storia Lombarda nel secolo XVII" (Milan, 1832), which was published later under the title "Commento storico ai Promessi Sposi di A. Manzoni, o la Lombardia nel secolo XVII". In this work Cantù expressed liberal views in his comments on the Austrian policy, and was consequently condemned to thirteen months' imprisonment. The miseries of the incarceration were described by him in the well-known historico-political novel, "Margherita Pusterla" (Milan, 1838), a book widely read and frequently republished.

CESARE CANTÙ

About this date Cantù began his most important work, the "Storia universale" (35 vols., Turin, 1837, and succeeding decades). The work was often reprinted, and has been translated into English, German, French, and Spanish. It is the first historical work by an Italian which, in a well-finished and vigorous style, gives a philosophical treatment of the development of all civilized peoples from the remotest times to the pontificate of Pius IX. Cantù, it is true, did not draw directly from original sources, but depended on French and German authorities, the value of which he did not always judge with sufficient acumen. He worked up the material thus obtained, however, with entire independence. Yet he showed the influence of the Romantic school, of which Manzoni is the most important representative, and he sought to combine Church and State, politics and religion. The effect of the Romantic movement is still more evident in those works in which Cantù treated the history of Italy of his own time, as in: "Storia dei cent' anni, 1750–1850" (5 vols., Florence, 1851); "Storia degli Italiani" (3 vols., Naples, 1856); and "Gli ultimi trenti anni" (3 vols., Turin, 1879). Constantly viewed with suspicion by the Government on account of his political opinions, he was obliged to make his escape from Milan to Piedmont when the Revolution of 1848 broke out, but he returned when the uprising came to an end. He was a member of Parliament from 1859 to 1861, and from 1874 until the time of his death he was the director of the archives of Lombardy. In addition to the more important publications mentioned above, Cantù wrote a large number of small historical works and numerous popular books and tales for the young, most of which passed through several editions, and were translated into other languages. Among these minor writings may be mentioned: "Letture giovanili", 4 vols.; "Buon senso e buon cuore"; "Il giovinetto dirizzato alla bontà"; "Il galantuomo"; and many others. A complete edition of his poetry appeared at Florence in 1870.

BERTOLINI, *Cantù e le sue opere* (Florence, 1895); MAZZONI, *Atti dell' Accademia della Crusca* (Florence, 1899).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Canute (or CNUT: THE GREAT, THE MIGHTY), King of the English, Danes, and Norwegians, b. about 994; d. at Shaftesbury, 12 November, 1035. He was the son of Sweyn, King of Denmark, and Sigrid, widow of Eric of Sweden. Though baptized while a child, there is no evidence of Christianity in his life until after he ascended the English throne. He accompanied his father on the invasion of England, and after the repulse at London and Sweyn's sudden death near Bury (3 February, 1014) was declared King of England by the Danish fleet. The witan, however, recalled Æthelred, their "born lord", who had fled at Sweyn's approach, and Canute, unable to withstand the restored monarch, set sail for the North. At Sandwich, after cutting off the noses, ears, and hands of the hostages taken by his father, he put them ashore—a dire omen of a more terrible return. Returned to Denmark, Canute proclaimed himself king and set about gathering a powerful fleet. England, instead of being prepared for his return, was torn by internal dissensions, and when Canute appeared off the coast with a fleet, said to have numbered two hundred sail, each boat containing eighty men, Eadric deserted Eadmund Ironside and joined the Danish standard. Upon the death of Æthelred, Eadmund was made king by the people of London, and, with all Wessex in submission, Canute laid siege to the city. This was the beginning of a series of bloody conflicts, interrupted only by pillage of the country-side, culminating at Assandun, where, after a battle which was waged all day and into the night, the English were routed, and "all the nobility of the English race was there destroyed" (Anglo-Saxon Chron., ed. Giles, London, 1847, p. 409). Eadmund was still formidable. Canute followed him into Gloucestershire and made terms of peace on the Isle of Olney. Mercia and Northumbria were Canute's portion, and a tax known as the "danegeld" was levied on both armies to defray the expenses of the Danish fleet. Eadmund

died a month later after a heroic reign of seven months; Eadric was murdered at the king's order; Eadwig, Eadmund's brother was similarly removed; and in July, 1017, Canute married Ælfgifu, or Emma, Eadmund's widow, a strange union which some writers attribute to political motives. Canute already had two sons, Harold and Sweyn, by another wife, but the right of succession was to be with the offspring of the new union.

Thus at the age of twenty-three, by right of might, Canute stood master of the realm; and if he was received unanimously by the people, it was because none durst oppose him. From this forward, however, his one desire seemed to be to wipe out the memory of the bloodshed and horror in which his kingship had been secured. The Danish host, a fruitful source of animosity, was dismissed after a danegeld of £72,000 had been raised, London alone contributing £15,000. Canute retained the crews of forty ships as a body-guard, known as the *huscarls* or *thingmanna*. "Eadgar's Law", the old constitution of the realm, was revived and Dane and Englishman stood on a level footing. The Church had suffered heavily at Canute's hands, but he sought her friendship and built a church at Assandun to commemorate the victory; rebuilt the church of St. Eadmund at Bury and established the monks there; and was a benefactor in many other places, contributing even to the erection of the cathedral of Chartres. On his visits to Denmark he took many missionaries with him, among whom were Ranier, Bernhard, and Gerbrand, Bishops of Fionia, Sconen, and Zealand. In 1026 Canute made a pilgrimage to Rome, his path being marked by his charities. He records in a letter his joy at visiting the tombs of the Apostles; his meeting with Pope John and Emperor Conrad; his plea for security for English and Danish travellers to Rome; the pope's promise to lighten the tax for the pallium; and he adds his own vow to rule justly and regrets the misdeeds of his youth.

Canute's greatest gift to his people was peace, says Green. Eighteen years unbroken by domestic strife laid the foundations of a national tranquillity. The kingdom was divided into four earldoms, and little by little Danish names disappear and are replaced by English (Freeman, Norman Conquest, I, 289). The people are to "love and worship one God and love King Cnut with right truthfulness". The ferocity which mutilated the hostages was not burnt out, for the king struck down one of his huscarls with his own hand. But he pronounced heavy sentence upon his deed and, on another occasion, is said to have rebuked his flatterers by placing his crown upon the crucifix of the cathedral of Winchester. From the time his sceptre is secure, a sincere zeal for his people's good shines out in his life. The yoke is lightened and his benefactions are widespread. He is a patron of poets and a lover of minstrelsy, and upon hearing the monks of Ely chant on Candlemas, he breaks out into the famous song:—

> Merie sungen ðe muneches binnen Ely,
> Ða Cnut Ching reu ðer by;
> Roweð, Cnihtes, noer ðe land,
> And here we þes muneches sæng.

(Merrily sang the monks of Ely when Cnut King rowed by. Row, boatmen, near the land, and hear we these monks sing.)—Intriguing, ambitious, and violent, Canute yet atoned for his early cruelty by a Christianity that was not unworthy. He came as an invader and ruthless destroyer, and by a change of temperament as remarkable as it was far-reaching in its effects, remained to rule, in justice and peace, a people whose part he wholly espoused. He was buried in the old minster at Winchester.

FREEMAN, *Norman Conquest* (New York, 1873), I, 244–320, with valuable references to sources; STEENSTRUP, *Normanerne*, III; GREEN, *Conquest of England*, 418 sqq.; IDEM, *Short History of the English People* (New York, 1887), I, 94–98; PALGRAVE, *History of the Anglo-Saxons* (London, 1867), 231; HUNT in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, IX, 1 sqq.; LINGARD, *History of England* (London, 1878), I, 156–162.

E. F. SAXTON.

Canute IV (CNUT), SAINT, martyr and King of Denmark, date of birth uncertain; d. 10 July, 1086, the third of the thirteen natural sons of Sweyn II, surnamed Estridsen. Elected king on the death of his brother Harold about 1080, he waged war on his barbarous enemies and brought Courland and Livonia to the faith. Having married Eltha, daughter of Robert, Count of Flanders, he had a son Charles, surnamed the Good. He was a strong ruler, as is proved by his stern dealing with the pirate Eigill of Bornholm. The happiness of his people and the interests of the Church were the objects he had most at heart. To the cathedral of Roskilde, still the royal burying-place, he gave his own diadem. His austerity was equalled by his assiduity in prayer. An expedition to England, in favour of the Saxons against William the Conqueror, planned by him in 1085, failed through the treachery of his brother Olaf. His people having revolted on account of the cruelties of certain tax-collectors, Canute retired to the island of Fünen. There, in the church of St. Alban, after due preparation for death, the king, his brother Benedict, and seventeen others were surrounded and slain 10 July, 1086. His feast is 19 January, translation, 10 July; his emblems, a lance or arrows, in memory of the manner of his death.

Acta SS., July, III, 118–149, containing the life (written in 1105) by ÆLNOTH, monk of Canterbury, and also that by SAXO GRAMMATICUS; BOLLANDISTS, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* (Brussels, 1898), 232; CHEVALIER, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge* (Paris, 1905), I, col. 771; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 19 January.

PATRICK RYAN.

Capaccio and Vallo, DIOCESE OF (CAPUTAQUENSIS ET VALLENSIS), suffragan of Salerno. Capaccio is a city in the province of Salerno (Italy), in an unhealthy region, not far from the ruins of the ancient Pæstum. It is believed that Capaccio was built after the destruction of Pæstum by the Saracens (915), and that the see was transferred there. The first known bishop of Capaccio is Arnolfo, present at the council of the Lateran in 1179. Lelio Morello, elected in 1586, obtained from Sixtus V the transfer of the bishop's residence to Dania. Other bishops worthy of mention were: the zealous monk Pietro Matta de Haro (1611), who was assisted by the venerable Gian Filippo Romanello, founder of a congregation of priests for the instruction of the peasantry in the articles of faith; the learned Cardinal Francesco Maria Brancacci (1627); Tommaso Caraffa (1639), and Giovani della Pace (1684). The bishop resides at Vallo. The diocese contains a population of 122,400, with 102 parishes, 282 churches and chapels, 256 secular and 14 regular priests, and 3 religious houses for men.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844); *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 365.

U. BENIGNI.

Cape Breton Island. See NOVA SCOTIA.

Capefigue, BAPTISTE-HONORÉ-RAYMOND, historian, b. at Marseilles, 1802; d. at Paris, 22 December, 1872. In 1821 he was a law student at Paris; at a later date he became a contributor to the "Quotidienne", and in 1827 he was made editor of the Legitimist journal, "Messager des Chambres". On account of his journalistic activity in behalf of the government, Capefigue soon received a position in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, but lost it in consequence of the Revolution of July. A strong Royalist, he was after this an active supporter of the Orleanists in

his writings and later of Napoleon. Capefigue was a prolific writer; his works are, consequently, somewhat superficial and of no great historical value, but in them he always maintained his convictions as a devout Catholic. His first work was entitled: "Recueil des opérations de l'armée française en Espagne sous les ordres du Duc d'Angoulême" (Paris, 1823). His principal work, "Histoire de Philippe-Auguste" (Paris, 1827–1829), 4 vols., passed through several editions. The best of his publications is: "Histoire de la Restauration et des causes qui ont amené la chute de la branche aînée des Bourbons" (Paris, 1831, 10 vols; 3d ed., Paris, 1842, 4 vols.). Of less importance was the work, on a more ambitious scale, "L'Europe depuis l'avènement de Louis-Philippe" (Paris, 1845–1846, 16 vols.; 2d ed., 1847–1849, 10 vols.), and the publication entitled, "L'Europe depuis la chute de Louis-Philippe jusqu'à la présidence de Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte" (Paris, 1849), 3 vols. Mention should also be made of: "Les reines de la main gauche" (Paris, 1858–1864), 15 vols., which includes sketches of Agnes Sorel, Pompadour, du Barry, etc., and "Les reines de la main droite" (Paris, 1856–1864), 6 vols., sketches of Catherine de' Medici, Elizabeth of England, and Maria Theresa, etc. Among his writings which belong to the department of church history are: "Vie de saint Vincent de Paul" (Paris, 1827; 2d ed., 1840); "Quatre premiers siècles de l'Eglise chrétienne" (Paris, 1850), 4 vols. Capefigue also produced a historical novel called: "Jacques II à Saint-Germain" (Paris, 1833), 2 vols.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Cape of Good Hope. See GOOD HOPE, CAPE OF.

Caperolo, PIETRO, Friar Minor, date of birth unknown; d. at Velletri in 1480; he was a man of much energy and great learning, and was held in high esteem as a preacher by the people of Brescia, Velletri, and other cities of Northern Italy. Caperolo played an important part in the religious disturbances, which arose about the year 1475, between the Franciscan provinces of Milan and Venice, and which were occasioned in great measure by the war then going on between Milan and the Venetian Republic. After considerable difficulty Caperolo succeeded in obtaining permission from Pope Sixtus IV to separate several convents of the Venetian province from the obedience of the Observants, and to form a vicariate, which was placed under the obedience of the Conventuals, but retained the right to elect its own provincial superior. The members of the new congregation were known as Caperolani, from Caperolo their founder. The death of Caperolo, however, put an end to the Caperolani as a distinct branch within the order, and all the members of the new vicariate without exception returned to the obedience of the Observants.

WADDING, *Annales Minorum* (Rome, 1732), XIII, 402; XIV, 242; KOBLER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Capes (EDITOR OF THE RAMBLER). See RAMBLER.

Cape Verde Islands. See SANTIAGO AND CAPE VERDE.

Capgrave, JOHN, Augustinian friar, historian, and theologian, b. at Lynn in Norfolk, 21 April, 1393; d. there, 12 August, 1464 (according to Pits, 1484). His name is chiefly known in connexion with the "Nova Legenda Angliæ", the first comprehensive collection of English saints' lives. But this work was really compiled by John of Tynemouth, a Benedictine (born c. 1290), and Capgrave merely edited and re-arranged it, though it has ever since passed under his name. Yet quite apart from the "Nova Legenda", his own undoubted works prove him to have been a scholar of unusual eminence. But few facts—and these gleaned from his own works—are known concerning his life. He states that he was born at Lynn in Norfolk, and not in Kent as Bale and others have stated. His university is uncertain, both Oxford and Cambridge claiming him, but he certainly was ordained priest in 1417 or 1418, and was professed an Augustinian at Lynn. He became a doctor of Divinity, and subsequently provincial of his order. Many of his unpublished works exist in MS., but some are lost. His historical works are: "De illustribus Henricis" (R. S., London, 1858); "Vita Humfredi ducis Glocestriæ"; "Life of St. Gilbert of Sempringham"; "Metrical Life of St. Katharine" (Early English Text Soc., 1893); "Chronicle of England to A. D. 1417" (R. S., London, 1858); "Vita S. Augustini"; "De sequacibus S. Augustini"; "De illustribus viris O. S. A." His theological works, too numerous to detail (given by Hingeston, below), include commentaries on many books of the Bible, a work on the creeds, sermons, lectures and addresses to the clergy.

HINGESTON, *Capgrave's Chronicle of England* (R. S., London, 1858); MAUNDE THOMPSON in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1887), IX, 20; HORSTMAN, *Nova Legenda Angliæ*, Introduction (Oxford, 1901).

EDWIN BURTON.

Cap Haïtien, DIOCESE OF (CAPITIS HAITIANI), erected by Pius IX, 3 October, 1861, in the ecclesiastical Province of Port au Prince, territorially corresponds to the Department of the North of the French-speaking negro Republic of Haiti. In 1906 the jurisdiction of the See of Cap Haïtien covered some 650,000 Catholics, or rather more than one-fourth of the whole population of the Haitian Republic, which forms the western political division (about one-third the area) of the Island of Santo Domingo, the largest but one of the Greater Antilles.

HISTORY.—On his second voyage to Santo Domingo, or, as he named it, Hispaniola, Columbus brought with him some religious of the Order of St. Dominic. This was in November, 1493, and since then the Haitian part of the island, at least, has never lacked pastors. A plan of the city of Cap Haïtien still extant, and dating from the year 1600, differs hardly at all in extent from the plan of the present city. In the collection of annals of the "Missions catholiques" there are, also, letters of the same period, written from Petite Anse by a Jesuit Father. The parishes of the North were generally served by religious of the Society of Jesus, but there were also at Cap Haïtien some Franciscans whose names have been preserved, and one section of that city is still called "Morne des Capucins". In addition to the work of the parish the Jesuits administered a very large hospital at the gate of the city and another (military) hospital inside. There was also a convent of nuns, very fine, and of very considerable size, to judge by its site, which has remained unoccupied, being now held in reserve by the Government for the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny, whenever that congregation shall be able to found an establishment there.

From the time when Haiti secured its national independence (1804) to the Concordat (1860) the country was without a hierarchy. After a period of unsuccessful attempts at ecclesiastical reorganization under vicars and prefects Apostolic, negotiations between the Holy See and the administration of President Geffrard resulted (28 March, 1860) in the conclusion of the Concordat, which expired in 1885. Monsignor Monetti, titular Bishop of Lervia, was sent to Haiti in 1861 to settle various points left open in the text of the Concordat, and among these was the establishment of a suffragan see at Cap Haïtien, as well as the amount of the stipends to be paid to bishops and vicars-general. Provision was made for another diocese at Port de la Paix, but it was never formally established, and its territory is administered from Cap Haïtien.

The first Bishop of Cap Haïtien, Monseigneur Constant Mathurin Hillion, took possession of his see 24

May, 1874. There was no cathedral, and the Divine Offices were performed in a miserable chapel which was much too small. To supply this pressing need the bishop set about rebuilding a ruined church which dated from the time of Louis XV. He was able to collect a sum of about 200,000 francs ($40,000), and in the space of three months an American company completed the construction of the actual nave with its aisles, the transept and choir being still (1906) incomplete. The bishop also lost no time in establishing two schools, one for boys and the other for girls, under the Institute of Christian Instruction (Frères La Mennais) and the Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny. The sisters had arrived 9 May, 1872; the Frères La Mennais came 9 November, 1877. At this epoch, through the initiative of Père Bertin, *curé* and honorary canon, the equipment of the cathedral was rendered complete by the erection of a presbytery. Upon the death of Monseigneur Guillons, Monseigneur Hillion succeeded him as Archbishop of Port-au-Prince, and Monseigneur Kersuzan, titular Bishop of Hippo and coadjutor to the late archbishop, was made Bishop of Cap Haïtien, 10 November, 1886. The Bishop of Cap Haïtien had until then resided in a house too small for the gatherings of all the clergy in their annual retreat. He found means to build a very fine episcopal residence, with a chapel and adequate outbuildings, an edifice undeniably the most considerable in the city after the cathedral. This residence was destroyed by fire, but the construction of a more spacious and equally imposing edifice is now (1906) in progress. The diocesan seminary had been carried on at Pont-Château, in Brittany, by the Society of Mary founded by Bl. René de Montfort. When the French Government outlawed the religious orders, Monseigneur Kersuzan succeeded in installing his present seminary (Saint-Jacques) at Lanpaul, in the Diocese of Quimper, Brittany. It is under the care of secular priests: a director, two administrators, and six professors, with 50 students. The same bishop also founded at Cap Haïtien the College of *Notre-Dame de secours perpétuel*, which affords Haitian youths the advantages of secondary education without the expense and risks of a sojourn in Europe. This college is administered by a director, two ecclesiastic, and two lay, teachers. Lastly, the hospice owes to Monseigneur Kersuzan the introduction of the sisters, whose ministrations insure disinterested care for the sick with due consideration of their spiritual welfare.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL STATUS.—Since the establishment of the hierarchy the twenty-one parishes of this diocese have little by little been provided with pastors, and some with assistants. There are altogether sixty-three churches, chapels, and oratories in the diocese. The number of practical Catholics has more than trebled and marriages have multiplied everywhere. There still remains, however, an unconverted majority in the immense parishes, which often contain a population of 30,000, while the smallest always contain several thousands.

In addition to the college already mentioned there is a boys' school, conducted by ten of the Frères La Mennais, with 200 pupils; and three other schools, each employing three religious of the same order, with from 150 to 200 pupils in each. The Sisters of St. Joseph of Cluny carry on six schools, one with 250 pupils under ten sisters, and five, each with 150 pupils under three sisters. The Daughters of Wisdom supply, besides ten religious for the hospice, 22 religious, teaching an aggregate of 750 girls in six schools in as many parishes. The number of Protestants residing in the diocese is extremely small, and is made up almost entirely of strangers from the neighbouring islands. There are three Masonic temples at Cap Haïtien, and probably one in each of the other towns or considerable villages of the diocese. When there was virtually no clergy, it was a fashion in Haiti to join the lodges; but these are now little frequented, except two or three times a year, on festival occasions, when there are receptions or banquets. M. CHATTÉ.

Capharnaum, a titular see of Palestine. Its name (also KAPERNAUM) means village of Nahum or consolation. It is frequently mentioned in the Gospels: Jesus, when repelled by the Nazarenes, made it His new abode (Matt., iv, 13; Luke, iv, 31; John, ii, 12); He chose there his first disciples, Peter, Andrew, James, John, Matthew (Matt., iv, 18, 21; ix, 9; Mark i, 16); He cured there the centurion's servant, Peter's mother-in-law, a paralytic, a demoniac, the Hæmorrhoissa, etc.; it was there that He brought to life again the daughter of Jairus, and delivered many discourses, especially the one concerning the institution of the Eucharist (John, vi). The inhabitants, however, at the instigation of the Pharisees, broke off with Him, and Jesus, on leaving their city, cursed it (Matt., xi, 23). Under Constantine the Great, Count Joseph, a converted Jew, built a church there which the pilgrim known as "Pseudo-Antoninus" visited in the sixth century. Since then the town has not been mentioned in the history of Palestine. It was never a Greek see, nor even a Latin one in the Middle Ages. Lequien, it is true (III, 719), quotes a document concerning the ecclesiastical province of Scythopolis, in Palestina Secunda, wherein we read: "Ibi sunt adhuc Bethsaida, Naim et Capharnaum, sed alio nomine vocitantur nec habent episcopos". Just when it became a Latin titular see is not known, the title now being held by the coadjutor to the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem. Capharnaum must be identified with Tell-Houm on the north bank of the Lake of Tiberias. There are splendid ruins there, chiefly of a magnificent synagogue seventy-two feet long and fifty-four feet wide. In a little convent on this site some Franciscans reside for the reception of pilgrims. According to some archæologists the site of Capharnaum is not at Tell-Houm, but in the vicinity, on the way to Tiberias, either at Khan-Minieh or at Aïn-Tabigah. In the latter place the Cologne Catholic Society conducts an agricultural colony.

WILSON, *Lands of the Bible*, II, 139–149; THOMSON, *The Land and the Book*, I, 542; ROBINSON, *Biblical Researches* (1856), III, 347–357; CONDER, *Tentwork in Palestine*, II, 182; KITCHENER in *Quarterly Statement* of the Palestine Exploration Fund (July, 1879).

S. VAILHÉ.

Capistran (CAPISTRANO), JOHN. See JOHN CAPISTRAN, SAINT.

Capital Punishment. See PUNISHMENT.

Capitolias, a titular see of Palestine, suffragan to Scythopolis in Palestina Secunda. According to the coins of the city, its special era begins A. D. 97 or 98; it dates, therefore, at least under this name, from the time of Nerva or Trajan. It was originally a part of the Decapolis. Capitolias is mentioned by many geographers, among others by Hierocles and Georgius Cyprius in the sixth and seventh centuries. Six bishops are given by Lequien (III, 715). The first, Antiochus, was present at Nicæa in 325; the second, Ananias, was at Chalcedon in 451; the last, St. Peter, is said to have suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Saracens early in the seventh century; he seems, however, to have been only a priest of Capitolias. In the twelfth century the see was an independent archbishopric, as appears from a "Notitia episcopatuum" of that time (H. Gelzer, in Byzantin. Zeitschrift, I, 253). Eubel, I, 169, mentions four Latin titulars in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The site of Capitolias is identified with the ruins at Bet-er-Ras, near Irbid, the chief village of a *kaïmakamlik* in the vilayet of Syria.

SCHUMACHER, *Northern Adjlun*, 154 sq.; LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus* (1740), III, 715–18.

S. VAILHÉ.

Capitularies (Lat. *Capitularia*), collections of laws or ordinances, chiefly of the Frankish kings, divided into many single laws or chapters (*capitula*), so that a *capitulare* meant the sum total of such single laws. Sometimes such collections consisted of only one law or *capitulum;* even then they were called *capitularia*. The word *capitulare* was used officially for the first time (779) in an enactment of Charlemagne (Mon. Germ. Hist: Leges, II, i, 47). It was also applied to certain legislative acts of bishops.

Episcopal Capitularies.—The capitularies or capitula of the bishops were compilations of ecclesiastical laws, drawn as a rule from previous legislation, and proposed to the clergy and people for their guidance. Their general purpose was, on the one hand, to make it easy for ecclesiastics to know the canons or laws of the Church, at least in the summaries thus compiled; on the other, to keep intact and uniform the discipline of the Church, and to maintain the religious life of both clergy and laity at as high a standard as possible. There are yet extant many such compilations, which may be divided into two categories. Those of the first contain laws whose content shows that they were not restricted to one diocese, but were applicable to several. Those of the second were meant primarily for one diocese and are more properly called capitularies. To the first order of capitularies belong the capitula of St. Martin, Metropolitan of Braga (571–80) in Gallicia, the present Portugal (Mansi, Sacr. Conc. Coll., IX, 845, sqq.). His object was to render more intelligible the canons of the Greek Church by a new translation into Latin, and to arrange them in a systematic order. The collection became very important in subsequent ages, when it was incorporated with the "Collectio Hispana", and with this passed into the work of Pseudo-Isidore. After the tenth century it formed part of nearly every compilation of ecclesiastical law. Then follow two collections made by St. Boniface (d. 754). The first contains twenty-eight capitula issued about 744 (Mansi, op. cit., XII, App. 107, sqq.); the second has thirty-six *statuta* issued about 745 (op. cit., XII, 383, sqq.). The collection of Egbert, Archbishop of York (735–51), known as "Excerptiones Egberti Eboracensis Archiepiscopi" (op. cit., XII, 411, sqq.), is but a summary made by the deacon Huncar about 1040 from a larger work of Egbert (q. v.) entitled "De jure sacerdotali". The collection attributed to Isaac, Bishop of Langres in France (859–80), and known as "Canones Isaac Episcopi Lingonensis" (op. cit., XVI, App. 633, sqq.), is merely an extract from the three books of capitularies of Benedictus Levita. The capitula of Angilramnus, Bishop of Metz (768–91), are said to have been published by him after he had received them from Adrian I (772–95). They are intimately connected with the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, and hence not genuine; they were written about the middle of the ninth century (Hinschius, Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ, 757, sqq.).

Among the capitularies of the second class we may mention first the Rule of St. Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz (742–66), written about 760 (Mansi, op. cit., XIV, 313, sqq.), which regulated the common or canonical life of his diocesan clergy. These decrees, modified by Amalarius of Metz, were eventually made obligatory upon the clergy of the whole Frankish Empire at the Diet of Aachen (817). Then follow: the capitulary of Theodulf, Bishop of Orléans (797–821), issued towards the end of the eighth century, with several additions (op. cit., XIII, 993, sqq.); the capitulary of Hatto, Bishop of Basle (836), issued about 822 (op. cit., XIV, 393, sqq.); the capitula of Rodulf, Archbishop of Bourges, issued about 850 (op. cit., XIV, 943, sqq.); the capitula of Hérard, Archbishop of Tours (855–70), issued in 858 (op. cit., XVI, App. 677, sqq.); the various capitula of Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims (845–82), issued in 852, 856, and 874 (op. cit., XV, 475, sqq., 493, sqq.); the capitula of Walter, Bishop of Orléans, issued about 871 (op. cit., XV, 503, sqq.); finally, the *constitutio* of Riculf, Bishop of Soissons, issued about 889 (op. cit., XVIII, 81, sqq.). A number of these capitularies were published in diocesan synods, e. g. those of Hérard of Tours, of Hincmar of Reims (at least the ones of 852 and 874), and of Walter of Orléans. Perhaps this was the usual custom, since the capitula of Theodulf of Orléans and of Rodulf of Bourges mention the diocesan synod as of obligation at stated intervals.

Royal Capitularies.—The capitularies of the Frankish kings were legislative or administrative enactments. In the Merovingian period they were known as *epistola, præceptum, edictum, decretio,* or *pactus* if issued by several kings together. In the present acceptation of the word the capitularies comprise legislative acts issued by the Frankish rulers, either Merovingians or Carlovingians, from the beginning of the sixth century to the end of the ninth. They are usually distinguished from *leges,* or laws, not because they lack legislative force, but because since the sixth century the term *leges* is usually applied to the written or formally codified customs prevailing among the various Germanic nations; thus we have the "Lex Salica", the "Lex Alamannorum", and the like. The capitularies, on the contrary, may have a wider application. They were usually drawn up without any specific order and without such formalities as the royal seal or signature; hence they differed from other royal acts, e. g. the *diplomata* and *mandata*. The capitularies were executed by the royal officers or by the king himself; therefore they did not need the formalities required for other documents as evidences of the royal will. The contents of the capitularies are manifold. Sometimes they contain only directions given to royal officers, chiefly the *missi dominici;* sometimes additions to, or modifications of, the *leges;* more generally they contain ordinances bearing on almost every form of civil and ecclesiastical life. Among the civil ordinances are regulations affecting the royal magistracy, commerce, customs-duties, markets, currency, the army, safety of travellers, procedure in criminal and civil suits, private rights or prerogatives, and many other subjects. Concerning ecclesiastical matters there are regulations on the organization of the Church, its relation to the civil power, monastic life, discipline of the Church, education, manner of worship, ecclesiastical feast-days, and the like. A division or systematic classification of the capitularies is practically impossible. While some deal exclusively with ecclesiastical matters, in many of them things ecclesiastical and civil are so intermingled that it is difficult to distinguish in them two kinds of capitularies. Nor can the capitularies bearing on civil matters be divided into classes, though some have imagined that they could distinguish three different kinds. Those of the first class were called *capitularia legibus addenda*, and were said to contain modifications of the *leges*, made with the consent of the nation whose laws were thus affected. Those of the second class were called *capitularia per se scribenda*, said to contain ordinances affecting the people of the Frankish Empire generally, issued by the king with or without the consent of the men of rank. Those of the third class were called *capitularia missorum*, and were said to contain merely instructions for the royal officers or counts known as the *missi dominici*.

There is no sufficient basis, however, in the text of the capitularies for this classification. While the matter contained therein has a bearing on all those subjects, still it is put together so indiscriminately that no systematic division can be made; in fact, no uniform system was aimed at in this legislation. There is, moreover, no sufficient foundation for the assertion that for a certain class of capitularies the

consent of a nation was required. The laws or ordinances were enacted either by the king himself and alone, or after a consultation with his advisers, or with the men of rank in a diet or parliament. It was customary among the Franks, as indeed among the Germanic nations generally, to assemble once a year in the month of March, or at some other time in the spring or summer, for legislative, military, or other purposes. The attendance, which at first was general on the part of all freemen, gradually shrank to the men of rank or the nobles and ecclesiastical dignitaries, such as counts, bishops, and abbots. At such assemblies or diets legislative matters were discussed between the king and his attendants, in which all, bishops, abbots, counts, and other royal officers, took part. Once the subjects were sufficiently debated, they were drawn up as *capitula* and published as laws. For this reason a certain number of capitularies were prepared and issued in the annual diets. But the same cannot be asserted of all, since there are many which were not issued in the diets, or at least of which this cannot be stated with certainty. If matters of an ecclesiastical character came up for discussion, they were generally, though not always, submitted to the judgment of the bishops alone. In fact, the bishops of the Frankish Empire often held their synods contemporaneously with the diets. Sometimes also the diets presented an almost exclusively ecclesiastical character, and thus they were called synods as well as *conventus* or *placita*. In order to preserve the capitularies and through them the written law, they were reduced to writing and kept in the archives of the imperial palace. Copies of them were sent to the royal officers throughout the empire, or else the officers were themselves requested to secure copies, send them to each other, and in turn make them known to the people. In a capitulary of the year 825 Emperor Louis the Pious (814–40) ordered that the archbishops and counts should secure copies of the capitularies from the chancellor, and communicate them to other ecclesiastical or royal dignitaries in their districts for the purpose of publication. This publication was to be done in the judicial assemblies or courts of justice, in the market-places of cities, and also in the churches. These orders were apparently not executed conscientiously; otherwise translations into the vernacular would have been made, of which, however, there is practically no trace.

As the number of the capitularies kept growing, the need was felt of uniting them into one work. The first (incomplete) collection of this kind was made in 827 by Ansegisus (q. v.), Abbot of the monastery of Fontanelle, or, as it was called afterwards, St-Vandrille in Normandy. He divided his work into four books: the first contained the ecclesiastical capitularies of Charlemagne, the second the ecclesiastical capitularies of Louis the Pious, the third the capitularies of Charlemagne on civil matters, the fourth the capitularies of Louis the Pious and his son Lothaire on civil matters. Three appendixes were added to the work containing titles of capitularies, or capitularies that were doubled. This collection, though owing to the private initiative of Ansegisus, received the sanction of Louis the Pious in 829, and in this way obtained an official character. Towards the middle of the ninth century a new collection in three books appeared, designed to continue and complete the work of Ansegisus. Its author states that it was made by Benedictus Levita, a deacon of Mainz (847), at the suggestion of Bishop Autgar of that city. In reality it contains few genuine capitularies; the greater part of the work is a forgery, the materials for which were taken from the Roman law, the *Breviarium Alarici*, the *leges* of the Visigoths and Bavarians, the canons of councils, the decretals of the popes, the penitential books, and the writings of the Fathers. It was published shortly after 847 and is intimately connected with the decretals of Pseudo-Isidore. Hence, according to many, it was most probably written either at Reims or Le Mans, the birthplace of the Isidorian decretals.

The capitularies enjoyed great authority throughout the Middle Ages. Bishops made use of them in their legislation; thus the above mentioned Hérard of Tours in his capitula, Isaac of Langres in his *canones*, and Walter of Orléans in his capitula. The provincial councils of the ninth and tenth centuries recommended their perusal, or else adopted their constitutions, e. g. a synod of Reims (881), a synod of Mainz (888), a synod of Ravenna (904), and a synod of Trosly, Diocese of Soissons (909). Finally, the later compilers of canons, like Regino of Prüm, Burchard of Worms, Ivo of Chartres, and Gratian, borrowed much of their material from the capitularies. The text of the capitularies has often been printed. They were first edited by Vitus Amenpach (Ingolstadt, 1545) from a manuscript of the monastery of Tegernsee (Bavaria). An incomplete edition of the capitularies of Ansegisus and Benedictus Levita was published by Jean du Tillet (Paris, 1548). Five books of capitularies were published by B. J. Hérold (Basle, 1557), but this edition is rather incomplete and defective. The edition of du Tillet was completed by Pierre Pithou (Paris, 1588), and again by François Pithou (Paris, 1603). Jacques Sirmond published the capitularies of Charles the Bald and his successors (Paris, 1623). A very complete edition of the capitularies was produced by Etienne Baluze (Paris, 1677), was reprinted at Venice in 1772, and re-edited by Pierre de Chiniac (Paris, 1780). The edition of Baluze has been inserted in various publications of law and history issued since then in Germany, France, and Italy. A new edition was made by Pertz for the "Monumenta Germaniæ Historica" (Leges, I–II, Hanover, 1835–37). A later and better edition appeared in the same great collection, the work of A. Boretius and V. Krause (Leges, I–II, Hanover, 1883–97). Baluze, Pertz, Boretius, and Krause sought to give the complete text of all existing capitularies and to arrange them in their chronological order; in their editions, therefore, the reader will find much more than the capitularies of Ansegisus and Benedictus Levita, which latter are now accessible in special reprints.

PHILLIPS, *Kirchenrecht* (Ratisbon, 1851), IV; HINSCHIUS, *Kirchenr.* (Berlin, 1883), III; VERING, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenr.* (Freiburg, 1881); SÄGMÜLLER, *Lehrb. des kathol. Kirchenr.* (Freiburg, 1904); MAASSEN, *Gesch. der Quellen und der Litt. des canon. Rechts* (Gratz, 1870); POHLE in *Kirchenlex.* (Freiburg, 1887), s. v. *Capitula;* SEELINGER, *Die Kapitularien der Karolinger* (Munich, 1893); PLATZ, *Die Capit. der fränkischen Könige bis zu Karl dem Grossen* (Pforzheim, 1882–88); IDEM, *Die Gesetzgebung Karl des Grossen nach den Capit.* (Offenburg, 1897–98); BALUZE, *Præfatio* in MIGNE, *P. L.* (Paris, 1862), XCVII; WAITZ, *Deutsche Verfassungsgesch.* (Berlin, 1883), III; DAHN, *Die Könige der Germanen* (Leipzig, 1894–99), VII, 2, VIII, 3; ESMEIN, *Cours élémentaire d'hist. du droit français* (Paris, 1892); SCHLÖSSER in *Kirchenlex.* (Freiburg, 1887), s. v. *Capitularia regum Francorum;* RIETSCHEL in *Realencyk. f. prot. Theol.* (Leipzig, 1901), X, 43.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Capitulary Vicar. See VICAR CAPITULAR.

Capitulations, EPISCOPAL AND PONTIFICAL, were agreements, by which those taking part in the election of a bishop or pope imposed special conditions upon the candidate to be fulfilled by him after his election. Episcopal capitulations owe their origin to the fact that since the eleventh and twelfth centuries the real election of bishops was restricted to the canons of cathedral chapters, who were anxious to curtail the prerogatives or the income of the bishops, and to secure for themselves privileges or larger revenues. Since the early part of the thirteenth century the canons of Mainz agreed amongst themselves not to elect a bishop unless he promised beforehand to exact no financial contributions from the clergy.

Such capitulations became practically universal throughout Germany, where the election of bishops remained in the hands of cathedral chapters. In the diet held at Nuremberg in 1522 the chapters were condemned for extorting such concessions from the bishops. If these capitulations contain conditions which curtail the jurisdiction or the prerogatives of the bishop, the privileges of the diocese, or the like, then they do not bind the candidate-elect, even if he has taken an oath to carry them out; the canons have no jurisdiction in such matters. Several papal declarations forbade them and pronounced them invalid; thus the Constitution "Contingit" of Nicholas III (1277–80) in the "Liber Sextus" (II, tit., xi, 1); Pius V (1566–72) "Durum nimis", 31 May, 1570; Gregory XIII (1572–85) "Inter apostolicas", 5 September, 1584; Innocent XII (1691–1700) "Ecclesiæ Catholicæ", 22 September, 1695; and Benedict XIV (1740–58) "Pastoralis regiminis", 15 July, 1754. Severe penalties were imposed on those who should act contrary to these instructions, viz., suspension for those in the episcopal order, interdict for the chapters, and excommunication for their individual members. Still the capitulations were maintained in Germany, partly because the constitution of ecclesiastical states was often based on them; partly because such privileges of the chapters were acknowledged by the "Instrumentum pacis", or Treaty of Osnabrück (1648); and partly because the emperors at the beginning of their reigns promised to protect the customary usages of the chapters.

The papal capitulations arose in about the same manner when, from the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the election of a pope was reserved to the cardinals. The first authentic example occurred when Innocent VI (1352–62) was chosen pope. The conditions then laid down by the cardinals restricted the rights of the future pope, especially with regard to the nomination, punishment, or deposition of cardinals, the appointment to positions in the papal provinces, and the administration of temporalities—in all of which the cardinals wished to have a voice. Similar but more far-reaching capitulations were entered into at the election of Eugene IV (1431–47), at the election of Pius II (1458–64), at the election of Paul II (1464–71), and at the election of Innocent VIII (1484–92). These papal capitulations were likewise forbidden and pronounced null and void. Innocent VI, in the Constitution "Sollicitudo" of the year 1353, rejected as not binding upon him the capitulation entered into at the time of his own election. Innocent VIII believed that he was not bound to observe those conditions of the capitulation which were contrary to the prerogatives of the head of the Church. More general declarations are contained in the Constitution "Ubi periculum" of Gregory X (1271–76), published in 1274; in the "In eligendis", published by Pius IV (1559–65), 9 October, 1562; and in the "Æterni Patris" of Gregory XV (1621–23), 15 November, 1621.

SCHMALZGRÜBER, *Jus ecclesiasticum* (Rome, 1843), I; FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Electio* (Paris, 1865), III; HINSCHIUS, *Kirchenrecht* (Berlin, 1869, 1878), I, II; PHILLIPS, *Kirchenrecht* (Ratisbon, 1854), V; BRUNNER, *Wahlkapitulationen der Bischöfe von Konstanz* in *Zeitschr. für die Gesch. des Oberrheins* (Karlsruhe, 1898); PASTOR, *Gesch. der Päpste* (Freiburg, 1891, 1894, 1895), I, II, III.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Capitula Tria, See THREE CHAPTERS.

Capo d'Istria, DIOCESE OF. See TRIEST.

Cappadocia. See ASIA MINOR.

Capponi, GINO, COUNT, historian and litterateur; b. at Florence, Italy, 13 September, 1792; d. 3 February, 1876. He came of an ancient family, whose members had often figured in the annals of Italian literature. Under private tutors of note, Count Capponi was well trained in the humanities and in such modern languages as English, French, and German. Fond of travelling, he early began his peregrinations throughout his native land, acquainting himself with the past and present traditions of Italian art and letters. In 1813, when he had but barely reached man's estate, he visited Paris, on a deputation to Napoleon. He also visited England, where he contracted a close friendship with the exiled Foscolo, and later he travelled in Holland and Germany. Back in Florence once more, he devoted himself to constant study, maintaining all the while constant relations with the best scholars and writers of the time, and figuring prominently in the various learned and literary academies. To his initiative and active co-operation was due the successful launching of a number of important periodicals dealing with many and varied interests. Thus the "Antologia" was founded in 1821 by Vieusseux, who valued greatly the aid given him by Capponi, and he was quite efficacious in starting the "Giornale Agrario Toscano" (1827), the "Guida dell'Educatore" (1836), and the "Archivio Storico Italiano" (1842). Entering into political life, he there professed moderate sentiments and so recommended himself by his self-restraint and prudence that he became head of a ministry in the Grand Duchy during the troublous times of 1848. He was afterwards a senator of the realm. He passed the latter part of his life in darkness, having been stricken by blindness in 1840.

While engaged in translating from the French a history of Florence by Mme O. Allart, he conceived the idea of writing his own "Storia della Repubblica di Firenze", which, after twenty years of labour, he published in 1875 (Florence, 2nd revised ed., 1876), by the advice of the German historian, Alfred von Reumont. His history extends from the beginning of the commune down to the fall of the republic in 1530, and is a statement of all that is told by the old Florentine chronicles and by the early historians, substantiated by documents and amplified with considerations on the state of culture in the various periods. Many of his lesser writings have been brought together in the "Scritti editi ed inediti" published by M. Tabarrini (Florence, 1877). Interesting still is the polemic which he wrote in connexion with the controversy about Amerigo Vespucci. Those who treat of the Lombards in Italy must take cognizance of his "Lettere al professor Capei sulla dominazione dei Longobardi in Italia". His views on pedagogical matters are expressed in the "Frammenti sull' educazione" and his studies in political economy take a practical turn in the "Cinque letture di economia toscana". With the zeal of an intelligent student of folk-lore he arranged, amplified, and published the "Raccolta di proverbi toscani" of the scholar Giusti. Instructive not only with regard to the man himself, but also for the general political, social, and literary conditions of his time, is the "Epistolario" published in six volumes by G. C. Carraresi (Florence, 1884–90); it embraces many letters written by others to Count Capponi, as well as those written by him.

The personality of Capponi reveals itself in every respect as one of the most engaging that modern Italy has possessed. He was a man of strong integrity, a sturdy Catholic, friendly to those forms of political liberty that obeyed the moral law, and thoroughly imbued with love for all the arts of refinement.

Edinburgh Review (April, 1876); *Nuova Antologia* (Feb., 1886); VON REUMONT, *Gino Capponi, Ein Zeit- und Lebensbild* (Gotha, 1880; this has also a bibliography); GUASTI in *Atti dell' Accademia della Crusca* (1876); DE GUBERNATIS, in *Rivista Europea* (June, 1876); his personal memoirs published as *Ricordi* in the *Scritti editi ed inediti*, II.

J. D. M. FORD.

Capranica, DOMENICO, cardinal, theologian, canonist, and statesman, b. at Capranica near Palestrina, Italy, in 1400; d. at Rome, 14 July, 1458. After brilliant studies in canon and civil law at Padua and Bologna, under such teachers as the later Cardinals

Giuliano Cesarini and Nicholas of Cusa, he received the title of Doctor of Both Laws at the age of twenty-one. Soon he became secretary to Martin V, and Apostolic prothonotary, and in 1423 or 1426 was made cardinal *in petto* by this pope, though his nomination was not published in secret consistory until 1430. He had earned this rapid promotion by various political and military services, notably by his administration of Imola and Forlì and by his successful reduction of rebellious Bologna. In the meantime he had become Bishop of Fermo, but for some reason did not go to Rome for the public ceremonies of the cardinalate. Despite his protest, and their previous agreement with Martin V, the cardinals of the conclave that followed the latter's death (1431) refused to recognize Capranica's nomination, and the new pope, Eugene IV, sustained their decision on the ground that the delivery of the hat and assignment of the title were necessary for the validity of a cardinalitial nomination. Capranica, having already suffered severe losses at Rome through the enmity of the Orsini, took refuge first with the Visconti of Milan and later appealed (1432) to the Council of Basle for recognition of his title. This was granted, but to punish him for adhering to the Council Eugene IV deprived him of all honours and dignities, also of all his possessions. Capranica, then served by Æneas Sylvius as secretary, bore himself with moderation and caution, and soon sought a reconciliation with the pope at Florence (30 April, 1434), who restored to him his offices and goods, gave him the cardinalitial Title of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and sent him to the Council at Ferrara, with special commission to treat with the Greek bishops and theologians concerning the reunion of the Churches. He frequently administered important departments of the States of the Church, always with justice, prudence, and integrity. He executed twelve responsible embassies for the Apostolic See, and was named (1449) Grand Penitentiary and Archpriest of the Lateran. Capranica was one of the most earnest reformers in the Roman Church, inaugurated the restoration of primitive fervour among the Cistercians of Tuscany, and drew up for Nicholas V, in 1449, a model plan of a general religious reformation (Pastor, Gesch. d. Päpste, 4th ed. I, 394–96). He was extremely stern and severe in character, and in the duties of his office open and free of speech, also quite fearless. He insisted on a personal examination of the votes cast for Nicholas V, whose election greatly surprised him, and remonstrated vigorously with Callistus III for his nepotism, especially in the nomination of Don Pedro Luis Borgia as Vicar (governor) of Spoleto (Pastor, op. cit., tr. II, 461). While very liberal to the poor, on the other hand he was austere and rigid towards the worldly prelates of the city and was wont to freely reproach them. His household was a model for correctness and simplicity of life. Capranica was eminent as a peacemaker, notably at Genoa, where he healed grievous municipal dissensions, and again between the Apostolic See and King Alfonso of Naples and the princes of Germany. During the plague of 1456 he remained at Rome when many others fled. He took a very prominent part in all the negotiations for a crusade against the Turks in the hope of restoring Constantinople to the Palæologi. To posterity he is best known as the founder of the Collegio Capranica (see COLLEGES, ROMAN), which he opened in his own palace (the oldest Roman monument of the early Renaissance) for thirty-one poor scholars, sixteen in theology and the liberal arts, and fifteen in canon law. Its constitutions, drawn up by himself (Rome, 1705, 1879), are praised as a model of their kind; the college itself is the oldest of the Roman colleges and therefore rejoices in the peculiar title of "Almo Collegio". In 1460 his brother Cardinal Angelo Capranica erected nearby a special building for the college (Denifle, Die Universitäten, I, 317 sqq.). He left all his property to ecclesiastical uses, saying: "The Church gave it to me; I give it back, for I am not its master, but its steward. I should indeed have reaped but little profit from the nights spent in studying ecclesiastical discipline if I were to leave to my relatives the goods of the Church which belong to the poor" (Pastor, op. cit. II, 492). At his death the Milanese ambassador wrote home that "the wisest, the most perfect, the most learned, and the holiest prelate whom the Church has in our days possessed is gone from us". He added that he was universally considered as the next pope (op. cit. II, 494). Pastor himself says that of all the cardinals of the Renaissance Age none but Albergati, Cesarini, and Carvajal can be compared with him (ibid., 495). He lies buried in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, near St. Catherine of Siena. He wrote an excellent *opusculum* known as "The Art of Dying Well" printed in 1487. In his life by Catalanus (see below) are some notes on the Council of Basle, and he is said by Mansi (in Moroni) to have written a history of that council, never printed. He also drew up for the instruction of his nephew certain "Rules of Life" that Pastor says reflect his beautiful character.

MONUMENT TO CARDINAL DOMENICO CAPRANICA

The most complete account of his life is found in the rare work of CATALANUS, *De Vitâ et scriptis Dominici Capranicæ, Cardinalis Antistitis Firmani* (Fermo, 1793). Cf. DA BISTICCI, *Vite di Uomini illustri*, in MAI, *Spicilegium*, I, 185–91; CUGNONI, *Æneæ Sylvii Piccolomini opera inedita*, etc. (Rome, 1893); PASTOR, *History of the Popes*, etc., tr. (London, 1891), II, 483–95 and passim; CIACONIUS-OLDOINUS, *Vitæ pontificum*, etc., II, 832–41; EUBEL in *Römische Quartalschrift* (1903), XVII, 273–92.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Caprara, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, statesman and cardinal, b. at Bologna, 29 May, 1733; d. at Paris, 27 July, 1810. His parents were Count Francesco Raimondo Montecuccoli and Countess Maria Vittoria Caprara; it was from his mother that he took his name. Having entered the ecclesiastical state, he was appointed in 1758 vice-legate of Ravenna, in 1767 nuncio at Cologne, in 1775 at Lucerne, and in 1785 at Vienna. In this last and most important position he did not always defend with sufficient courage the interests of the Church against the aggressions of the Emperor Joseph II (1765–90), and the imperial ministers Prince Kaunitz and Count Cobenzl. During the summer of 1792 he was made Cardinal-Priest of the Title of Sant' Onofrio, and in August, 1800, Bishop of Jesi in the Mark of Ancona. When the Concordat between Pius VII (1800–23) and the French Republic was concluded (July, 1801), Napoleon Bonaparte, then First Consul, asked for the appointment of a papal legate with residence in Paris. His choice fell upon Cardinal Caprara, undoubtedly because he expected in this way little or no opposition to his plans. Caprara was appointed legate *a latere* for France in August, 1801; he departed at once for his destination and arrived in Paris on the 4th of October. During

the negotiations which followed concerning the execution of the Concordat he displayed too conciliatory a spirit in dealing with the ten constitutional bishops who were to be appointed to as many of the newly-established dioceses; in fact, he went contrary to specific instructions from Rome. However, persistent pressure exerted by Napoleon may be taken as an excuse for the legate's conduct. Cardinal Caprara officiated at the solemn restoration of public worship in the cathedral of Notre-Dame on Easter Day (18 April, 1802), at which function the First Consul, the high officers of state, and the new ecclesiastical dignitaries assisted. At times the cardinal legate showed more strength in the interest of the Church; thus, in a letter written 18 August, 1803, he protested most energetically against the Organic Articles added to the Concordat by the French Government.

In May, 1802, shortly after the above-mentioned solemnities, he was appointed Archbishop of Milan, and as such he blessed, on the 26th of May, 1805, the Iron Crown, which Napoleon placed on his own head in his new dignity of King of Italy. Otherwise Caprara retained his position as papal legate in France until his death, or rather until the imprisonment of Pope Pius VII in July, 1809. His declining health saved him from the embarrassment connected with the divorce and second marriage of Napoleon (April, 1810). In his last will his entire fortune was left to the hospital of Milan. In memory of all that was done in behalf of France he published the "Concordat et recueil des bulles et brefs de N. S. Pie VII. sur les affaires de l'Eglise de France" (Paris, 1802). Cardinal Caprara was a man of simple and pure habits, zealous for religion and very charitable, but often inclined to yield to the imperious will of princes and ministers, a weakness which at times justified the reproaches of Pius VI (1775–99) and Pius VII.

RINIERI, *La Diplomazia Pontificia* (Rome, 1902), I; THEINER, *Hist. des deux Concordats* (Paris, 1869), I; GENDRY, *Pie VI* (Paris, 1905); ARTAUD, *Histoire du Pape Pie VII* (Paris, 1837); WERNER in *Kirchenlex.* (Freiburg, 1887), II.

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Capreolus, JOHN, theologian, b. towards the end of the fourteenth century (about 1380) in the Diocese of Rodez, France; d. in that city, 6 April, 1444. He has been called the "Prince of Thomists", but only scanty details of his personal history are known. He was a Dominican affiliated to the province of Toulouse, and a general chapter of his order at Poitiers in 1407 assigned him to lecture on "The Sentences" in the University of Paris. He began in 1408 and achieved success. The following year he finished the first part of his celebrated defensive commentary on the theology of St. Thomas Aquinas. He passed examinations for degrees at the Sorbonne in 1411 and in 1415. After serving for some time as regent of studies at Toulouse, he repaired to Rodez, where he laboured assiduously at his commentaries, completing the three remaining parts in 1426, 1428, and 1433. In the preface of a compendium of Capreolus's work by Isidore de Isolanis, it is stated that these MSS. once narrowly escaped destruction by fire, a lay brother having saved them, to the joy of the author, who was then advanced in years. The same authority describes the erudite commentator as having cherished through life a tender devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Though following the order of "The Sentences", the commentaries of Capreolus are a calm, learned, and penetrating exposition of the teachings of St. Thomas, as well as a comprehensive defence against sundry opponents and critics, including Scotus, Henry of Ghent, John of Ripa, Guido (the Carmelite), Aureolus, Durandus, Gregory of Rimini, William of Ockham, and other Nominalists. Copious and apt citations show that the author had mastered Aristotle and his Arabic commentator, Averroes; but a scrupulous fidelity to the Angelical Doctor, that earned for him the extraordinary appellation of "Soul of St. Thomas", is his chief characteristic.

There is nothing in the wide field of the doctrinal discussions of his time that Capreolus did not study and elucidate with precision of insight and reasoning, and express in a style so terse and vigorous that his work is rightly given a place among the most enduring achievements of the golden age of Scholasticism. The commentaries, bearing slightly variant titles, were published in four folio volumes at Venice, 1483, 1514, 1519, 1589. In 1881, Bishop Bourret of Rodez, who had made the life and works of Capreolus the object of considerable research, suggested a critically revised edition of the commentaries, which was at length undertaken by two Dominicans. Its publication was begun at Tours in 1900 and is now (1907) nearly completed in the seventh volume, under the title: "Johannis Capreoli Tholosani, Ordinis Prædicatorum, Thomistarum principis, Defensiones Theologiæ Divi Thomæ Aq. de novo editæ cura et studio RR. PP. Ceslai Paban et Thomæ Pègues". Early compendiums of the work by Paul Soncinas and by Sylvester Prierias were much used in their day.

ÉCHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, I, 795; PÈGUES in *Revue Thomiste*, March, 1899, 68 sq.; July, 1899, 317 sq.; Nov., 1899, 507 sq.; MANDONNET in VACANT, *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1905), col. 1693; UDE, *Doctrina Capreoli* (Graz, 1905); HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II, col. 805.

JOHN R. VOLZ.

Capsa, a titular see of North Africa. The city, said to have been founded by the Libyan Hercules, belonged to King Jugurtha, who had deposited his treasures there; it was captured by Marius in 106 B. C. and destroyed, but later became a Roman colony. When Africa was divided into two provinces by Justinian, it was assigned to Byzacena. Under Justinian the Duke of Byzacena resided there and the town, which was protected by a strong citadel, was called *Justiniana Capsa*. In the eleventh century, after the Arab conquest, more than two hundred flourishing villages stood in the surrounding region. Five bishops, one a Donatist, are known from 255 to 484 (Morcelli, Africa Christiana, I, 118; Gams, 464). The modern name of the town is Gafsa; it is situated in a most fertile oasis, about 81 miles west of Gabes and 128 west of Sfax, with which it is connected by a railway. The oasis has about 5000 inhabitants, trading in dates, carpets, and wool rugs. It is well watered, has magnificent palm-trees, and is an important centre for French military and civil administration in Tunisia.

SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878), I, 510.

S. VAILHÉ.

Captain (IN THE BIBLE).—In the Douay version *captain* represents several different Hebrew and Latin words, and designates both civil and military officers. It is used without rule, other words being frequently substituted where the same expression with the same sense is translated, and this is true with regard to the Latin Vulgate as well as the Hebrew or Greek text. It is rarely used to designate civil officials, and then only the highest. Thus we find "captain of my people" (IV Kings, xx, 5); "let us appoint a captain" (instead of Moses; Num., xiv, 4; cf. Prov., vi, 7). When applied to military officers it corresponds in most cases to the Hebrew *sâr*, and like it designates officers of all grades, namely: (1) Generals, "captains of the host" (*sâr hâççâbâ*, στρατηγός, ἡγούμενος, *princeps exercitus, dux*); but in many cases "general of the army" or "prince of the army" is used. (2) The various grades of officers of infantry: "captains of thousands" (*sâr hâalâphîm*, χιλίαρχος, *tribunus*);

"captains of hundreds" (*sár hámmēôth*, ἑκατόνταρχος, *centurio*); "captains of fifty" (*sár ḥamíshshîm*, πεντηκόνταρχος, *quinquagenarius*); and "captains over tens" (δεκάρχης, *decurio*). (3) "Captains of the chariots" (*sár hārékeb*. The "captains of cavalry", Vulg. *duces equitatus* in II Par., xviii, 30, 31, 32, xxi, 9, should be "captains of the chariots"). (4) Commanders of the body-guard (*sár háṭṭábbāhîm*, *sár hārāṣîm*, translated respectively "captain of soldiers", Gen., xxvi, 26, xxxvii, 36, etc., and "captain of the shieldbearers", III Kings, xiv, 27). (5) Lastly, captain is used to designate two special classes of officers, the *shôṭerîm*, probably officers charged with the organization of newly levied troops and the order of the camp (Deut., xx, 5, 9), and the *shâlîshîm*, whose status is not clear; under the later kings they were royal equerries or aides-de-camp (IV Kings, ix, 25, xv, 25, cf. vii, 2, 17). It is also applied to the chiefs of marauding bands (III Kings, ii, 24). In the New Testament "captain" occurs but once, Matt., ii, 6, in the prophecy of Micheas, ii, 5, "for out of thee shall come forth the captain that shall rule my people Israel".

F. BECHTEL.

Captives, REDEMPTION OF. See REDEMPTION OF CAPTIVES.

Captivities of the Israelites.—I. THE ASSYRIAN CAPTIVITY. (1) *The End of the Northern Kingdom.*—The Kingdom of Israel, formed by the secession of the Ten Tribes under Roboam, covered the whole northern and north-eastern part of the realm of David, which constituted the bulk of the land of the Hebrews. Politically and materially it was of much greater importance than its southern neighbour, Juda. Under Jeroboam II (782–746 B. C.) it had recovered from the inroads of the Syrians and the pecuniary exactions of Shalmaneser II of Assyria, and had regained on the east and north-east the boundaries conquered of yore by Solomon. In fact the Israel of Jeroboam II was at the summit of its prosperity. But beneath this material bloom lay a depth of religious and moral corruption. Jehovah had always been acknowledged as the supreme God, but His worship was still tainted by the heathenish symbolism of the calf at the national temples of Bethel and Dan (Osee, viii, 5–7), and affronted by the Chanaanitish cult at the high-places and groves, where the Baalim or gods of fertility were offered rites accompanied by unbridled sexual licence (Osee, ii, 13, 17; iv, 12 sq.). The Prophets Amos and Osee (A. V. Hosea), especially the latter, paint in strong colours a picture of the dire iniquity of the times: "There is no truth, and there is no mercy, and there is no knowledge of God in the land. Cursing, and lying, and killing, and theft, and adultery have overflowed, and blood hath touched blood." (Osee, iv, 1, 2.) Practically there prevailed the principle that Jehovah could not fail to uphold His people, sin as it might, so long as that people paid Him the outward homage of sacrifice and ceremony. Against this superstitious presumption and the licence of the land Osee and Amos spoke in burning words, and in the very hey-day of Israel's prosperity foretold the destruction of the kingdom as the penalty of its wickedness. They announced captivity in foreign countries: "They shall not dwell in the Lord's land; Ephraim is returned to Egypt, and hath eaten unclean things among the Assyrians" (Osee, ix, 3).

After Jeroboam II, political disintegration began from within by a series of short reigns of usurpers, who reached the throne and were hurled from it by murder. At the same time a world-power, Assyria, was looming up on the East and menacing the existence of the small states which lay between it and the Mediterranean. An Assyrian king, Tiglath-pileser III (D. V. Theglathphalasar, the Phul of IV K., xv, 19), led a campaign against Damascene Syria, Hamath, and Palestine (742–738), and Manahem, the reigning prince of Israel, was fain to buy security with a heavy tribute of silver. Manahem's son Phaceia (Pekahiah), after a two years' reign fell a victim to a conspiracy, and the throne was seized by its leader, Phacee (Pekah). The latter entered into an alliance with King Rasin (Rezin) of Damascus, whose object was the capture of Jerusalem and the placing of a Damascene king over Juda, in order to consolidate the Syrian-Israelitic defence against the ever-threatening Assyrian domination. But Achaz of Jerusalem acknowledged Tiglath-pileser s suzerainty, and called in his aid in opposition to the prophetic warnings of Isaias. Later, at Damascus, he did homage to the Assyrian emperor, and from that city imported pagan ideas into the Temple ritual. The power Achaz invoked was destined ultimately to scourge his country, but it fell heavily first upon the coalition against Juda. Tiglath-pileser reappeared in Syria in 734, and his advance forced the allies to raise the siege of Jerusalem. After defeating Rasin and blockading Damascus, the Assyrians turned westward and occupied Northern Palestine. The cuneiform inscriptions tell us that Tiglath-pileser required Phacee's death as the penalty of his presumption, and made his slayer, Osee (Hoshea), king in his stead. (Cf. IV K., xv, 29 sq.) Numbers of captives were carried out of Israel, the first of the deportations which depopulated the country. The prisoners were taken from Galaad, Galilee, and other northern districts of the kingdom, both east and west of the Jordan basin.

It was therefore over a crippled and impoverished land that Osee ruled as a vassal-king. For relief from this galling pressure he turned to Egypt, the only nation that could then pretend to cope with Assyria. He ceased paying the annual tribute and allied himself with Sua (So), a ruler of Lower Egypt, and Hanan, a Philistine prince of Gaza. The expedient was a ruinous failure; Egypt, always a false friend of Israel, deserted Osee. Tiglath-pileser's successor, Shalmaneser (the fourth of the name), having learned of this conspiracy, came down upon the Kingdom of Israel and made Osee a prisoner. But the patriotic revolt was a national one and survived the king's capture. Samaria, the capital, held out desperately against a besieging Assyrian army for three years, and was not taken till 722 B. C., Sargon II having meanwhile succeeded Shalmaneser. It was the death-blow of the Kingdom of Israel. An Assyrian inscription found in the ruins of Sargon's palace at Nineveh informs us that he carried away 27,290 of the people. War, famine, and earlier deportations must have much reduced the population. To fill the place of the dead and exiled Israelites, Sargon brought in among the remnant Babylonians and other pagan peoples from conquered lands. The Northern Kingdom became the Assyrian province of Samaria, and from the intermarriage of its various races arose the Samaritans. But the depopulation of the former kingdom of its natives was far from complete. The bulk of the populace, composed of the poorer and least influential inhabitants, was allowed to remain, so that we read in the Assyrian monuments of a later futile effort of Hamath, Arpad, Simnira, Damascus, and "Samarina", i. e. Samaria, to shake off the lordship of Sargon. (Schrader, Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, II, 56, 57.) But the Israelitic stock left in the land was gradually merged into the composite race of Samaritans.

(2) *The Ten Tribes in Exile.*—The exiles were settled by their conquerors "in Halah and Habor [a river] by the river of Gozan, in the cities of the Medes". Their colonies were therefore in the heart of Northern Mesopotamia and in Western Persia, then subject to Assyria. In Mesopotamia, or Assyria proper, the Israelites were assigned to the region centring about the city of Nisibis, which is mentioned by

Josephus as their leading settlement. The exiled of the Ten Tribes remained and multiplied, never returning to Palestine. (See authorities cited by Schürer in art. "Diaspora" in sup. vol. of Hastings' Bib. Dict., 92.) Wellhausen and others who assume that the banished Israelites of the Northern Kingdom lost their identity and disappeared in the surrounding populations disregard the explicit testimony to the contrary of Josephus in his "Antiquities": "the ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates until now, and are an immense multitude [μυριάδες ἄπειροι], not to be estimated by numbers." We may well believe that the swarming Hebrew population of Southern Russia is composed in large part of descendants of the Israelites expatriated in Northern Assyria and the regions south of the Caspian. No particulars of the lot of these transplanted inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom have reached us. We may only surmise from the manner in which they multiplied that their situation was at least a tolerable one.

(3) *Assyrian Harrying of Juda.*—The annihilation of its sister kingdom laid open petty Juda to the full pressure of Assyria. Thenceforward that unhappy state, placed between the rival Assyrian and Egyptian Empires, was at the mercy of whichever happened at the time to be the stronger. A miraculous intervention did indeed hurl back Sennacherib's Assyrian army from the walls of Jerusalem in the reign of Ezechias (Hezekiah), but the country outside the city suffered cruelly from the ravages of that expedition. A monument of Sennacherib, who was Sargon's son and successor, records that he captured forty-six fortified towns and numberless smaller places of Juda, and took away as spoil, presumably to Assyria, 200,150 people and an immense number of beasts and herds. (Cf. IV K., xviii, 13, in confirmation of this.)

II. The Babylonian Captivity.—(1) *The Destruction of the Kingdom of Juda.*—Yet Jerusalem, the Temple, and the dynasty remained intact. Under the succeeding rulers, Manasses and Amon, the kingdom slowly recovered, but their potent example and approval led the nation into unprecedented syncretic excesses. So flagrant was the idolatry, the worship of the Baalim under the symbols of obelisks and pillars or sacred trees, and the degrading cults of Astarte and Moloch, that not even the holy precincts of the Temple of Jehovah were free from such abominations. The morality of a people given over to licentious and cruel syncretism may be imagined. The sweeping religious reform under Josias seems not to have penetrated much beneath the surface, and the inveterate pagan propensities of the nation broke out in later reigns. The Prophets denounced and warned in vain. Except in the spasm of Josias' reform they were not listened to. Only a supreme national chastizement could purify this carnal people, and effectually tear idolatrous superstitions from their hearts. Juda was to undergo the fate of Israel.

A prelude to the process of national extinction was the defeat of Josias and his army by Pharao Nechao at Mageddo or Migdol. Egypt had thrown off the Assyrian suzerainty and was threatening Assyria itself. Josias had encountered the Egyptians, probably in an effort to keep the independence Juda had enjoyed during his reign. But by this time the second Assyrian Empire was tottering to its fall. Before Nechao reached the Euphrates Nineve had surrendered to the Medes and Babylonians, the Assyrian territories had been shared between the victors, and instead of Assyria Nechao was confronted by the rising Chaldean power. The Egyptians were defeated at Carchemish in the year 605 by Nabuchodonosor (Nebuchadnezzar), the son and heir of the Babylonian king Nabopolassar. It was now the Chaldean Kingdom, with its capital at Babylon, which loomed large upon the political horizon. Joakim (Jehoiakim), a son of Josias, was forced to exchange Egyptian for Babylonian vassalage. But a fanatical patriotism urged defiance to the Chaldeans. The people looked upon the Temple, Jehovah's dwelling-place, as a national ægis which would safeguard Juda, or at least Jerusalem, from the fate of Samaria. In vain Jeremias warned them that unless they turned from their evil ways Sion would go down before the enemy as the sanctuary of Shiloh had long before. His words only stung the Jews and their leaders to fury, and the Prophet narrowly escaped a violent death. In the third year of his reign Joakim rebelled, and Juda was able to ward off for four or five years the inevitable taking of Jerusalem by Nabuchodonosor. Joachin (Jehoiachin), who meanwhile had succeeded to the crown of Juda, was forced to surrender the beleaguered city, 597 B. C. His life was spared, but the conqueror dealt Jerusalem a terrible blow. The princes and leading men, the rank and file of the army, the citizens of wealth, and the artificers, numbering in all 10,000, were carried captive to Chaldea. The Temple and palace were rifled of their treasures. Sedecias (Zedekiah), an uncle of Joachin, was placed over the shadow of a kingdom remaining. (IV K., xxiv, 8 sqq.) After nine years of a reign characterized by gradual decay and religious and moral chaos, revolt flamed forth again, fed by the always illusory hope of succour from Egypt. Jeremias' warnings against the folly of resistance to Chaldean domination were futile; a blind, fanatical fury possessed princes and people. When the patriotic cause momentarily triumphed, the advance of the Egyptian army causing Nabuchodonosor to raise temporarily the siege of Jerusalem, the Prophet's was the solitary voice that broke the exultant peal by the persistent refrain of ruin at the hands of the Chaldeans.

The issue verified his prediction. The Egyptians again failed the Israelites in their hour of need, and the Babylonian army closed in on the doomed city. Jerusalem held out more than a year, but a dreadful famine weakened the defence, and the Babylonians finally entered through a breach in the wall, 586 B. C. Sedecias and the remnant of his army escaped in the night, but were overtaken on the plain of Jericho, the king captured, and his followers routed (Jer., lii, 7–9). He was carried to the Babylonian camp at Reblatha in Emath, and cruelly blinded there, but not before he had seen his sons put to death. The royal palace was burnt. A similar fate met Solomon's splendid Temple, which had been the stimulus and stay of the religious-national outbreaks. Its sacred vessels, of enormous value, were taken to Babylon and in part distributed among the pagan shrines there; the large brass fixtures were cut to pieces. The destruction of the larger houses and the city wall left Jerusalem a ruin. The people found in Jerusalem and, presumably, the greater number of those who had not sought refuge in the city were deported to Chaldea, leaving only the poorest sort to till the land and save it from falling into an utter waste. Some local government being necessary for these remaining inhabitants, Masphath (Mizpah), to the north of Jerusalem, was chosen as its seat, and Godolias (Gedaliah), a Hebrew, left as overseer of the remnant. On learning this, many Israelites who had fled to neighbouring countries returned, and a considerable colony centred at Masphath. But a certain Ismahel, of the Davidic stock, acting at the instigation of the Ammonite king, treacherously massacred Godolias and a number of his subordinates. The murderer and his band of ten were leading away to Ammon the terror-stricken rest of the community, when the latter were rescued by a Hebrew military officer connected with the administration. But fear that the Chaldean vengeance for the overseer's death would smite indiscriminately drove the colony into Egypt, and Jeremias, who had

taken asylum at Masphath, was compelled to accompany it thither.

(2) *The Exile and its Effects.*—We are left to conjecture the number deported from Juda by the Babylonians. The 200,150 captives whom Sennacherib the Assyrian took from the Southern Kingdom three generations before its downfall we can reasonably surmise to have been settled in Assyria, i. e. Northern Mesopotamia, perhaps in the neighbourhood of the Israelitish communities (see above). These cannot be reckoned as properly in the Babylonian Exile. We have no data for a close estimate of the numbers brought away by the Chaldeans. Assuming the dates of Jeremias, lii, 28–30 to be correct, none of the deportations there noted took place in the years of the great disasters, viz. 597 and 586. Adding these minor expatriations—a sum of 4600—to the 10,000 of the first capture of Jerusalem, gives 14,600; and since the final catastrophe was more sweeping than the former we are warranted in trebling that number as a rough estimate of the total of the Babylonian Captivity. The exiles were settled in the Kingdom of Babylonia, partly at the capital, Babylon, but mostly in localities not very distant from it, along the Euphrates and the canals which irrigated the great Chaldean plain. Nehardea, or Neerda, one of the principal of these Jewish colonies, lay on the great river. (Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII, ix, 1.) Nippur, an important city between the Euphrates and the Tigris, also contained many Hebrew captives within its walls or vicinity. One of the main canals which fertilized the interfluvial plain, passing through Nippur, was the *nâr Kabari*, which is identical with the river Chobar "in the land of the Chaldeans" of Ezech., i, 1, 3; iii, 15. [See Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Lands (1903), 410 sq.] Other colonies were at Sora and Pumbeditha. It has been plausibly conjectured that Nabuchodonosor, whom the cuneiform records show as a builder and restorer, would not fail to utilize the great labour power of the Hebrew captives in the work of reclaiming and draining waste lands in Babylonia; for, as its present condition proves, that region without artificial irrigation and control of the overflow of the rivers is a mere desert. The country about Nippur seems to have been thus restored in ancient times. In any case it is a priori quite probable that the mass of the exiles were for a time at least in a condition of mitigated slavery. The condition of slaves in Babylonia was not one of grinding serfage; they enjoyed certain rights, and could, by redemption and other means, ameliorate their lot and even gain entire freedom. It is evident that soon after their deportation many of the Jews in Chaldea were in a position to build homes and plant gardens (Jer., xxix, 5). Babylonia was pre-eminently a land of agriculture, and the Southern Israelites, who at home, on the whole, had been a vine-growing and pastoral people, now by choice, if not by necessity, gave themselves to the tilling of the soil and the rearing of cattle in the rich alluvial flats of Mesopotamia (cf. I Esd., ii, 66). The products of Babylonia, especially grain, formed the staples of its busy internal commerce, and doubtless the great marts at Babylon, Nippur, and elsewhere, attracted many Jews into mercantile pursuits. The trading activities and the exact and well-regulated commercial methods of Babylonia must have greatly stimulated and developed the innate commercial genius of the expatriated race.

The fact that the Jews were allowed to settle in colonies, and this according to families and clans, had a vital bearing on the destinies of that people. It kept alive the national spirit and individuality, which would have disappeared in the mass of surrounding heathendom if the Southern Israelites had been dispersed into small units. There are indications that this national life was strengthened by a certain social organization, in which reappeared the primitive divisions of leading family and tribal stocks, and that their heads, the "elders", administered under royal licence the purely domestic affairs of the settlements (cf. Ezech., viii, 1; I Esd., ii, 2; II Esd., vii, 7). As long as the Temple stood it was the centre and pledge of Jewish hopes and aspirations, and even the first exiles kept their mental vision fixed on it as a beacon of early deliverance. The negative and ill-presaging voice of Ezechiel was unheeded by them. When Jerusalem and the Temple fell, the feeling was one of stupor. That Jehovah could forsake His dwelling-place and allow His sanctuary to be humbled to the dust by deriding Gentiles was inconceivable. But there was the terrible fact. Was the Lord no longer their God and greater than all other gods? It was a crisis in the religion of Israel. The providential rescue was at hand in prophecy. Had not Jeremias, Ezechiel, and others before them repeatedly foretold this ruin as the chastisement of national infidelity and sin? This was remembered now by those who in their fanatical deafness had not listened to them. So far from Jehovah being a defeated and humbled God, it was His very decree that had brought the catastrophe to pass. The Chaldeans had been merely the instruments of His justice. He now stood plainly revealed to the Jews as a God of moral righteousness and universal sway, as a God who would tolerate no rival. Perhaps they had never before realized this; certainly never as now. Hence it is that the Exile is a great turning-point in the history of Israel—a punishment which was a purification and a rebirth. But Exilic prophecy did not merely point to the great religio-ethical lesson of the visitations of the past; it raised more loudly than ever the note of hope and promise. Now that Jehovah's purpose had been accomplished, and the chosen people been humbled beneath His hand, a new era was to come. Even the mournful Jeremias had declared that the captives would return at the end of seventy years—a round number, not to be taken literally. Ezechiel, in the midst of the desolation of the Exile, boldly sketched a plan of the resurgent Sion. And Deutero-Isaias, probably a little later, brought a stirring and jubilant message of comfort and the assurance of a joyful, new life in the fatherland.

Several minor but important factors contributed to the preservation and cleansing of the religion of Israel. One was negative: the forcible uprooting from the soil where Chanaanitish idolatries had so long survived, detached the Jews from these baneful traditions. The others are positive. Without the Temple no sacrifices or solemn worship could be lawfully practised. The want was in part supplied by the keeping of the Sabbath, especially by religious assemblies on that day—the beginnings of the future synagogues. The Mosaic Law, too, assumed a new importance and sacredness, because Jehovah therein manifested His will, and in some sort dwelt, as an ordaining Presence. The writings of the Prophets and other Scriptures, in so far as they existed, also received a share of the popular veneration hitherto concentrated on the Temple and external rites. In short, the absence of sacrifice and ceremonial worship during half a century had a tendency to refine the monotheism and, in general, to spiritualize the religion of the Hebrews.

(3) *The Prelude of the Restoration.*—Nabuchodonosor after a long and prosperous reign was succeeded by his son Evil Merodach, the Amil Marduk of the monuments. The latter showed himself benign to the long-imprisoned ex-king Joachin (Jechonias), releasing him and recognizing in a measure his royal dignity. After a short reign Evil Merodach was deposed, and within the space of four years (560–556) the throne was occupied by three usurpers. Under the last of these, Nabonidus, the once all-powerful

Babylonian Monarchy declined rapidly. A new political power appeared on the eastern and northern frontiers. Cyrus, the King of Anzan (Elam) and Persia, had overcome Astyages, ruler of the Medes (or Manda), and seized his capital, Ecbatana. Media, by the partition of the Assyrian Empire and the further conquests of Cyaxares, had grown powerful; its territories took in, on the north and west, Armenia and half of Cappadocia. Cyrus extended these conquests by the subjugation of Lydia, thus stretching his sovereignty to the Ægean Mediterranean and forming a vast empire. The balance in Hither Asia was destroyed, and Babylon was threatened by this formidable new power. The Deutero-Isaian Prophet hailed this brilliant star on the political horizon with joy, and recognizing in Cyrus the foreordained servant of God, predicted through him Babylon's downfall and Israel's deliverance (Is., xliv, 28–xlv, 7). In the year 538 B. C. the Persian monarch invaded Chaldean territory; helped by disaffection in the south, one of his generals was able in a few days to take Babylon without resistance, and Cyrus became ruler of the Chaldean Kingdom.

(4) *The Restoration under Cyrus: Zorobabel's Return.* —Cyrus reversed the policy of deportation followed by the Assyrian and Babylonian kings. He deemed this the wiser statecraft, probably because he had experienced in the conquest of Babylonia the danger of keeping an ill-affected population in the midst of a country threatened by a foreign foe. At the same time, to repeople Judea with a nation bound to the Persian dynasty by ties of gratitude would strengthen his realm against Egyptian invasion. Thus did Providence "stir up the heart of Cyrus" to a liberal course towards the Israelites, and employ him as an unwitting instrument in the reconstitution of a people whose mission was not yet accomplished. Cyrus, accordingly, in the first year of his rule at Babylon, 538 B. C., forty-eight years after the destruction of Jerusalem, issued an edict in which he allowed and recommended the return of all the Hebrews in his domain to the fatherland, ordered the rebuilding of the Temple, for which a subsidy from the royal treasury was granted, directed the sacred vessels seized by Nabuchodonosor to be sent back, and urged all Israelites to contribute to the restoration of public worship. The extreme liberality of the Persian monarch in the matter of the Temple is less surprising when we consider that a restored Jerusalem was inconceivable without a restored sanctuary. Semitic cities and districts rose or declined with the shrines of their tutelary deities, and Cyrus' largeness towards the Jews in religious affairs is quite in keeping with his rehabilitation of certain Babylonian temples and the return of images to their former abodes, as witnessed by his inaugural proclamation (Records of the Past, new series, V, 143 sq.). That the Northern Israelites dwelling in Assyrian Mesopotamia were not similarly favoured is to be explained not merely by the much longer time elapsed since their political extinction—a lapse which had permitted them to become rooted to the land of their exile—but principally to the absence of any desire on their part to set up the old symbolic, half-heathen sanctuaries of Jehovah. They too had learned the stern lesson of the Captivity. It was a province of the Persian Empire, and not a Kingdom of Juda, that Cyrus had determined to create, and therefore Zorobabel, the grandson of Joachin, *alias* Jechonias (I Paral., iii, 17–19), and therefore the heir-royal of the Davidic line, was to be only its governor. He was a young man who had never known any court but that of Babylon, and so far as history records never violated the surprising trust placed in him by attempting to recover the crown of his fathers. A contrary thesis has been defended on insufficient grounds by Sellin (Serubbabel, Leipzig, 1898). Sassabasar, "the Jewish prince" mentioned in the First Book of Esdras, is identical with Zorobabel. He and Josue, the high-priest, were entrusted with the Temple furniture, and made the leaders of the *gola*, or expedition of the returning Jews. Besides a considerable number of slaves, 42,360 followed Zorobabel on the long journey to Judea. The data about this repatriation in the Book of Esdras are fragmentary. "Every man went into his own city", and from later particulars we should infer that the body of the immigrants took up their abode in the small cities and towns outside, and mostly to the south of Jerusalem. The latter must have been little more than a ruin. The returned exiles found the neighbouring tribes and races, the Samaritans, Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, installed at many points on Jewish soil, alongside the pitiful remnants of their countrymen, and it must have needed the authority, if not the force, of the Persian Emperor to make room for the Israelites on their former homesteads. Under Zorobabel the struggling community enjoyed autonomy in its internal affairs. In the absence of the old system of royal administration, the primitive organization by clans and families, partially resumed in captivity, gained added vigour, and the heads of these sections, the "princes" and "elders", represented them in all general assemblies.

But the new Israel was less a political than a religious community. Only a fraction of the 250,000 or more Jews who had gone into the East could have lived to return, and, allowing for natural increase among the captive people, a still smaller part of those who might have looked upon Judea as their home returned from the Exile to dwell within its borders. Only the most patriotic and religious, the zealous élite, answered the call of Cyrus and migrated from their abodes which had become fixed, moved by a desire to restore the theocracy in a purer form with the "house of God" as its heart and centre (cf. I Esd., i, 5). One of the first measures, therefore, to which the leaders addressed themselves was the rebuilding of the altar of burnt-offerings, upon whose dedication the faithful rejoiced at the resumption of the daily sacrifices. Within less than a year after the corner-stone of a new Temple was laid. But an obstacle was encountered in the jealousy of the Samaritans, the half-heathen neighbours on the north. They were largely represented in the alien elements living among the Jews, and viewed with distrust the reorganization of a religion and community in which they would not fill an important, much less a predominating rôle. They accordingly asked to join in the construction of the Temple. Zorobabel declined their aid by referring to the decree of Cyrus. Hereby he inaugurated that policy of separation from all contaminating influences long followed by later leaders of Israel. But the Samaritans, if they could not assist, could hamper the enterprise by intrigues at the Persian court. Owing to these difficulties the work was suspended, and the zeal of the people cooled. It was not till these were aroused by the reproaches of the prophets Aggeus (Haggai) and Zacharias that Zorobabel and Josue could begin anew the work under Darius Hystaspis (521), sixteen years after its suspension. The external obstacles had been removed by a decree of Darius; the undertaking was pushed vigorously, and four years later the second Temple was completed. But those who had seen the Temple of Solomon sadly confessed that the new sanctuary could not bear comparison with the glory of the former.

The history of the Jewish Captivity properly embraces the additional migration from Babylonia of about 1400 souls led by the priest and scribe Esdras (Ezra). In the sacred narrative the account of this second *gola* follows immediately that of the finishing of the Temple. But its true chronological setting is

a matter of considerable dispute. The obscurity involving the point arises from the fact that the books of Esdras and Nehemias, the chief inspired sources for the history of the Restoration, mention in several places a King Artaxerxes, without specifying which of the three Persian monarchs of that name is meant, viz. whether the first, surnamed Longimanus (465–424 B. C.), the second, Mnemon (405–362), or the third, Ochus (362–338). The controversy turns on the point whether the expedition of Esdras, referred to in the first book of that name (viii), preceded or followed the first governorship of Nehemias. The hitherto accepted order places the Esdras *gola* in the seventh year of Artaxerxes I (458 B. C.), and hence before the appointment of Nehemias, which occurred in the twentieth year of an Artaxerxes. But several exegetes have recently advanced strong reasons for reversing this order. Van Hoonacker, the leading advocate of the priority of Nehemias to Esdras, assigns the latter's expedition to the seventh year of Artaxerxes II, i. e. to 398. Lagrange, according to whom the mission of Nehemias took place under the second Artaxerxes, fixes the Esdras migration as late as 355, a little more than a century after the prevalent date. Of course a revision of the temporal relations of the missions of Esdras and Nehemias postulates a serious confusion in the text and arrangement of the books bearing those names, as they have come down to us. More or less involved in this chronological question is that of the respective parts of Nehemias and Esdras in the reconstruction of the Jewish theocracy. Van Hoonacker contends that the co-operation of Esdras with Nehemias, described in II Esdras (also called Nehemias), viii, occurred before Esdras had, as he claims, gone to Babylon to organize the expedition in order to strengthen the new community, and that we must allow that the priest-scribe's place in the task of reorganization was minor and supplementary to that of Nehemias, the governor. According to this view—and herein it is largely borne out by the terms of Esdras' commission as given by the Persian king (I Esd., vii, 13–26)—the charge of the priest-scribe was not the promulgation of the Law, but the embellishment and improvement of the Temple service, the constitution of judges, and other administrative measures. The question is not without an important bearing on the validity of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis of the origin of the Pentateuch. (See ESDRAS, NEHEMIAS, BOOKS OF.)

III. THE ROMAN CAPTIVITY.—Jerusalem fell before the Roman arms in August, A. D. 70, after a long and dreadful siege conducted by Titus, the son of the Emperor Vespasian, and himself later emperor. Hosts of prisoners were taken in this war; the number was estimated at 97,000, being substantially all that remained of the nation in Palestine. The severity of treatment meted out to these unfortunates tells of the exasperation caused by the stubborn defence of Jerusalem. The weak and sickly prisoners were at once put to death. The rest of the concourse were gathered in the Gentile's Court of the ruined Temple and told off into various classes. All those recognized or reported as active in the rebellion were set aside for slaughter, except seven hundred young men of the finest presence, who were spared to grace the triumph at Rome. The remainder of the captives were divided into those over and those under seventeen. Of the former, part were put in chains and sent to labour in the Egyptian mines; others, including thousands of the female sex, were dispersed among the Roman cities to be victims of the inhuman public games. Those below seventeen were sold as slaves. The leaders of the rebellion, John of Gishkhala and Simon of Gerasa, were carried captives to Rome to appear in the triumph of Titus; John was afterwards put to death.

EWALD, *Hist. of Israel* (London, 1878, tr. 1880), IV, V; WELLHAUSEN, *Israelitische und jüdische Gesch.* (Berlin, 1895, 1898); MCCURDY, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments* (London and New York, 1898, 1901), I, 383, sq., III. For the cuneiform evidence see: *Die Keilinschr. und das A. T.*: WINCKLER, *History of Israel* (Berlin, 1903). The following works deal mainly with the period of the Return and Restoration: VAN HOONACKER, *Néhémie et Esdras* in the *Muséon* (Louvain, 1890); IDEM, *Zerubabel et le second temple* (Louvain, 1892); IDEM, *Nouv. études sur la restauration juive* (Paris and Louvain, 1896); IDEM, *Notes sur l'histoire de la restauration juive* in *Rev. Bib.* (Jan., 1901), being a reply to certain arguments of NIKEL, *Die Wiederherstellung des jüd. Gemeinwesens nach dem babylonischen Exil* in *Biblische Stud.* (Freiburg, 1900).

GEORGE J. REID.

Capua, ARCHDIOCESE OF (CAPUANA).—The city of Capua is situated in the province of Caserta, Southern Italy. Of Etruscan foundation, it was formerly known as *Volturnum* and was capital of *Campania Felix*. About 424 B. C. it was captured by the Samnites and in 343 B. C. implored Roman help against its conquerors. During the Second Punic War, after Hannibal's victory at Cannæ (216 B. C.), he and his army were voluntarily received by Capua, where the Carthaginians became demoralized by luxurious living. The city was recaptured by the Romans (211 B. C.), its inhabitants were killed or enslaved, and the territory declared common land (*ager publicus*). Julius Cæsar made Capua a Roman colony under the name of *Julia Felix*. In A. D. 456 the Vandals under Genseric sacked the city. During the Gothic war Capua suffered greatly, and similarly a little later from the Lombards. About 840 it was burned to the ground by the Saracens, after which it was rebuilt, but at some distance from the former site, where, however, another city was built and called Santa Maria in Capua Vetere. In 1058, the Norman, Richard, Prince of Aversa, conquered it; thenceforth its history is linked with that of the Two Sicilies.

Christianity, it is said, was first preached at Capua by St. Priscus, a disciple of St. Peter. In the martyrology mention is made of many Capuan martyrs, and it is probable that, owing to its position and importance, Capua received the Christian doctrine at a very early period. The first bishop of whom there is positive record is Protasius, present at the Roman Council under Pope Melchiades (313); he was succeeded by Protus Vincentius, a Roman deacon and legate of Pope Sylvester I at Nicæa, who took a prominent part in the Arian controversies, and was present at the Council of Sardica (343). At the *conciliabulum* of Arles (353) he was led astray by Constantius and consented to the deposition of St. Athanasius, an error for which he made amends at Rimini. Bishop Memorius, who held a council to deal with the Schism of Antioch and the heresy of Bonosus, is often mentioned in the letters of St. Augustine and St. Paulinus, and was the father of that ardent Pelagian, Julian of Eclanum. In 443, Priscus, an exile from North Africa and a man of great sanctity, was elected bishop; possibly it is his name that popular tradition carried back to the head of the list of Capuan bishops. Another incumbent of this see was Germanus, whom Pope Hormisdas sent twice to Constantinople to restore unity with the Roman Church. In 541, Bishop Benedictus died and was ever afterwards held in repute of sanctity. His successor, Victor, was a learned exegete. In 968 John XIII took refuge in Capua, and in gratitude raised the see to archiepiscopal rank. In 1087, under Victor III, and in 1118, under Gelasius II, councils were held in Capua; at the latter Henry V and the antipope, Gregory VIII (Burdinus), were excommunicated. Among other bishops, nearly all famous for their learning, are: M. Marino (1252), a disciple of St. Thomas Aquinas; Filippo de Berilli (1506), who suffered for justice' sake; Fra Nicolò Schomberg (1520), a distinguished theologian; Cesare Costa (1573), active as a reformer of the clergy, and a learned canonist; Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (1602);

and Cardinal Capecelatro, Librarian of the Holy Roman Church and author of many learned works. The suffragan dioceses of Capua are: Caiazzo, Calvi and Teano, Caserta, Isernia and Venafro, Sessa Aurunca. The archdiocese contains a population of 96,800, with 57 parishes, 90 churches and chapels, 255 secular and 18 regular priests, 16 religious houses of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844); *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 367.

U. BENIGNI.

Capuchinesses, a branch of the Poor Clares of the Primitive Observance, instituted at Naples, in 1538, by the Venerable Maria Longo. This holy woman had in early years embraced the rule of the Third Order of St. Francis and devoted herself to active works of charity. She founded a hospital for the sick in which she herself served, and also gave herself to the saving of fallen women. She adopted at her hospital the custom of ringing the bell at nightfall for prayers for the faithful departed. In 1630 the Franciscan Friars of the Capuchin Reform went to Naples, and were for a time given shelter in her hospital. She had long wished to undertake a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, but about this time she was instructed in prayer that she could please God more by building a convent under the title of Santa Maria in Gerusalemme. She built the convent and established in it a community of sisters under the Rule of the Third Order, and was herself appointed superior. At first the spiritual directors of the convent were the Theatine Fathers, but afterwards these gave over the direction to the Capuchins, by whose advice the sisters in 1538 adopted the primitive Rule of St. Clare. They also received constitutions based on those of the Capuchin Friars, and were placed under the jurisdiction of the Capuchin vicar-general, whence they are styled Capuchinesses. They made a foundation in Rome in 1576 and very shortly afterwards were to be found in various parts of Italy and France, where they flourished until the Revolution. They still exist, in diminished numbers, in Italy and elsewhere. Some of the convents are still under the jurisdiction of the Minister-General of the Capuchin Friars Minor; others are under the jurisdiction of their respective diocesans. St. Veronica Giuliani was a member of this observance, as was also the Blessed Mary Magdalen Martinengo. The Capuchinesses flourished in many countries of Europe before the Revolution; they still have convents in Italy and Spain, also in South America, and until lately in France. Exiled French Capuchinesses opened (1904) a house at Vaals in Holland, near Aachen, destined to serve as a German novitiate.

BOVERIUS, *Annales Capucinorum* (Lyons, 1632–39); *ad an. 1538 and 1542; Bullarium Ord. Cap.* (Rome, 1740–1883); ANTON, *Life of Ven. Maria Longo*, in German (Munich-Dillingen, 1903); HEIMBUCHER, *Orden und Kongreg. d. Kath. Kirche* (Paderborn, 1907), II, 486–87.

FATHER CUTHBERT.

Capuchin Friars Minor, an autonomous branch of the first Franciscan Order, the other branches being the Friars Minor simply so called, but until lately usually known as Observants or Recollects, and the Conventual Friars Minor. This division of the first Franciscan Order has come about by reason of various reforms; thus the Observants were a reform which separated from the Conventuals, and the Capuchins are a reform of the Observants.

I. GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT:—The Capuchin Reform dates from 1525. It had its origin in the Marches, the Italian province where, after Umbria, the Franciscan spirit seems to have found its most congenial dwelling-place. Cut off by the mountains from the great highways of Italy, the inhabitants of the Marches have to this day retained a delightful simplicity of character and blend a mystical tendency with a practical bent of mind. They may be said to possess the *anima naturaliter Franciscana*, and it is easy to understand the quick response of the people of this province to the Franciscan teaching, and the tenacity with which the friars of the Marches clung to the primitive simplicity of the order. We have a monument of the enduring vigour of the Franciscan spirit in the Marches in the "Fioretti di San Francesco", wherein the first freshness of the Franciscan spirit seems to have been caught up and enshrined. From the Marches, too, we get another book, of a very different character, but which in its own way bears eloquent witness to the zeal of the brethren of this province for poverty, the "Historia VII Tribulationum" of Angelo Clareno. And at Camerino, on the borders of the province, are preserved the relics of Blessed John of Parma, another of the leaders of the "Spiritual" Friars. The Marches were, in fact, from the earliest days of the order, a centre of resistance to the secularizing tendency which found an entrance amongst the friars even in the days of St. Francis, of which tendency the famous Brother Elias is the historic type.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Franciscans in the Marches, as elsewhere, were divided into the two distinct families of Conventuals and Observants or Zoccolanti. The dividing line between the two families was their adhesion to the primitive ideal of Franciscan poverty and simplicity: the Conventuals accepted revenues by papal dispensation; the Observants refused fixed revenues and lived by casual alms. At least such was the principle; but in practice the Observants had come themselves to relax the principle under various legal devices. Thus, though they would not accept money themselves, they allowed secular persons, styled syndics, to accept money for their use; they accepted chaplaincies to which were affixed regular stipends. To those who looked to the primitive custom of the order, such acceptances seemed but a legalized betrayal of the rule, nor were these relaxations at any time allowed to pass without protest from the more zealous of the Observants. But the question was not merely concerning this or that point; it was one of general tendency. Was the order to maintain itself in the simplicity and unworldliness of St. Francis, or was it to admit and bow to the spirit of the world? Was it to be dominated by the spirit of St. Francis or by the spirit of Brother Elias? Such was the question as it shaped itself in the minds of the reforming friars; and one has to recognize this truly to appreciate the history of the various Franciscan reforms. The difficulty which met each reform, as it arose and acquired an independent constitution, was the difficulty which meets every unworldly ideal in its attempt to propagate itself in the actual world. To live on and endure it must take to itself a secular embodiment, and in the process is apt to acquire something of the secular spirit; and the more unworldly the original ideal, the more difficult is its process of secular development. This is peculiarly so in the case of a religious community like the Franciscan Order, which aims at realizing a principle of life so entirely opposed to the principles commonly accepted in the world at large. Hence it is that the Observants, after breaking away from the Conventuals, themselves gave rise to various reforms, which aimed at a more perfect return to the primitive type. In this way the Capuchin Reform took its origin from amongst the Observants of the Marches. The leader of the reform was Father Matteo di Bassi, a member of the Observant community in the Diocese of Fermo. He was an exemplary religious and a zealous preacher. It is said that Leo X had given him permission to institute a reform amongst the Observants; but if so Father Matteo did not avail himself of the permission, perhaps because of the death of that pontiff. But in 1525, a year of Jubilee, he went

to Rome and whilst there obtained from Clement VII leave to wear the Capuchin habit and to live in strictest poverty. Matteo di Bassi was finally led to this step by an incident which recalls to mind the history of St. Francis. The friar had been attending a funeral and was returning to his convent, when he met a beggar by the wayside barely clad. Moved with compassion, Father Matteo gave the beggar part of his own clothing. Shortly afterwards the friar was in prayer when he heard a voice, which three times admonished him, saying, "Observe the Rule to the letter". Whereupon he arose, and took an old habit, and made a long pointed hood out of the *cappa*, and donning the habit at once set out for Rome. This story, retailed by all the earliest chroniclers, makes it certain that the aspiration to observe the rule to the letter was the one compelling motive of the reform, and that the taking of the habit with the long pointed hood was the symbol of this aspiration. For the habit in this shape was supposed to be the original form of the Franciscan habit, whilst the habit with the *cappa* and small rounded hood was held by many to be an innovation introduced with the spirit of relaxation. Certain it is that the habit adopted by Father Matteo and his followers was known in the order before their time. In the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, is a copy of an altar-piece dating from the fifteenth century, representing Our Lady with a number of friars gathered under her outspread mantle; and they are wearing a habit similar in form to that of the Capuchins. In a picture of St. Francis in the library of Christchurch, Oxford, attributed to Margaritone, we find the same form of habit; and in at least one other instance of early portraiture of the Seraphic Saint he seems to have been represented with a habit of this sort. (See "On the Authentic Portraiture of St. Francis of Assisi", by N. H. J. Westlake, London, 1897.) Thomas of Celano again seems to speak of it as a novelty that a certain friar went about wearing a habit "with the hood not sewn to the tunic" (II Celano, 32—ed. d'Alençon, Rome, 1906). And at the Ognisanti, in Florence, is preserved a habit, said to be one worn by St. Francis, the hood of which is sewn to the tunic. At any rate the reforming friars, in assuming the pointed hood sewn to the habit, claimed to be assuming the form of habit worn by St. Francis and the first friars, and in their eyes it was a symbol of their return to the primitive observance.

In putting his hand to the reform, Matteo di Bassi had no intention of separating himself from the jurisdiction of the Observants; he thought rather to introduce the reform amongst them. All he asked from Clement VII was liberty for himself and other friars of a like mind to wear the habit of St. Francis, to observe the rule strictly in accordance with the earliest tradition, and to preach the Word of God in the world. From the days of St. Francis himself the liberty of the stricter observance had been allowed; and the friars enjoying such liberty had usually dwelt apart in small houses or hermitages, but under the effective jurisdiction of the superiors of the order. But when, on Matteo di Bassi's return from Rome, two other friars, Louis of Fossombrone and his brother Raphael, sought to join the new reform, they were stoutly opposed by the superiors, especially by the minister provincial, John of Fano, who, however, himself eventually joined the Capuchins. Nevertheless, the two friars were at length, through the intervention of the Duke of Camerino, allowed to proceed to Rome. On 18 May, 1526, they received from the Cardinal-Bishop of Palestrina, the Grand Penitentiary, the Brief, "Ex parte vestrâ", whereby Clement VII formally allowed them, together with Matteo di Bassi, to separate from the community of the Observants and live in hermitages, in order that they might be free to observe the rule as they desired; and, to protect them against molestation on the part of the superiors of the order, they were placed under the protection of the Bishop of Camerino. They were by the same Brief permitted to aggregate others to their manner of life. They were, however, still considered to belong to the Observant family, though separated from the community; but on 3 July, 1528, owing to the continued opposition of the Observant superiors, Clement VII, by the Bull "Religionis zelus", released them from their obedience to the Observants and constituted them a distinct family of the order, in a certain dependence, however, upon the Master-General of the Conventuals, to whom it belonged to confirm the vicar-general to be elected by the new reform.

In the following April, 1529, the first chapter was held at Albacina. At this time the reform numbered eighteen friars and four convents or hermitages. Matteo di Bassi having been elected vicar-general, the chapter drew up the new constitutions designed to safeguard the primitive observance of the rule. No one can read these "Constitutions of Albacina" without being struck with the similarity of tone and purpose between them and the "Speculum Perfectionis", about which so much has been heard since M. Paul Sabatier published his edition in 1898. The provisions relating to poverty and studies would almost seem an echo of that celebrated legend. Thus, when "hermitages or monasteries" are to be erected, the constitutions decree that no more land is to be taken than is in keeping with their poor estate; the houses are to be built, if possible, of mud and wattles, but earth and stones may be used where wattles cannot be obtained; the churches, however, shall be of more becoming structure, yet small and narrow. The friars are to bear in mind the admonition of St. Francis that their churches and houses must be such as to proclaim that those who dwell in them are but pilgrims and strangers on the earth. The houses are to be built outside the cities or towns, yet not far distant from them. In the houses near large cities not more than twelve friars might dwell, and in the other houses not more than eight—"for such indeed was the will of St. Francis as is set forth in the chronicles of the Order." The proprietorships must always be vested in the municipality or the donor, who may turn the friars out at will, and should this happen the friars are to go out at once without delay and seek another place. To each house a hermitage must be attached, where the friars may retire for solitary contemplation. In regard to alms they were not to quest for meat, eggs, or cheese, but they might receive these things when offered spontaneously. They were never, however, to lay in a store of food, but to depend on daily alms. At the utmost they might receive sufficient food to last for three days, and rarely for one week. They are forbidden to have syndics or procurators to receive property for them.—"No other syndic shall there be for us save Christ our Lord; and our procurator and protector shall be the most Blessed Virgin Mother of God; our deputy shall be our blessed Father Francis: but all other procurators we absolutely reject." The preachers were to be kept busy in the vineyard of the Lord, not only during Lent, but at all other times. They were not, however, allowed to use many books; two or three at most were deemed sufficient. Their sermons were to be simple and plain, without studied rhetoric; nor were they to be allowed to receive any remuneration for their preaching. Classes for the study of literature were not to be established; but they might study the Scriptures and such devout authors as "love God and teach us to embrace the Cross of Christ". The friars were not to hear the confessions of seculars except in cases of extreme necessity. In the houses of the order only one Mass was to be said each day, at which all the priests should be present, except on Sundays and solemn feasts, when all might celebrate; nor were they to receive any *honoraria* for Masses. They were, more-

over, forbidden to follow funerals or celebrate dirges, except in case of necessity. Finally, they were to go barefoot, shod only in simple sandals; and to recite the Divine Office at midnight even on the three last days of Holy Week; and on no account were extra Offices to be added to the canonical Office, so that the friars might have more time for private prayer.

Such were the "Constitutions of Albacina". Their intention is evident to any one conversant with the early Franciscan legends: they sought to re-establish the Franciscan life in the spirit and letter of the earliest Franciscan tradition. One point needs explanation here. In the earliest pontifical documents concerning the new reform, it is stated that the friars are to be free to observe the rule strictly in the eremitical life. The meaning of this, however, was not that they should be hermits in the sense of living always a retired and solitary life. Matteo di Bassi had asked of Clement VII liberty to observe the Rule of St. Francis in hermitages, to preach the Word of God in the world, and to bring sinners to repentance. The preaching of the Word of God was an essential feature of the Capuchin Reform. We have already seen how the constitutions of the order bade the preachers be frequently employed in their work for souls at all times of the year. Matteo di Bassi himself had no sooner received the sanction of Clement VII than he returned to the Marches and began to preach and to nurse the sick during the pestilence which swept through the Marches in 1525. The explanation, however, is simple enough to those who know the Franciscan legends. Amongst the Franciscans the hermitage stood in opposition to the large convent. The first houses of the order were built outside the city walls in some quiet spot where the friars, when not engaged in active ministry for others, could live undisturbedly in the cultivation of the spirit. These houses were small, and only a few friars dwelt in the same place. Besides the small communities, there were also hermitages, technically so called, at some distance from the community, whither the friars might retire for a still more secluded life. The original Franciscan life was thus a commingling of the active life with the eremitical. As the order increased in numbers, large convents were built in which the simplicity and seclusion of the original Franciscan community were in great measure lost; in these large houses it became impossible to observe the primitive standard of poverty, and the tendency was to conform to the more complex life and ceremonial of the monastic orders, properly so called. Hence every reform of the order turned again towards the ideal of the small community and the more secluded situation, where the original simplicity and poverty could more easily be maintained.

Matteo di Bassi remained vicar-general of the reform only for two months; then he resigned his jurisdiction into the hands of Louis of Fossombrone, as commissary general, in order that he might be free to give himself to the work of the apostolate. From this time he can hardly be said to belong to the family of the reform; though he seems to have still availed himself of the privileges granted him in 1525 by Clement VII. He died in 1552 and was buried in the church of the Observants in Venice, where his body was for a long time accorded the honours given to the relics of a saint, until a recent decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites restricted such honours to those formally beatified. But though not formally beatified, Matteo di Bassi is styled "Blessed" in the martyrologies of the order. During the government of Louis of Fossombrone the reform began to spread quickly and widely. Shortly after the Chapter of Albacina the friars were invited to Rome and given a house, Santa Maria dei Miracoli, near the Flaminian Gate, from which they removed in the following year to the convent of Santa Euphemia near Santa Maria Maggiore. Meanwhile a movement for reform was taking place amongst the Observants of Calabria, which was to have a marked influence upon the development of the reform in the Marches. Two friars, Louis of Reggio and Bernardine of Reggio, surnamed *lo Giorgio*, had, about the same time that Matteo di Bassi had visited Rome, also arrived in the Eternal City, and with the sanction of Clement VII had attempted a reform movement amongst the Observants of Santi Apostoli. Their efforts proving futile, they obtained leave, in 1526, to return to Calabria and choose three convents for their purpose. They assumed the name of Recollects—a name very generally given to the reforming friars, for the reason stated above. Here, as in the Marches, the superiors of the Observants regarded the reform with disfavour and treated the reformers as rebellious subjects; hence, at a chapter held by the Minister General of the Observants, at Messina, in 1532, the Calabrian Recollects petitioned to be allowed to pass to the Capuchin jurisdiction. Their petition, however, only drew upon them further rebuke. As they continued to persist in their demand, the minister general obtained from the pope a Brief of excommunication against them; but this was shortly withdrawn through the intervention of the Duke of Nocera and the Duchess of Camerino, and the Calabrian Recollects passed into the Capuchin family, forming the first province of the order outside the Marches.

Following the example of the Calabrians, the most zealous Observants began to pass over to the Capuchins in such numbers that Paul III, at the instance of the Minister General of the Observants, issued two Briefs, the first dated 18 December, 1534, and the second 12 January, 1535, forbidding any more Observants to be received by the Capuchins until the next general chapter of the Observant family. The second of these Briefs is noteworthy by reason of the fact that in it the friars of the new reform are for the first time called *Capucini*—Capuchins. Hitherto, in the pontifical documents they had been styled *Fratres Ord. S. Francisci Capucciati*. But in the Brief of 12 January, 1535, the pope adopted the name already conferred upon the new reform by the populace, who, seeing the long hoods, at once called the friars *Cappuccini*. Henceforth the friars are officially styled "Friars Minor of the Order of St. Francis, Capuchin".

At the chapter of the order held at Rome in November, 1535, Bernardine of Asti was elected vicar-general. He was a remarkable man—the genius and saviour of the new reform. He combined great prudence and power of organization with a rare humility and sweetness of character. He had held high office amongst the Observants before he joined the Capuchins in 1534. He died in 1554, and is styled Blessed in the martyrology of the Franciscan Order. His election was providential, for the Capuchin family had now to pass through a time of storm and stress, which the wisdom and fame of Bernardine of Asti, in great measure, enabled it to survive. Hardly had Bernardine of Asti taken up the reins of government than Louis of Fossombrone created a disturbance amongst the friars, alleging that the election was invalid. He himself had aspired to the headship of the order. A new chapter was thereupon convoked, in April, 1536, and Bernardine of Asti was again elected, whereupon Louis of Fossombrone threw off the habit and apostatized. His apostasy perhaps influenced Paul III when, on 3 January, 1537, he forbade the Capuchins to establish any houses of their reform outside Italy. But a greater blow fell in 1542 when Bernardine of Siena—the famous Occhino, not to be confounded with Saint Bernardine, who d. in 1444—the successor of Bernardine of Asti as vicar-general, apostatized and joined the Protestant Reformers. The scandal caused by his defection gave new vigour to the efforts of those who were opposed to the Capu-

chins, and at this time it was seriously considered at the Roman Court whether they should be suppressed. In fact it was generally said amongst the people that their suppression was already decreed. To dispel this rumour the new vicar-general, Francis of Jesi, assembled two hundred of his brethren at Assisi for the feast of the Portiuncula, in 1543. But it was Bernardine of Asti who pleaded the cause of the reform at the Council of Trent and averted the threatened disaster. And by his eloquent pleading he saved not only the new reform from extinction, but also the essential character of the Franciscan Order. For the conciliar Fathers had resolved that in future all religious orders should possess common property, and not be dependent upon alms. This resolution struck at the very fundamental principle of the Franciscan life, since, according to the Rule of St. Francis, his friars were to possess property neither individually nor in common, but to depend for their daily sustenance upon their labour and upon alms. As St. Francis had pleaded for this absolute poverty before Pope Innocent III, so Bernardine of Asti now pleaded before the council, and with such success that the Capuchin Friars and the Observants were expressly exempted from the general law and allowed the privilege of common, as well as of individual, poverty. By a providential coincidence, whilst the fate of the new reform was hanging in the balance, it received a new recruit in a poor countryman who was destined perhaps more than anyone else to establish the Capuchin family in the love and veneration of the Roman people: this was St. Felix of Cantalicio, the lay brother friend of St. Philip Neri. But in a short while the cloud passed away, and the Capuchin family grew with amazing swiftness in numbers and in fame. At the chapter of 1536 the reform numbered five hundred friars; in 1587 it had increased to five thousand nine hundred and fifty-three friars. In 1574 Gregory XIII revoked the decree of Paul III, and granted Capuchins the right to establish ultramontane provinces; and in 1619 the reform was released from all dependence upon the Conventuals, and given a minister general of its own election. It need hardly be said that, as the order increased in numbers and spread to various countries, it was found necessary to modify the stringent regulations of the first constitutions. The Council of Trent compelled the Capuchins to establish courses of studies for the friars destined for the priesthood; larger convents were built, and the regulation forbidding the friars to hear the confessions of secular people was rescinded. Yet a constant effort was made to maintain the simplicity of the Franciscan life. Notwithstanding the Council of Trent, the Capuchins obtained from St. Pius V for their lay brothers the privilege of voting in the elections of the order, thus conserving the original democratic character of the Franciscan family. In the ordinances of the general chapter of 1613 great stress was laid on simplicity of life, and regulations were made forbidding such innovations as high Masses and the introduction of spiritual exercises for novices, after the manner of the Jesuits. The same spirit and intention are found in the definitive constitutions formally approved by Urban VIII, in 1643. This pontiff had already, by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars (30 April, 1627), declared the Capuchins to be true sons of St. Francis, and on 28 June of the same year had issued the Bull "Salvatoris et Domini", in which he reaffirmed a former constitution of Paul V, "Ecclesiæ Militantis", of 15 October, 1608, setting forth that the Capuchins are the spiritual descendants of St. Francis in the direct line, and not a mere offshoot of the Franciscan Order.

In the time of Urban VIII the reform numbered over seventeen thousand friars in forty-two provinces; a century later, at the general chapter of 1754, there were representatives from sixty-three provinces, and the number of the friars was given as thirty-two thousand eight hundred and twenty-one. But during the French Revolution the order suffered severely; nearly all the provinces were disorganized or suppressed; and in the subsequent revolutions on the European continent the Capuchins suffered the fate of all the religious orders, being continually oppressed and dispersed. Yet during the last twenty years a notable revival has taken place. In 1889 the order had 636 houses and 7852 friars; in 1906 there were 731 houses and 9970 friars, divided into 56 provinces.

II. Influence of the Reform upon the General History of the Church.—The Capuchins, together with the Jesuits, were the most effective preachers and missionaries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We have already seen that the privilege granted by Clement VII to Matteo di Bassi was not only to observe the Rule of St. Francis in its primitive simplicity, but also to go about preaching the Word of God. In this matter the friars of the reform were but reasserting the primitive Franciscan life; and it is to be noted that the method of their apostolate was also thoroughly in accord with what the early legends of the order tell us about St. Francis's method. In their preaching they eschewed artificial oratory and set forth their message with a simplicity and directness which came from the heart. But perhaps what most endeared them to the people, and gave them that singular power with all classes to which the history of the times bears witness, was their all-embracing charity. The picture of the Capuchin friar drawn by Manzoni in "I Promessi Sposi" is historical. In their apostolate they not merely preached from the pulpits; they mingled in the daily life of the people, ministering to suffering humanity in its temporal as well as its spiritual needs. In the frequent pestilences which devastated Italy and Europe generally in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Capuchins were constantly found doing a notable part in the service of the sick. The annals of the order and the chronicles of the times tell us of the heroism of the friars in the pestilences which swept through Northern Italy and Spain in 1589, through Switzerland in 1609, through Germany in 1611. In the great pestilence of 1630 the friars took charge of the lazarettos at Milan, and acted as confessors, nurses, cooks, and dispensers to the victims. They did the same at Marseilles and Freiburg. At Siena the friars were assembled for a provincial chapter when the pestilence broke out; they prorogued the chapter and went out to nurse the sick, and forty-three of them fell victims to their charity. During the pestilence of 1636 in Franche-Comté, so many Capuchins died in ministering to the sick that Urban VIII allowed young clerics to be ordained priests before the canonical age to take the place of those who had succumbed. St. Laurence of Brindisi, sent as missionary Apostolic to Germany in 1599, began his apostolate by nursing the sick in the pestilence of that year. Undoubtedly their universal charity, united to the austerity of their lives, accounts for much of their success as missionaries, whether with Catholics or non-Catholics.

And not only were they popular with the multitude; they had the confidence of the authorities. This is shown in the frequent choice of the friars by the popes and princes to fill responsible positions. Thus, in the wars against the Turks in the sixteenth century, it was usually the Capuchins who were appointed chaplains and spiritual directors to the Christian forces. In the Venetian expedition of 1571, a number of Capuchins accompanied the Venetian navy by command of St. Pius V, and at the battle of Lepanto, Father Anselmo da Pietramolara was in the thick of the fight, urging on the Christian forces with raised crucifix; in fact, it was his indomitable bravery which prevented the ship he was in from being cap-

tured by the Turks. The friars were similarly employed in the struggles of the German princes against the Turks in the seventeenth century. St. Laurence of Brindisi, in 1610, went as chaplain general with the Christian army, and so did Venerable Mark of Aviano, in 1687. It is pleasing to note that the friars obtained, from Gregory XIII, power to absolve Christians who, during the wars, freed or hid captive Turks.

They were moreover not infrequently commissioned to transact affairs of state. St. Laurence of Brindisi was sent as ambassador by the Emperor Rudolph to solicit the alliance of Spain with the Catholic League of Germany. Gregory XIII employed the Capuchins to negotiate for the ransom of Christian captives in Algiers. Father Giacinto da Casale was commissioned by Gregory XV to unite the Catholic princes of Germany in defence of the Faith. Sometimes their personal influence, without any official status, enabled them to intervene with success in public matters, as in Switzerland, when the canton of Appenzell was hesitating whether to ally itself with the Catholic cantons or with the Protestant, the Capuchins went in and drew Appenzell to the Catholic side. In similar fashion, in 1637, a Swiss Capuchin acted as arbitrator in the canton of Aargau. These public acts testify to the great influence acquired by the friars in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but their influence was gained by hard and strenuous labours both as home and as foreign missionaries. They were to be found everywhere, preaching and ministering to the people. Not only were they established in almost every country of Europe, but as foreign missionaries their activity seems almost incredible. At the general chapter of 1662 the list of foreign missions served by the friars included the Congo, Benin, Morocco, Egypt, Ethiopia, Smyrna, Mingrelia, Cyprus, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, Ecbatana, Kurdistan, Persia, Tatary, Brazil, New Granada, Canada, Morea, the Grecian Archipelago, whilst they also had missions, under Propaganda, in Rhætia, the Grisons, and the Valtellina.

As "home" missionaries they were mainly instrumental in reforming the pulpit, substituting solid teaching, with burning and convincing piety, for the vapid rhetoric so common amongst the preachers of the sixteenth century. Their object was always to reach the heart of the people. To be convinced of the solidity and piety of their preaching, one has only to consult the many books of sermons and treatises of devotion which the missionary friars have left us. According to Baronius and the chroniclers of the order, the devotion of the *Quarant' Ore* owes its origin to the missionary zeal of the Capuchins. Father Giuseppe da Ferno is said to have been the first to expose the Blessed Sacrament for forty hours' prayer, during a mission he was preaching in the Duomo at Milan, in 1637. Giuseppe da Ferno certainly wrote a treatise on the method of the *Quarant' Ore*, and from this time we find frequent mention of the devotion in the missionary chronicles of the order. But the supreme monument to their missionary zeal is the Congregation of the Propaganda itself. This congregation was instituted by Gregory XV, in 1622, at the suggestion of Father Girolamo da Narni, Vicar-General of the Reform. He was a noted preacher and experienced in missionary labours. When the congregation was established, its first prefect was the Capuchin Cardinal of Sant' Onofrio; and its first martyr was another Capuchin, St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen, whom the Propaganda had appointed Prefect of the Mission of Rhætia. The friars had already been established for some years in Switzerland, whither they had been called by St. Charles Borromeo in his capacity as Protector of the Catholics in those parts. The saint, backed by Pope Gregory XIII, had requested the general chapter of 1581 to send friars thither, and the chapter had at once acceded to the request. Such was their success in combating the errors of the Calvinists and in preserving the Faith in many cantons that to this day they are accorded a privileged position in the churches of the Catholic cantons as confessors and preachers. It was in the Grisons that Saint Fidelis was martyred, in 1622. Here the Calvinists had practically gained over the whole population, as also in the Valtellina, and only by heroic efforts were the friars able to keep alive any remnant of the Faith. The missions in these parts are still under the jurisdiction of the Capuchins.

In Savoy the friars, under the leadership of Father Cherubino da Mariana, the friend of St. Francis of Sales, were at work in 1596, and the mission of Thonon was especially given into their charge in 1610. Father Cherubino also introduced the friars into the Vallese in 1610, at which time, as St. Francis of Sales reported, the religious condition of that country seemed hopeless. Under St. Laurence of Brindisi twelve Capuchins were sent, in 1599, to combat the influence of Protestantism in Germany, where by their public controversies with Protestants, as well as by their preaching, they did much to win back many to the Faith. They rapidly established houses in all parts of Southern Germany, and in 1611 they were established in the Rhine Provinces by Father Francis Nugent, a distinguished Irish friar.

On the foreign missions they were equally energetic. The first foreign mission was undertaken in 1551, when two friars were commissioned by Julius III to go to Constantinople. They were, however, expelled, after being imprisoned and tortured. But we find them shortly afterwards in Crete, where Father Ignazio d'Apiro established five missionary centres in two years, besides a hospital at Canea. He was a man well versed in Oriental languages. He died in 1569. About this time two Capuchins were put to death in Palestine. But it was at the general chapter of 1581 that the friars put their hand definitively to the matter of foreign missions. They then obtained a faculty from Sixtus V to send missionaries to the East, and a band of friars, amongst whom was St. Joseph of Leonissa, were despatched to Constantinople. Imprisonment and torture awaited them; but from that time the friars have held fast to their missions in the Turkish dominions. In 1623 the Propaganda commissioned the Capuchins to found missions in Syria, Egypt, and Abyssinia. Six friars were sent to Constantinople, where they at once established a school for the study of Oriental languages; others went to Aleppo, Alexandria, and Armenia. Their method was to open schools wherever they settled, and they were active in publishing books. As a result of their labours in Syria at this time, a schismatic Armenian metropolitan and a schismatic Greek metropolitan sought reunion with the Church. In 1618 the general chapter, at the request of Paul V, sent missionaries to the Congo. They encountered great difficulties, owing to the Dutch traders, and success seemed hopeless. Yet they struggled on till 1654, when a fresh effort was made, and a new band of missionaries was sent out, including Father G. Antonio Cavazzi, the writer of a well-known work on the Congo.

From Aleppo friars were sent, in 1630, to Cairo, under the leadership of the Blessed Agathange de Vendôme, one of the most remarkable missionaries of the seventeenth century. He was an Arabic scholar, and had published books in Arabic setting forth the Catholic Faith. On the coming of the friars to Cairo Urban VIII addressed a letter to the Catholics in Egypt, bidding them welcome the friars and accord them every assistance. But unhappily the friars found that their work amongst the Copts, for whose reunion with the Roman See they more particularly laboured, was hindered chiefly by the scandalous lives of the European Catholic merchants.

Yet the friars obtained leave from the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria to preach in the churches of the Copts, and the pope even granted them permission to celebrate Mass in the same churches. Father Agathange's influence with the Copts was such that he persuaded the Coptic patriarch to appoint for the Copts in Abyssinia a bishop who would live in peace with the Catholics. In 1637 Father Agathange, together with Father Cassian de Nantes, entered Abyssinia, but owing to the treachery of a German Lutheran they were at once seized and imprisoned, and the following year suffered martyrdom. The Capuchin mission in Abyssinia was thus brought swiftly to a close, but only to be renewed in later years. Towards the end of the last century the friars were again established in the dominions of the Negus, chiefly through the exertions of the celebrated Capuchin missionary afterwards known as Cardinal Massaïa. He has left a record of his experiences in his book, "I miei trentacinque anni nell' alta Etiopia" (Rome and Milan, 1895).

Towards the middle of the seventeenth century the friars established missions in India at Surat, Pegu, Golconda, and Madras, and a little later at Pondicherry. The story of their Indian missions is much the same as elsewhere; they established schools, wrote books in the vernacular of the country, held public conferences with the learned heathen, and found their chief obstacle in the European traders—in this case, the Portuguese. At the present day the missions in India are amongst the most important in the order: the Archdiocese of Agra (the premier diocese in India), the Dioceses of Lahore and Allahabad, and the Prefecture of Rajputana, are entirely served by Capuchins. They still carry on their work in Asia Minor, where they have a flourishing missionary seminary at Smyrna. Other present-day missions are in Central and South America, in Arabia and Somaliland, in the Seychelles, Philippines, and Caroline Islands, in Abyssinia and Mesopotamia; whilst in Europe they carry on missionary work in Constantinople and Bulgaria. In 1906 eight hundred and fifty-five friars of the reform were engaged in foreign missionary labour.

The reform has produced few writers of the first order in literature or scholarship, though the "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ord. Min. Cap." (Genoa, 1680; Venice, 1747) gives the names of a great number of writers and a goodly list of works, many of them of no mean merit. But most of their writings are connected with their apostolic labours—books of sermons, devotional treatises, and works dealing with the history of the missions. In this last department they have produced several valuable works, such as Cavazzi's treatise on the Congo, Dionigi Carli's book on the customs, rites, and religion of the people of Africa, Merolla da Sorrento's account of the Congo and South Africa, and Cardinal Massaïa's work on Abyssinia. In the seventeenth century the French Capuchins were noted for their studies of Oriental languages, and in view of the present revival of the Celtic tongues, it may be recalled that a Breton Capuchin, Gregorius de Rostrenen, published in 1732 "Dictionarium Gallo-Celticum, seu Gallo-Aremoricum" (Rennes, 1732) and "Grammatica cum Syntaxi Gallo-Celtica, seu Gallo-Aremorica" (Rennes, 1738). In Scriptural exegesis Bernardine a Piconio has a deservedly high name as the author of the "Triplex expositio" (1706), whilst in the sixteenth century Francis Titelmann, who left the theological chair of Louvain to put on the habit of St. Francis, gained European repute by his treatises on Scripture and his controversy with Erasmus. Amongst devotional writings, the works of Gaetano da Bergamo, published in the first half of the eighteenth century, have an enduring value; his treatise on humility and his meditations on the Passion have both been translated into English. Benedict Canfield's treatise "On the Holy Will of God" has an enduring place in ascetical literature. Amongst modern theologians of merit a place must be given to Albert of Bulsano; and as an authority on canon law the Belgian Capuchin Piatus is much esteemed. In the late revival of Franciscan historical studies, Père Edouard d'Alençon has issued new editions of the "Sacrum Commercium" (Rome, 1900), and the legends of Thomas of Celano (Rome, 1906). Amongst the chroniclers of the order the first place must be given to Boverius, a man of great learning not only as an historian, but as a controversial writer of the sixteenth century. In 1640 Carolus de Arembergh published at Cologne "Flores Seraphici", a voluminous work concerning the noted members of the order.

But the Capuchin friars have at all times been men of action rather than students, and the enormous influence they possessed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was due to their extensive labours as home and foreign missionaries and to the universality of their genius in dealing with the spiritual needs of the people. Amongst the special marks of favour shown them by the Holy See must be mentioned their custody of the Holy House of Loreto, given to them in 1608, and the fact that since 1596 they have had the privilege of supplying the Apostolic preacher at the Roman Court. Pope Urban VIII was a special patron of the order. His friendship with the friars was in part due to the fact that his brother, Antonio Barberini, afterwards Cardinal of Sant' Onofrio, was a member of the order. This pope built for them the famous convent of the Barberini in Rome, the architect of which was himself a Capuchin Friar, Fra Michaele da Bergamo; and the new church attached to the convent was the first church in Rome to be dedicated in honour of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. The convent was opened with great solemnity on 15 April, 1631, and Urban VIII signalized the event by appointing Fra Michaele architect of the Apostolic Palace. The convent was the headquarters of the order until a few years ago, when the minister general and his *curia* were expelled by the Italian Government, which now uses the greater part of the convent as a barracks, leaving only a few friars to take care of the church. We may here take note that the reform has given many cardinals and bishops to the Church; sixteen of its members have been canonized or beatified, and the cause of others is in process at Rome with a view to canonization.

That the friars came in for much of the abuse levelled against the Church and especially against the religious orders, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, only testifies to their influence and zeal. Except the Jesuits, no religious order has, perhaps, been more vilely lampooned. In France, during the seventeenth century, book after book appeared defaming the friars; one of these was translated into English and published in London in 1671 under the title of "The Monk's Hood pull'd off, or the Capuchin Fryar described".

III. The Reform in English-speaking Countries.—It was in 1599 that the first friars of the reform came to England. These were Father Benedict Canfield, an Englishman, and Father Chrysostom, a Scotchman. Benedict Canfield was of Puritan parentage, but had embraced the Catholic Faith whilst yet a student. As a friar he was reputed a powerful preacher, and was a writer of note. But he had hardly landed in England when he and his companion were seized and imprisoned. He was released at the end of three years and expelled the kingdom. Amongst other friars who came to England about this time were Father Archangel, "the Scotch Capuchin", who became the subject of a popular Italian biography, written by the Papal Legate Rinuccini, in which, however, the author's imagination played freely

around historical fact; and Epiphanius Lindsay, described in the Memoir of P. Cyprien de Gamache as "son of the Count of Maine", but probably of the family of the Lindsays, lairds of Mains in Kirkcudbrightshire. But in 1630 the missionaries were withdrawn, when Henrietta Maria, Queen of Charles I, brought over twelve Capuchins as royal chaplains. Under the protection of the Court, the friars publicly celebrated Mass and preached, sometimes holding controversies with the Protestants, and they are said to have made many conversions. Their mission, however, was abruptly terminated when Queen Henrietta went to Holland to solicit aid for the king against the Parliament. The royal chapel was closed, and the friars told to consider themselves prisoners in their own house. They were afterwards sent back to France. They returned at the Restoration of Charles II, but only for a few years. From this time no Capuchin seems to have come to England until Father Arthur O'Leary, the brilliant Irish friar, settled in London, in 1789, ostensibly as chaplain to the Spanish Embassy, but really to minister to the Irish Catholics, for whom he built St. Patrick's Church in Soho Square. He died in 1802. The present province of England was not established until the latter end of the last century, through the instrumentality of Father Louis of Lavagna, an Italian friar, who came to England in 1850 with the intention of proceeding to Canada, but having arrived in London he was induced to stay there and minister to the wants of the Catholics in the district of Peckham. Here he built a small church, and at his request other friars were sent over to assist him. At this time the Franciscan Order had virtually died out in England. Only one Father of the Recollect Province founded in the time of Queen Mary remained, and he ended his days a few years later in the house of the Capuchins at Pontypool, thus creating a link between the new Franciscan foundation and the old.

The order rapidly took root on English soil. Ten years after the coming of Father Louis of Lavagna the friars had four canonical communities at Peckham, Pantasaph, Chester, and Pontypool, besides several stations; during the next few years they established several houses in the Diocese of Southwark, so that in 1873 it was thought expedient to erect the English houses into a canonical province. The province is yet too young to afford much matter in the way of history of general interest; but it may be noted that in little more than half a century the friars have established thirty-five missions, most of which have been given over to the bishops when they were able to support a secular priest; besides the parochial work thus entailed, they are continually employed in missionary labours outside their own parishes. In 1904 several friars of the province were sent to establish a house in Mendocino, California, which is to be the centre for missionary work in Mendocino county, now given into their charge by the Archbishop of San Francisco. They also have undertaken to supply missionaries for the Vicariate of Aden in Arabia. In 1905, at the request of the Bishop of Southwark, the friars undertook a unique mission to Catholic hop-pickers. Every year in the month of September there is a large exodus of the London poor into the hop-gardens of Kent; of these poor the Catholics average yearly about ten thousand. Until 1905 no provision was made for the spiritual needs of the Catholic hop-pickers, and hardly any of them during the period of picking were able to hear Mass or receive the sacraments. Now each year when the hop-picking begins, Capuchin friars, assisted by Sisters of Mercy and lay workers, men and women, go down to the hop-district. The work has distinctive characteristics. The majority of the hop-pickers are of the very poorest class, whence chiefly comes the leakage from the Church; they seldom enter a church, and often are lost to the priest in the shiftings and maze of London life. In the Kentish hop-gardens they come again under the influence of the priest and religion. The work is as yet in its infancy, but it is big with possibilities for regaining to the Faith the indifferent and lapsed amongst our Catholic London poor; and it is characteristically Franciscan in its object and methods, for once again the friar is seen celebrating Mass and preaching in the open fields amongst the ill-clad and the hungry. In 1906 the friars were able to restore one of the broken links in the history of English Franciscans by their return to Oxford, once glorified by the learning amidst poverty of the sons of the *Poverello*. On the outskirts of the city they have secured a school for the training of candidates for the order, whence they can look down upon Merton College, where, according to tradition, Duns Scotus lectured, and upon the site of the ancient friary where the relics of Blessed Agnellus of Pisa—sent by St. Francis to establish the English Province—were enshrined until their dispersion in the reign of Henry VIII.

It was in 1615 that the first friar of the Capuchin Reform came to Ireland, Father Stephen Daly. He was sent over by Father Francis Nugent, who, in 1608, had received a papal commission to establish the reform in his native land. According to Bernardine of Colpetrazo, the other branches of the Franciscan Order had, in 1549, petitioned the general chapter of the Capuchins to send over friars to introduce the reform into the Franciscan houses of that country; but this was impossible, since at that time the decree of Paul III was still in force which forbade the Capuchin reform to establish houses outside Italy. Francis Nugent, the actual founder of the Irish province, was a remarkable man. He had already introduced the reform into the Rhine country when he petitioned the Roman authorities to set aside a house of the order for the reception of Irish friars. Accordingly, the convent of Charleville, in the Low Countries, was given him for his purpose, and thither the Irish friars from all provinces were sent to form a community whence the Irish foundation might be begun. The convent of Charleville thus became the novitiate and *alma mater* of the province of Ireland. In 1615, first Stephen Daly and then four other friars were sent over. At first they lived separately wherever they could; but in 1623 or 1624 (the exact date seems uncertain) they took a house in Bridge Street, Dublin, where they lived in community. But in 1630 the house was seized by the Lords Justices and conferred upon the University of Dublin. The friars, however, remained in the country, and were gradually reinforced in numbers: several of them suffered imprisonment and banishment for the Faith. In 1642, the Irish mission numbered fifty-one friars, with houses in Dublin, Slane, Limerick, Mullingar, Drogheda, and Cork. In 1733 they had fourteen houses in Ireland and two in France, and were that year erected into a canonical province. Just then began one of the saddest periods in the history of the Irish people. Persecution and famine for a time seemed to break the spirit of the people; vocations became scarce, and the Irish province became almost extinct. It lingered on, however. In 1771 Father Arthur O'Leary built a church in Cork, and the friars reopened houses in Dublin and Kilkenny. The last days of the old province were made illustrious by the apostolic labours of the world-famous Father Theobald Mathew, the propagator of the temperance movement. After being for a while united with the friars in England under a commissary-general, the Irish friars were again, in 1873, formed into a separate "custody", with autonomous government, and in 1885 the canonical province was re-established. There are now four convents of the order in Ireland, with eighty-nine

friars. From the days of Father Mathew, the Irish friars have been to the front in forwarding the temperance movement initiated by him; but in October, 1905, the Irish hierarchy formally entrusted to them the preaching of a national crusade of temperance. Since then the friars are to be found in all parts of the country carrying out their mission.

On the American continent the Capuchins not only have flourishing missions in Central and South America, they have also two provinces in the United States, a missionary district in California, served by the English province, and missions in Canada, served by French friars. The present establishment of the friars in the United States dates from 1857; but there were missionary Capuchins in the present territories of the United States and Canada early in the seventeenth century. In 1632 friars of the province of Paris were put in charge of the missions in Acadia. The centre of the mission was at Port Royal, now Annapolis, but it extended from Hancock County, in Maine, northwards, to the Bay of Chaleur. They seem also to have had missions in the Antilles, for in 1641 the friar, Father Pacifique, was murdered there whilst on a visitation of the missions. The missions in Acadia were in a flourishing condition when the English Puritans broke up the settlement in 1655 and expelled the friars. Yet in 1656 the friars were still at work amongst the Micmac Indians. In 1714 French Capuchins were invited to undertake missions in Louisiana by the coadjutor Bishop of Quebec, de Mornay, himself a Capuchin Friar. They remained there till 1770, when, for political reasons, Spanish friars took the place of their French brethren. They had missions in New Orleans, St. Louis, Galveston, Mobile, Pensacola, Natchez, Natchitoches, and other places. But in 1800 the friars were withdrawn. In 1787 two German friars were in charge of the Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia.

But, as has been said, the present establishment of the friars in the United States dates from 1857; and its history is one of romantic incidents in the history of the reform. The chance visit of a young Swiss from the United States to his native land, and his recital of the spiritual needs of America, inspired two secular priests in Switzerland with the idea of introducing the Capuchin Order into the United States. They resigned their parishes and, going out to America, were given Mt. Calvary, Wisconsin, as the site of a Capuchin convent, by the Bishop of Milwaukee. At the express wish of Pope Pius IX these two secular priests were then clothed with the religious habit and commissioned to lay the foundation of a new province. At the present day this province has houses at Mt. Calvary, Milwaukee, New York, Brooklyn, Detroit, Appleton, and Yonkers. In New York they have four parishes, and three parishes in Milwaukee; at Mt. Calvary they have a flourishing college, begun in 1864. Besides the province of Mt. Calvary, there is also the province of Pennsylvania, established by Bavarian and Westphalian friars, driven from their native home by the *Kulturkampf*. The first house of this province was established at Pittsburg in 1874; but it was not till 1882 that the province became autonomous, at which time it had houses in Pittsburg, Herman, Pa.; Victoria, Kan.; Peoria, Metamora, Ill., and Cumberland, Md. The fathers of this province have introduced into the United States a charitable institution which has had remarkable success in Germany, the *Seraphisches Liebeswerk*—the "Seraphic Work of Charity". This society aims at assisting destitute Catholic children to obtain Catholic education, by placing them in institutions or in private families. The centre of this work is at the Capuchin convent, Pittsburg, Pa.

In Canada, the French Capuchins have houses in Ottawa and Quebec, and a missionary centre for work amongst the Micmac Indians at Sainte-Anne de Restigouche. The work carried on here is reminiscent of the heroic days of the Canadian mission. From the mission centre the fathers make missionary tours amongst the scattered Indians. The Micmac number about four thousand; they are much attached to their religion and language, and show no signs of decay.

Amongst Capuchins of note who have laboured in North America, mention must be made of Ignazio Persico, Bishop of Savannah from 1870 till 1872, and afterwards cardinal. Another cardinal still living, Cardinal Vives y Tuto, took his vows as a Capuchin Friar at Santa Clara College, San Francisco, in 1872, and was for a time a member of the community at Milwaukee. Nor may we omit the name of Bishop Charbonel, who resigned the See of Toronto to take the Capuchin habit. It was he who invited the saintly friar, Louis of Lavagna, founder of the present English province, to take up missionary work in Toronto in 1856. The friar only lived nine months after reaching Toronto, dying on 17 March, 1857; yet during that short period he had gained the reputation of a saint.

Thus are the Capuchins, together with their brethren of the other families of the Franciscan Order, taking up again in English-speaking lands the traditions of past centuries with renewed vigour. The troubles of the past may have purified, they have not broken, the Franciscan spirit.

By way of distinction from other religious, the Capuchin Friars in most countries append the sign "O. M. Cap." (*Ordinis Minorum, Capuccinorum*) after their names; but in England and Ireland they sign "O. S. F. C." (*Ordinis Sancti Francisci, Capuccinorum*) in accordance with the use of the ancient English province.

Collectio Authentica Ordinationum Capit. Gen. in *Analecta Ord. Cap.*, V, VI; BOVERIUS, *Annales Ord. S. Fr. Cap.* (Lyons, 1632), I, II; *Bullarium Ord. Cap.* (Rome, 1740); Innsbruck, 1883–4); *Bibliotheca Script. Ord. Cap.* (Venice, 1747); *Chronica Fr. Joannis Romæi*, in *Analecta Ord. Cap.*, XXII; D'AREMBERGH, *Flores Seraphici* (Cologne, 1640); PELLEGRINO DA FORLI, *Annali Cappuccini* (Milan, 1882); ROCCO DA CESINALE, *Missione dei Cappuccini* (Paris, 1867); *Chronicle of the English Province*, in *Franciscan Annals* (Crawley, England), XIII; *The Capuchins in English-speaking Lands*, in *Seraphic Child of Mary* (pub. by the Capuchins of Pennsylvania), IV, V.

FATHER CUTHBERT.

Capuciati (from *caputium*, hood), so named from the headgear which was one of their distinctive marks.

I. A short-lived confraternity founded in 1182 or 1183 in France for the restoration and maintenance of peace. It was one of the various attempts to put an end to the incessant wars and feuds which were spreading ruin and desolation throughout that country during the twelfth century. The origin of the Capuciati is traced to a poor carpenter of Le Puy, named Durand, who claimed to have had an apparition of the Blessed Virgin Mary in 1182. In this vision he received a paper on which there was a representation of the Blessed Virgin seated on a throne with a figure of the child Jesus in her hands, and bearing the inscription, "Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world give us peace". An association was to be formed whose members should bind themselves to keep and procure peace and, as distinctive signs, wear a white hood and a medal bearing a reproduction of the picture and inscription.

Durand met with astounding success in the execution of these instructions. A confraternity was organized under the direction of the clergy exactly on the lines of Catholic confraternities of the present day. The Church of Our Lady of Le Puy became the centre of the movement, which spread with extraordinary rapidity over the provinces of France, south of the Loire. The Capuciati, in addition to pledging themselves not to swear falsely, not to blaspheme, not to play dice, enter taverns, or wear costly garments, also promised to do all in their power to re-

store and maintain peace. Their endeavours in this line were not ineffectual, an overwhelming defeat which the "Routiers", or undisciplined bands of soldiery of the period, sustained in 1183 must be largely ascribed to the co-operation of the Capuciati with the royal army. The existence of the confraternity was of short duration. Its disappearance is involved in obscurity; but it seems to have directed its efforts against the members of the nobility, and to have been wiped out of existence by them, aided by the "Routiers". Its advocacy of heretical principles is not clearly and trustworthily indicated in historical records. The accusation that it respected neither ecclesiastical nor civil authority may perhaps be explained by its resistance to real or imagined abuses of power.

II. CAPUCIATI was also a designation applied to that special class of English Lollards who profited by the preaching and denunciations of the former Augustinian monk, Peter Pateshull (c. 1387), to indulge in deeds of iconoclasm. They owed their name to their practice of keeping the hoods on their heads in presence of the Blessed Sacrament. For fuller details as to these *Capuciati*, see LOLLARDS.

I. GEOFFREY OF VIGEOIS, *Chronic. Lemovicense* in *Recueil des hist. de la Gaule* (Paris, 1879), XVIII, 219; *Chronic. Laudunense* (ibid.), 705–06; *Hist. Episc. Autissiodorensium* (ibid.), 729–30; GÉRAUD, *Les Routiers* in *Biblioth. de l'Ecole des Chartes* (Paris, 1842), III, 125–47; ALPHANDÉRY, *Les idées morales chez les hétérodoxes latins au début du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1903), 13–21.

II. THOMAS OF WALSINGHAM, ed. RILEY (London, 1864), II, 157–59; VERNET in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1905), II, 1696.

N. A. WEBER.

Caquetá, APOSTOLIC PREFECTURE OF, situated in South America on the southern border of the Republic of Colombia, in the angle formed by the Central Cordilleras and the Cordilleras del Caquetá, on the river Caquetá, which, after changing its name into Japurá, empties into the Amazon. According to an agreement of 27 December, 1902, between the Government and the Holy See, this prefecture comprises almost the entire Colombian province of Mocoa; it formerly belonged to the extensive Diocese of Pasto. The decree of erection is dated 20 December, 1904, and the Capuchins of the Spanish province of Cataluña are entrusted with the evangelization of the aborigines, who as yet are in a very low state of civilization, some being even addicted to cannibalism. In 1906 there were two permanent mission-stations at Mocoa and Sibundoy, with 10 fathers and 3 lay brothers in charge of 14 chapels. About 12,000 converted Indians live among 40,000 heathens. In 1906, 245 baptisms, 130 marriages, and 118 funerals were recorded, and the five Catholic schools numbered 178 children. It is subject not to the Propaganda but to the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs.

Reports of Capuchin Missionaries, in *Analecta Capuccinorum*, passim; STREIT, *Atlas des Missions cath.* (Steyl, 1906), 26, and plate 28.

OTTO JÉRON.

Carabantes (or CARAVANTES), JOSÉ DE, Friar Minor Capuchin and theologian, b. in Aragon, in 1628; d. in 1694. He did much for the evangelization of the Indian tribes in Spanish America. He wrote a work entitled "Ars addicendi atque docendi idiomata", and likewise a "Lexicon, seu vocabularium verborum, adverbiorum, etc.", for the use of missionaries among the Indians (Madrid, 1678). A biography of Father Carabantes was published at Madrid in 1705 by Diego Gonzales de Quiraga.

QUIRAGA, *Biography of Carabantes* (Madrid, 1705); CAT in *Grande Enc.*, IX, 259.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Caracalla (MARCUS AURELIUS SEVERUS ANTONINUS, nicknamed CARACALLA), Roman Emperor, son of Septimius Severus and Julia Domna, b. 188; d. 217. He became joint ruler in 211 with his brother Geta, whom he caused to be murdered in 212, and thereby became sole emperor. He was slain himself in the neighbourhood of Carrhæ in Mesopotamia. In spite of his cruelty, immorality, avarice and treachery Caracalla was a brave soldier and successful administrator and did much to restore the security of the Empire by his campaigns against the Germans and in the Orient. He had little sympathy with Roman ideals or customs and his influence aided considerably in weakening the moral unity of the Empire and destroying the ancient traditions of Rome. The most noteworthy act of his reign was the extension by the Constitutio Antoniana (212) of the rights of Roman citizenship to all the inhabitants of the Empire. It is impossible to estimate what effect this rather doubtful boon had upon the fortunes of Christianity. While the martyrs henceforth could be executed as Romans the right of appeal to Cæsar was abrogated and new and heavy burdens of taxation were imposed. No changes in the laws regarding Christians were introduced by Caracalla and the policy followed in the reign of his father was continued with unabated severity and many were put to death. The weakened allegiance to the national religion of Rome and the spirit of syncretism fostered by the policy of this Emperor bore fruit in later reigns.

TERTULLIAN, *Ad Scapulam;* DIO CASSIUS, Hist. Bk. LXXVII; HERODIAN, Bks. VII and VIII; SPARTIANUS, *Vita Caracallæ*, in *Scriptores Hist. Aug.;* TILLEMONT, *Hist. des Empereurs*, III, 88; GIBBON, Chap. VI; ALLARD, *Hist. des persécutions pendant la première moitié du III^e siècle* (Paris, 1886), II, 158–69; SCHILLER, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, I, pt. II, 739–89.

P. J. HEALY.

Caracas (or SANTIAGO DE VENEZUELA), ARCHDIOCESE OF (SANCTI JACOBI DE BENEZUELA), in the Republic of Venezuela, a metropolitan see with Barquisimeto, Calabozo, Guayana, Merida, and Zulia as suffragans. It was made an episcopal see in 1530,

CATHEDRAL AT CARACAS

soon after the Spanish conquest, though until 1637 the residence was at Coro, was vacant from 1721 to 1727, and was raised to the rank of an archdiocese in 1803. Archbishop Juan Bautista Castro, appointed in 1904, was the eighth metropolitan and the thirty-fourth Bishop of Caracas. Battandier gives (1907) the population of the archdiocese as 425,640; that of the city is (1904) 60,000. The latter has a pleasant and healthful climate, is situated at the foot of the Silla de Caracas (4017 ft.), and is connected with the seaport La Guaira by a railway of twenty-three miles. The city suffers from earthquakes, in one of which (1812) 12,000 lives were lost. It was founded in 1567 by Diego Losada, and in 1595 was plundered and burned by the English under Drake; Bishop Juan de Manzanillo, a Dominican, soon rebuilt the Cathedral of Santa Anna that still stands in the Plaza Bolivar.

There are 102 priests and 110 churches and chapels. The University of Caracas, founded in 1822, has faculties of political, medical, mathematical, and ecclesiastical sciences; the chairs of the latter faculty are in the metropolitan seminary.

The Church has suffered in Caracas more perhaps than in any other of the South American Republics. The university, therefore, the seminary, the convents that once flourished in that beautiful city, have gone through many hardships, and it is difficult to give an accurate account of their present condition. The population on the whole can still be called Catholic, while the recent International Eucharistic Congress celebrated in Caracas shows a revival in the Venezuelan Church.

HERNAEZ, *Coleccion de Bulas Breves y otros Documentos relativos á America y Filipinas* (Brussels, 1879); BATTANDIER, *Ann. Pont. Cath.* (Paris, 1907), 244; WERNER, *Orbis Terrarum Catholicus* (Freiburg, 1890); STREIT, *Katholischer Missionsatlas* (Steyl, 1906); HEILPRIN, in *Lippincott's Gazetteer* (Philadelphia, 1906); *Statesman's Year Book* (London, 1908).

J. MONTES DE OCA Y OBREGON.

Caraffa, GIOVANNI PIETRO. See PAUL IV.

Caraffa, VINCENT, seventh General of the Society of Jesus, b. at Naples, 5 May, 1585; d. at Rome, 8 June, 1649. He was of the family of the Counts of Montorio and a relative of Pope Paul IV. He entered the Society of Jesus, 4 October, 1604, and was sixty years of age at his election as general. He died four years after. He had taught philosophy and governed the principal house of the Society at Naples, and was provincial at the time of the election to the generalship. In 1635 he had published his "Fascetto di mirra" (Bundle of Myrrh), which has been translated into several languages. He is the author of several other ascetical works, such as the "Cammino del Cielo", the "Cittadino del Cielo", "Il Peregrino della terra", "Idea Christiani hominis", and "Il Serafino", all previous to his election. He wrote under the name of Aloysius Sidereus. His only known writing when general is his Encyclical letter: "De mediis conservandi primævum spiritum Societatis" (The means of preserving the primitive spirit of the Society). His short term of office coincided with the beginning of the war of Jansenism on the Society and the troubles with Palafox, Bishop of La Puebla. A great scandal occurred in Spain because of unsuccessful business speculations by a coadjutor brother, and in France on account of the open apostasy to Calvinism of a priest; but the martyrdom of men like Jogues, Brébeuf, Cuthbert Prescot, Neville, and others in Canada and England was an assurance that the Society's ancient fervour had not relaxed. The well-known Confraternity of the Bona Mors, which is now so universal in the Church, was instituted at the suggestion of Father Caraffa.

DAURIGNAC, *History of the Society of Jesus* (Cincinnati, 1865), VI; B. N., *The Jesuits, their Foundation and History* (New York, 1879); FELLER, *Biog. Univ.* (Paris, 1819); DE BACKER, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* (Liège, 1858).

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Caraites, a Jewish sect professing to follow the text of the Bible (*Miqra'*) to the exclusion of Rabbinical traditions, and hence opposed to the Talmud. They are called in Jewish writings *Benê Miqra' Ba' Miqra', Qerā'îm*—i. e. followers of the Bible. The tendency to reject or minimize the traditions and decisions of the Elders is rather old; the Sadducees were, in that respect, the forerunners of Caraism. Our Lord himself is said to have discarded such traditions altogether, but, when more closely examined, the passages quoted show simply that He, knowing such traditional lore to be human, insisted more on the true spirit of the Bible. He corrected individual traditions to safeguard the true import of the Biblical legislation, but He did not deny the principle. (Cf. Matt., xv, 1 sq.) Caraism in the strict sense owes its origin to Anan (died about A. D. 780), and for a time it bore the name of Ananism. It gained ground among the Jews up to the tenth century, but then met with a decided and able opponent in Saadia al-Fayyumi, 892–942. During the eleventh century there was a lively struggle between Rabbinites and Caraites, especially in Spain, but through the influence of two statesmen, Joseph Faussol and Judah ben Ezra, Caraism was almost entirely driven out of that country, and practically out of Western Europe. Since then it has succeeded in maintaining itself in the East, but has steadily lost ground to the parent orthodox Judaism. To-day Caraism numbers about 10,000 adherents in Russia and 2000 in other countries. In keeping with their principle, that the text of the Bible alone is authoritative, the Caraites have made some valuable contributions to grammar and Biblical philology; it must be granted, however, that the desire of finding in the Bible a justification for certain beliefs held on other grounds has led many of the Caraites to vindicate rules of interpretation as arbitrary as many of those of ancient Judaism. Anan and his successors have been greatly influenced by Islamic models in deducing laws from their own Sacred Books. Among the best-known authors of Caraism we may mention Judah Hadassi (twelfth century) whose "Eskhol ha-Kofer" was in the Middle Ages, and still is, one of the main sources of Caraism; Aaron ben Joseph (thirteenth century); Aaron ben Elijah (fourteenth century); Elijah ben Moses Bashyasi (fifteenth century). In modern times the most celebrated Caraite scholar is Abraham Firkowich (1786–1874), whom his well-deserving labours and discoveries, and still more his literary forgeries in favour of Caraism, have made especially famous.

The beliefs of Caraism with regard to God and man are substantially those of orthodox Judaism. They differ especially in religious observances. The Caraites have retained, or reverted to, many of the mystical views of Essenism, particularly with regard to cleanliness. The Sabbath law is very rigorous. It must be added, also, that whatever may be their independence from Rabbinism in theory, the Caraites have adopted in practice many Rabbinical customs and observances.

JOST, *Geschichte des Judenthums u. seiner Sekten* (Leipzig, 1857–59), II, 294–382; FÜRST, *Geschichte des Karäerthums* (Leipzig, 1862–65); GRÄTZ, *History of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1891–98), passim, espec. III, 130 sqq.; DE HARKAVY, s. v., in *Jewish Encyclopedia*.

R. BUTIN.

Caramuel y Lobkowitz, JUAN, Spanish ecclesiastic and writer; b. at Madrid, 23 May, 1606; d. at Vigevano, 8 September, 1682. He was a precocious child, early delving into serious problems in mathematics and even publishing astronomical tables in his tenth year. After receiving a superficial education at college, where his unusual ability brought rapid advancement, this prodigy turned his attention to the Asiatic languages, especially Chinese. He was received into the Cistercian Order at the monastery of La Espina, in the Diocese of Palencia, and after ordination entered upon a singularly varied and brilliant career. His sermons attracted the favourable attention of the Infante Ferdinand, Governor of the Low Countries, while he was attached to the monastery of Dunes in Flanders, and in 1638 he was honoured with the degree of Doctor of Theology by the University of Louvain. When he was obliged to leave the Palatinate, the King of Spain made him his envoy to the court of the Emperor Ferdinand III. He was in turn Abbot of Melrose (Scotland), Abbot-Superior of the Benedictines of Vienna, and grand-vicar to the Archbishop of Prague. In 1648, when the Swedes attacked Prague, he armed and led a band of ecclesiastics who did yeoman service in the defence of the city. His bravery on this occasion merited for him a

collar of gold from the emperor. Soon after he became Bishop of Königratz, then Archbishop of Otranto, and at his death was Bishop of Vigevano.

His books are even more numerous than his titles and his varied achievements; for, according to Paquot, he published no less than 262 works on grammar, poetry, oratory, mathematics, astronomy, physics, politics, canon law, logic, metaphysics, theology and asceticism. But he produced little that is of permanent value. He loved to defend novel theories, and in "Theologia moralis ad prima atque clarissima principia reducta" (Louvain, 1643) tried to solve theological problems by mathematical rules. Some of his moral opinions gained for him from St. Alphonsus Liguori the title of "Prince of the Laxists".

MURATORI, *Reflexiones sobre el buen gusto en las Ciencias*, tr. by SEMPERE (Madrid, 1782), 101; NICERON, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustres de la république des lettres* (Paris, 1728–45), XXIX, 259; PAQUOT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas* (Louvain, 1765–70), II, 175; ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Hispana nova* (Madrid, 1783), I, 666; WERNER, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (Munich, 1889), 56; REUSCH, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Bonn, 1885), II, 501, 502; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1876), II, pt. I, 529; BRUCKER, *Historia critica philosophiæ* (Leipzig, 1743), IV, 132.

LEO F. O'NEIL.

Caravaggio, MICHEL ANGIOLO DA. See MORIGI.

Caravaggio, POLIDORO DA. See CALDARA.

Carayon, AUGUSTE, French author and bibliographer, b. in Saumur, France, 31 March, 1813; d. at Poitiers, 15 May, 1874. He joined the Society of Jesus in 1848, and was at various times librarian and procurator. He edited many historical works between 1864 and 1874, and is considered a leading authority upon the history of his order, especially in New France. His principal works are: "Bibliographie historique de la Compagnie de Jésus (Paris, 1864); "Documents inédits concernant la Compagnie de Jésus" (Poitiers, 1863–1874, 18 vols.); "Première mission des Jésuites au Canada" (Paris, 1864); "Bannissement des Jésuites de la Louisiane" (1865); "Etablissement de la Compagnie de Jésus à Brest par Louis XIV" (Paris, 1865); "Les prisons du Marquis de Pombal" (1865); "Notes historiques sur les parlements et les Jésuites au XVIII^{e} siècle" (Paris, 1867). Carayon is also the author of several devotional treatises published between 1854 and 1863.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II, 714–718; THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896–1901), I, 311.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Carbery, JAMES JOSEPH, third Bishop of Hamilton, Ontario, b. in the County Westmeath, Ireland, 1 May, 1823; d. at Cork, 17 December, 1887. His early education was received at the Seminary of Navan. He entered at an early age the Order of St. Dominic, and made his course of philosophy and theology at Viterbo and Rome. Returning to Ireland in 1849, he soon became known for his learning, eloquence, and zealous labours. He filled many important positions in his order, and became an assistant to the master general. In 1883 he was appointed Bishop of Hamilton, and was consecrated in Rome, 11 November of the same year. He died while seeking to restore his broken health by a visit to his native country.

V. F. O'DANIEL.

Carbonari (CHARCOAL-BURNERS), the name of a secret political society, which played an important part, chiefly in France and Italy, during the first decades of the nineteenth century. The improbable claim was made that the society originated some centuries earlier, and the French king Francis I appears in the secret documents of the Carbonari as one of their protectors. In reality the association originated as the eighteenth century passed into the nineteenth; it was one of the results of the political movement which accompanied the great French Revolution and of the political principles that were proclaimed at that time. It is not certain whether the Carbonari, as a political society, had its first organization in France or Italy. At any rate the power of the association was first shown at the beginning of the nineteenth century in the Kingdom of Naples and the States of the Church. Just as the name "Carbonari" was adopted from the charcoal-burners, so also in their secret intercourse they made use of many expressions taken from the occupation of charcoal-burning. The place where the members assembled was called *baracca* (hut), its interior *vendita* (place of selling coal), and its surroundings *foresta* (forest). The members called one another *buon cugino* (good cousin); those not belonging to the society were *pagani* (heathens). The Carbonari were divided into two classes: apprentices and masters. No apprentice could rise to the grade of a master before the end of six months. The members made themselves known to one another by secret signs in shaking hands. These signs for masters and apprentices were unlike. One of the underlying principles of the society, it is true, was that the "good brotherhood" rested on religion and virtue; but by this was understood a purely natural conception of religion, and the mention of religion was absolutely forbidden. In reality the association was opposed to the Church. Nevertheless, it venerated St. Theobald as its patron saint. The members belonging to each separate district formed a *vendita*, called thus from the place of assembly. At the head was the *alta vendita*, to which deputies were chosen from the other *vendite*. A small hatchet was the distinguishing symbol of a master, the apprentices were indicated by a little fagot worn in the button-hole. Initiation into the society was accompanied by special ceremonies which, in the reception into the grade of master, imitated the Passion of Christ in a manner actually blasphemous. The members were bound by a frightful oath to observe absolute silence concerning whatever occurred in the *vendita*. The similarity between the secret society of the Carbonari and Freemasonry is evident. Freemasons could enter the Carbonari as masters at once. The openly-avowed aim of the Carbonari was political: they sought to bring about a constitutional monarchy or a republic, and to defend the rights of the people against all forms of absolutism. They did not hesitate to compass their ends by assassination and armed revolt. As early as the first years of the nineteenth century the society was widespread in Neapolitan territory, especially in the Abruzzi and Calabria. Not only men of low birth, but also government officials of high rank, officers, and even members of the clergy belonged to it.

In 1814 the Carbonari resolved to obtain a constitution for the Kingdom of Naples by force. The lawful ruler, Ferdinand I, was opposed to them, but the king placed on the throne by Napoleon, Murat, connected himself with them in March, 1815, as he believed the time was come to create a united and independent Italy. However, Murat was captured and shot in October of the same year and Ferdinand once more mounted the throne. In the following years the Carbonari grew in strength and power in all the districts of the Kingdom of Naples and made preparations for a new revolutionary movement. From Naples the Carbonari spread into the neighbouring territories of the States of the Church, and here also the society sought to overthrow the absolute dominion of the papacy. The Carbonari even promulgated a forged papal Brief which contained an apparent confirmation of the association. On 15 August, 1814, Cardinals Consalvi and Pacca issued an edict against secret societies, especially against Freemasonry and the Carbonari, in which all were

forbidden under severe penalties to become members of these secret associations, to attend their meetings, or to furnish a meeting-place for such. Notwithstanding all this the propaganda of the Carbonari went on, chiefly in the district of Macerata, where an outbreak occurred, 25 June, 1817, which, however, was easily suppressed by the papal troops (cf. the important report, of Leggieri, Processo romano contro i congiurati di Macerata di 1817, ristretto presentato alla congregazione criminale, Rome, 1818).

When the Spanish revolution broke out in 1820, the Neapolitan Carbonari once more took up arms, in order to wring a constitution from King Ferdinand I. They advanced against the capital from Nola under a military officer, Morelli, and the Abbot Minichini. They were joined by General Pepe and many officers and government officials, and the king on 13 July took an oath to observe the Spanish constitution in Naples (cf. Pepe's defence of himself, Relation des événements politiques et militaires qui ont eu lieu à Naples en 1820 et 1821, Paris, 1822). The movement also spread to Piedmont, and Victor Emmanuel resigned the throne in favour of his brother Charles Felix. It was only through the intervention of Austria, which sent troops to Italy, that the movement was crushed and the Neapolitan constitution suppressed. The Carbonari, however, secretly continued their agitation against Austria and the governments in friendly connexion with it. They formed, even in Rome, a *vendita*, published in the press the most violent accusations against the lawful rulers, and won over to their cause members of deposed sovereign families, among whom was Prince Louis, later Napoleon III. Pope Pius VII issued a general condemnation of the secret society of the Carbonari, 13 September, 1821. The association lost its influence by degrees and was gradually absorbed into the new political organizations that sprang up in Italy; its members became affiliated especially with Mazzini's "Young Italy". From Italy the organization was carried to France where it appeared as the *Charbonnerie*, which, as in Italy, was divided into *ventes*. Members were especially numerous in Paris, where the society was formed in 1821 by three young men named Bazard, Buchez, and Flotard. The chief aim of the association in France also was political, namely, to obtain a constitution in which the conception of the sovereignty of the people could find expression. From Paris as a centre the Charbonnerie spread rapidly through the country, and by the end of the year 1821 it was the cause of several mutinies among the troops. The movement lost its importance after several conspirators had been executed, especially as quarrels broke out among the leaders. The Charbonnerie took part in the Revolution of July, 1830; after the fall of the Bourbons, however, its influence rapidly declined. After this a *Charbonnerie démocratique* was formed among the French Republicans, the aim of which was to obtain a republican constitution for the country; however, after 1841, nothing more was heard of it. Carbonari were also to be found in Spain, but their numbers and importance were more limited than in the other Romance countries.

Döring tr., *Denkwürdigkeiten der geheimen Gesellschaften in Unteritalien, insbesondere der Carbonari, aus dem Original übersetzt* (Weimar, 1822); Jarcke, *Der Orden der Carbonari und die neapolitanische u. piemontesische Revolution* 1820 *u.* 1821, in *Vermischte Schriften* (Munich, 1839), II; Saint-Edme, *Constitution et organisation des Carbonari* (Paris, 1821); Deschamps, *Les sociétés secrètes et la société* (5th ed., Paris, 1881), II, 232 sqq., III, 147 sqq.; Frost, *Secret Societies in European Revolutions* (1876), II; Greco, *Il tentativo dei Carbonari di Calabria citeriore nel* 1813 (Cosenza, 1866); Hergenröther, *Der Kirchenstaat seit der französischen Revolution* (Freiburg im Baden, 1860), 153 sqq.; Brück, *Die geheimen Gesellschaften in Spanien* (Mainz, 1881), 78, 260 sq.; Schuster, *Die geheimen Verbindungen u. Orden* (Leipzig, 1902–1906), II; Nürnberger, *Papsttum und Kirchenstaat* (Mainz, 1897), I, 119 sqq., 143 sqq.

J. P. Kirsch.

Carbonnelle, Ignatius, professor of mathematics and science, writer on mathematical and scientific subjects, and editor; b. at Tournai, Belgium, 1 Feb. 1829; d. at Brussels, 4 March, 1889. He entered the Society of Jesus 8 Sept. 1844, applying himself to mathematical studies and contributing papers to the "Bulletins de l'académie royale de Belgique". After his ordination to the priesthood he spent six years, 1861 to 1867, teaching at Calcutta and was the first editor of the "Indo-European Correspondence", 1865–1867. On his return to Europe he became professor of mathematics and astronomy at Louvain, but was soon appointed to the staff of "Etudes" and thereafter was allowed to devote his time to writing. He published many articles in "Etudes", the "Revue catholique", the "Annales de la société scientifique de Bruxelles" and the "Revue des questions scientifiques". In 1875 he founded the Scientific Society of Brussels, of which he became secretary in 1877, and from that year until his death he was editor of "Annales" and the "Revue". Some of his essays were republished under the title, "Les confins de la science et de la philosophie" (second edition in 2 vols., Paris, 1881).

Revue des questions scientifiques (Brussels, 1869), 25; *Précis historiques* (Brussels, 1889), 190; Sommervogel, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, s. v.

John Corbett.

Carcassonne (Carcassum), Diocese of, comprising the entire department of Aude, and suffragan to Toulouse. On the occasion of the Concordat of 1802 the former Diocese of Carcassonne, nearly all the old Archdiocese of Narbonne, almost the entire

Castle of Carcassonne

Diocese of Saint-Papoul, a part of the ancient Dioceses of Alet and Mirepoix, and the former Diocese of Perpignan were united to make the one Diocese of Carcassonne; in 1822 the Diocese of Perpignan was re-established. (1) *The Diocese of Carcassonne* was founded after 533. The Visigoths sought to compensate themselves for the loss of Lodève and Uzès by having Carcassonne erected into a bishopric. The first of its bishops known to history was Sergius (589). From 1848 to 1855 the see was occupied by Bishop de Bonnechose, later Cardinal, and from 1855 to 1873, by the mystical writer, Bishop de la Bouillerie. (2) *The Archdiocese of Narbonne.* Local tradition identifies Paulus, first Bishop of Narbonne, with Sergius Paulus mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (xiii, 7), but Gregory of Tours assigns the episcopate of St. Paulus to the middle of the third century. Among other incumbents of the See of Narbonne were St. Rusticus (427–61); St. Theodardus (885–93); Guifredus (Guiffroy) of Cerdagne, who was excommunicated several times (1019–79); Guy Foulques (1259–65), who became pope under the title of

Clement IV (1265–1268); Bernard de Farges (1311–41), who founded the Narbonne College at Paris; Cardinal Georges d'Amboise, Prime Minister to Louis XII and Archbishop of Narbonne from 1482 to 1485 and from 1492 to 1493; Cardinal Briçonnet (1507–14), chief instigator of the expedition of Charles VIII into Italy, and famous for his opposition to Julius II in the Council of Pisa; Giulio de' Medici (1515–23), who became pope under the title of Clement VII (1524–34), and Cardinal de Joyeuse (1582–84). In medieval times the Archbishopric of Narbonne was of great importance. For four centuries its jurisdiction extended over a part of Northern Spain, and in the eleventh century it had as suffragans the Dioceses of Toulouse, Béziers, Lodève, Uzès, Agde, Maguelonne, Carcassonne, Elne, Gerona, Barcelona, Vich, and Urgel. Important councils were held at Narbonne in 589 and in the thirteenth century, and its bishops presided legally over the meetings of the Estates of Languedoc. (3) *The Diocese of Saint-Papoul.* A Benedictine abbey founded in 760 by Pepin the Short, and named after the holy priest Papoul, martyred near Toulouse in the third century, was created an episcopal see by John XXII in 1317. (4) *The Diocese of Alet.* A Benedictine abbey founded at Alet in 813 was made an episcopal see by John XXII in 1317. Nicolas Pavillon, a Jansenist, known for his resistance to the commands of the Holy See, was Bishop of Alet from 1637 to 1677. (5) *The Diocese of Mirepoix.* See PAMIERS.

The history of all this region is intimately connected with that of the Albigenses. The monastery of Prouille, where St. Dominic established a religious institute for converted Albigensian women in 1206, is still a place of pilgrimage consecrated to the Blessed Virgin. St. Peter of Castelnau, the Cistercian inquisitor martyred by the Albigenses in 1208, St. Camelia, put to death by the same sectarians, and St. John Francis Regis (1597–1640), the Jesuit, born at Fontcouverte in the Diocese of Narbonne, are specially venerated in the Diocese of Carcassonne. Notre-Dame de Canabès and Notre-Dame de Limoux, both of which date back to the ninth century, are still frequented by pilgrims. The church of Saints-Nazaire-et-Celse at Carcassonne was rebuilt toward the end of the eleventh century, the first work upon it being blessed by Pope Urban II, who came to Carcassonne to urge the Vicomte Bernard de Trincavel to join the Crusade. The naves of this church are Roman, and the transept and choir Gothic.

Previously to the enforcement of the Law of 1901, there were in the Diocese of Carcassonne Capuchins, Cistercians, Dominicans, Lazarists, Carmelites, and Children of Mary Immaculate. Two important local orders of women care for the sick, and teach: the Sisters of the Holy Family (mother-house at Pézenas) and the Sisters of the Holy Name of Joseph (mother-house at Lusignan). In 1900 the diocese had the following religious institutions: 7 foundling asylums, 22 infant schools, 2 orphanages for boys, 6 for girls, 1 house of shelter, 9 hospitals and homes for the aged, 2 houses of retreat, 8 dispensaries, 1 insane asylum, and 69 houses of hospital sisters. At the close of 1905 (the end of the period covered by the Concordat) statistics showed a population of 313,531, with 37 pastorates, 378 succursal parishes (mission churches), and 40 curacies formerly supported by the State.

Gallia Christiana (ed. nova, 1739), VI, 1–136, 269–88, 860–935; *Instrumenta*, 1–72, 101–26, 411–75; (ed. nova, 1785), XIII, 299–314; *Instrumenta*, 247–67; DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, I, 289–95, 307–308; VIC-VAISSETTE, *Histoire de Languedoc* (Toulouse, 1875), V; CROS-MAYREVIEILLE, *Histoire du Comté et de la Vicomté de Carcassonne* (2 vols., Paris, 1846, 1896); HENNET DE BERNOVILLE, *Mélanges concernant l'évêché de Saint-Papoul, pages extraites et traduites d'un manuscrit du quinzième siècle* (Paris, 1863); GUIRAUD, *Cartulaire de Prouille* (Paris, 1907); CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibl.* s. v. *Alet, Carcassonne, Narbonne, Saint-Papoul.*

GEORGES GOYAU.

Cardan (CARDANO, CARDANUS), GIROLAMO, Italian physician and mathematician, b. at Pavia, 24 September, 1501; d. at Rome, 21 September, 1576. He was educated at the Universities of Pavia and Padua, receiving at the latter the degree of Doctor of Medicine. He lectured on medicine at Milan in 1543 and at Pavia in 1544. In 1562 he was appointed professor at Bologna through the mediation of St. Charles Borromeo, and in 1571 he went to Rome where he received a pension from the pope and resumed the practice of his profession.

Cardan was an eccentric character. Perhaps it was on account of his leaning towards astrology and superstition that he was unjustly charged with atheism. His philosophical views were characteristic of the time in which he lived. He recognizes but three of the Aristotelean elements, viz. air, water, and earth, while warmth and moisture, according to him, are the energizing principles which give all things life. In man he distinguishes between the *mens*, or spirit, and the soul which is the seat of the sensitive faculties including the *ratio*. The latter belongs to the body and perishes with it, while the former is immaterial and immortal and partakes of the Divine. Moreover, one and the same spirit dwells in all men. This spirit is destined to be elevated in ecstasy to the contemplation of the Divine Essence. Cardan also characterizes this ecstasy as the state of faith in which all the lower faculties, including the *ratio*, become quiescent, so that, according to him, faith and reason would seem to be incompatible. His whole system occupies a position of little importance in the history of philosophy, and led logically to magic and astrology, in which he became an adept. Cardan's fame rests on his work in mathematics, and especially in algebra. In 1545 he published his "Ars Magna", a treatise on algebra which contains the solution of the cubic equation, since named after him. This involved him in a lengthy dispute with Tartaglia. Cardan, it appears, had obtained the solution from Tartaglia, its original discoverer, under promise of the strictest secrecy. He however extended and developed it, and after his pupil Ferrari had discovered the solution of the biquadratic equation by means of the cubic, he felt justified in publishing it. In the preface of his work he acknowledges his obligations to Tartaglia and Ferrari. Cardan was also author of: "De Subtilitate libri XXI" (Nuremberg, 1550); "De Rerum Varietate libri XVII" (1557); "Opus novum de proportionibus numerorum, motuum, ponderum sonorum" (1570). Cardan's "Opera Omnia" in 10 vols. appeared in Lyons in 1663.

H. MORLEY, *Jerome Cardano* (London, 1854); Monograph by BUTTRINI (Savona, 1884); WATERS, *Jerome Cardano* (London, 1898); MARIE, *Hist. des sciences math. et phys.* (1888), II; CAJORI, *Hist. of Math.* (New York, 1894); CUMSTON, *Notes on Life and Writings of G. Cardano* in *Med. and Surgical Journal* (Boston), CXLVI, no. 4, p. 77; STÖCKL, *Gesch. d. Phil. d. Mittelalters*, III; IDEM in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 1943 sqq.

H. M. BROCK.

Cardenas, JUAN, moral theologian and author; b. at Seville, 1613; d. 6 June, 1684. He entered the Society of Jesus at the age of fourteen and during many years held in it the offices of rector, master of novices, and provincial. Through his busy life he ever found time for intellectual work of a high order. He composed several small ascetical treatises: "Seven Meditations on Jesus Crucified" (originally published at Seville, 1678) and "Geminum sidus Mariani diadematis" (Lyons, 1673). From his pen we have also two pious biographies: "Historia de la Vida y Virtudes de la Venerable Virgen Damiana de las Llagas" (Seville, 1675) and "Breve relación de la Muerte, Vida, y Virtudes del Venerabile Cavallero D. Miguel Manara Vincentelo de Leca" (Seville, 1679).

But he is chiefly remembered for his important contributions to moral theology, which won for him

the highest praise from St. Alphonsus Liguori. In a singularly clear style and with great profundity of thought he examines some of the moral opinions prevalent in his day, especially those tinged with extreme Laxism, in his well-known "Crisis theologica bipartita, sive Disputationes selectæ" (Lyons, 1670). This work, which appeared in two parts, opened up a storm of controversy, and in the edition of 1680 he reasserted his position in a supplement which defended moderate Probabilism against the twofold attacks of Laxists and Rigorists. Though the argument is unquestionably strong, and the opinions advanced moderate and sound, the many digressions that controversy suggests make this part of the book rather uninteresting. In the Venetian editions of 1694, 1700, and 1710 there was first published, together with these three parts, an explanation of the propositions condemned by the pope in 1679. This last work, of which Father P. J. Kugler, S. J., composed a compendium in 1704, has often been published separately under the title: "Crisis theologica in quâ plures selectæ difficultates ex morali theologiâ ad lydium veritatis lapidem revocantur ex regulâ morum positâ a SS. D. N. Innocentis XI P. M." etc. (Seville, 1687; Venice, 1693, 1696).

ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Hispana nova* (Madrid, 1783), I, 671; RIBADENEIRA-SOTWELL, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum S. J.* (Rome, 1676), I, 431; DE BACKER AND SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la c. de J.* (Brussels, Paris, 1891); II, col. 734–37; DE BACKER, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la c. de J.* (Liège, 1869), I, col. 1078; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1876), II, pt. I, 231; DÖLLINGER-REUSCH, *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der Römischkatholischen Kirche* (Nördlingen, 1889), I, 39, 41, 46.

LEO F. O'NEIL.

Cardica, a titular see of Thessaly. Cardica is a Latinized medieval form for Gardicium, the true Greek name being Gardikion. It figures only in later "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of the twelfth or thirteenth century as a suffragan of Larissa. Lequien (II, 979) mentions five Latin Bishops of Cardica, from 1208 to 1389, the first being Bartholomew, to whom many letters of Pope Innocent III are addressed. Lequien was unacquainted with any Greek bishop of the see. Manuscript lists, however, contain eight names. They are: John, 1191–1192; Metrophanes, degraded in 1623; Gregorius or Cyrillus, 1623; Sophronius, 1646–1649; Gregorius, about 1700; Meletius, 1743; Paisius, eighteenth century; Gregorius, about 1852. When Thessaly was united with Greece (1882) the see had been vacant since 1875. It was suppressed in 1899, and Gardikion, commonly Gardiki, is now but a little town with about 3,000 inhabitants in the Diocese of Phthiotis.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cardinal, a dignitary of the Roman Church and counsellor of the pope. By the term *cardinal* (*Cardinalis*) was originally understood every priest permanently attached to a church, every *clericus*, either *intitulatus* or *incardinatus*. [C. 3 (Gelasius I, 492–496), D. XXIV. C. 35 (Gregory I, 595), D. LXXI. C. 6 (Gregory I, 603), D. LXXIV. C. 42 (Gregory I, 592), C. VIII, q. 1.] It became the usual designation of every priest belonging to a central or episcopal church, an ecclesiastical *cardo* (Lat. for hinge). Cf. Hincmar of Reims, "De jure metropolitani", c. 20 (Opp. ed. Sirmond, II, 731); C. 2, § 6 (Pseudo-Isidore), D. XXII. Lastly it was equivalent to *principalis*, i. e., excellent, superior, and is so used by St. Augustine (De baptismo, I, 6; ed. Bened. IX, 56).

The origin, development, and modifications of this office will be treated as follows: I. Cardinal-priests; II. Cardinal-deacons; III. Cardinal-bishops; IV. Cardinalitial dioceses, titles, and deaconries; V. Relations of the cardinals to the bishops; VI. Relations of the cardinals to the pope; VII. Nomination of cardinals; VIII. Duties of cardinals; IX. Rights of cardinals; X. The College of cardinals.

I. CARDINAL-PRIESTS.—Until late in the Middle Ages the title of cardinal was given to prominent priests of important churches, e. g., at Constantinople, Milan, Ravenna, Naples, Sens, Trier, Magdeburg, and Cologne (cf. G. Phillips, Kirchenrecht, Ratisbon, 1845 sq., VI, 41 sqq.; P. Hinschius, "Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken und Protestanten in Deutschland", Berlin, 1869, I, 318 sqq.). In keeping with this custom we find the term *Cardinales* applied at Rome from the end of the fifth century to priests permanently attached to the (twenty-five to twenty-eight) Roman *tituli*, or quasi-parishes (*quasi diœceses*), belonging to the church of the Bishop of Rome, the pope—therefore to the *Cardo ecclesiæ* par excellence—in which *tituli* the Sacraments of Baptism and Penance were administered, and which were also often called *tituli cardinales*. The "Liber Pontificalis" describes as follows this quasi-parochial system of ancient Rome: "Hic [Euaristus, 99–107?] titulos in urbe Româ divisit presbyteris . . . "; and again: "Hic [Dionysius, 259–268] presbyteris ecclesias dedit et cymeteria et paroccias diocesis constituit"; and elsewhere: "[Marcellus, 308–309] XXV titulos in urbe Româ constituit quasi diocesis propter baptismum et pœnitentiam multorum qui convertebantur ex paganis et propter sepulturas martyrum" (op. cit., ed. Duchesne, Paris, 1886, I, 126, 157, 164). In other words, an ecclesiastical division of the city for various parochial purposes is attributed to popes of the second and third centuries. Such a division, scarcely possible in the period of persecution, is vouched for at the end of the fifth century by the signatures of Roman presbyters present at the Council of Rome in 499 under Pope Symmachus (cf. A. Thiel, Epistolæ Romanorum Pontificum genuinæ, Brunsberg, 1868, 651 sqq.). These presbyters were thenceforth known as *cardinales* [C. 5. (Constitutum apocryphum Silvestri I, about the end of the fifth century, c. 7), D. XCIII, C. 2 (Concilium apocryphum Silvestri I, about the end of the fifth century), C. II, q. 4; C. 3, 4, 5 (Roman Synod under Pope Stephen III, 769), D. LXXIX; Letter of Leo IX (1053) to Michael Cærularius in Jaffé, "Regesta Pontificum Romanorum", 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1885), no. 4302].

However, not all the numerous priests attached to these titular churches were known as *cardinales*, but, in keeping with the then current use of *cardinalis* as the equivalent of *principalis* (see above), only the first priest in each such church—let us say the archipresbyter. According to a constitution of John VIII, published between 873 and 882, these cardinal-priests (*presbyteri cardinales*) were the supervisors of ecclesiastical discipline at Rome and also ecclesiastical judges. We read in this constitution "De jure cardinalium" as follows: "Itemque ex nostrâ præsenti constitutione bis in mense vel eo amplius vel apud illum vel illum titulum sive apud illam vel illam diaconiam sive apud alias quaslibet ecclesias vos convenire mandamus, et ob vestram et inferiorum clericorum vitam et mores et qualitates et habitus vestium perscrutandum et qualiter quilibet præpositi se erga subditos habeant vel quod subditi suis præpositis non obediant et ad quæque illicita amputanda, clericorum quoque et laicorum querimonias, quæ ad nostrum judicium pertinent, quantum fieri potest definiendas, quippe cum sicut nostram mansuetudinem Moysi, ita et vestram paternitatem LXX seniorum, qui sub eodem causarum negotia diiudicabant, vicissitudinem gerere, certum habeamus. Item monasteria abbatibus viduata et abbatum nostra præcedente conscientia substitutionem his, qui sunt inter vel fuerint monasticæ professionis, disponenda committimus" (Jaffé, op. cit., no. 3366). That is, the pope commands them to meet at least twice a month, in their own or other churches, to investigate their own lives and those of the clergy, the relations of superiors and inferiors, and in general to check all violations of the laws; also to settle, as far

as is possible in the papal court, all conflicts between laymen and ecclesiastics. The pope, he says, is like Moses in gentleness of government, while the administration of the cardinals recalls the paternal character of the seventy elders who sat as judges under the patriarch's control. The pope also entrusts to them the administration of vacant abbeys and the filling of the vacant abbatial offices, but not without his foreknowledge.

Moreover, in virtue of a papal provision as old as the reign of Pope Simplicius (468–83), these cardinal-priests were wont to conduct Divine service at the three principal cemetery churches (St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Laurence), and later on at the same churches raised (with St. Mary Major) to patriarchal rank. To each of these four churches were assigned seven cardinals; the latter were therefore twenty-eight in number. This is the sense of the "Liber Pontificalis" when it says (ed. Duchesne, I, 249 sqq.): "Hic [Simplicius] constituit ad sanctum Petrum apostolum et ad sanctum Laurentium martyrem ebdomadas, ut presbyteri manerent, propter-penitentes et baptismum: regio III ad sanctum Laurentium, regio prima ad sanctum Paulum, regio VI vel septima ad sanctum Petrum" (cf. Duchesne, "Les titres presbytéraux et les diaconies", in "Mélanges d'archéol. et d'hist.", VII, 17 sqq.; J. Zettinger, "Die ältesten Nachrichten über Baptisterien der Stadt Rom", in "Römische Quartalschrift", XIX, 326 sqq.). For the twelfth century we have the statement of Johannes Diaconus in the sixteenth chapter of his work "De ecclesiâ Lateranensi" (ed. J. Mabillon, in "Museum Italicum", Paris, 1724, II, 574): "Cardinales Sanctæ Mariæ Maioris sunt ii: SS. Apostolorum, S. Cyriaci in Thermas, S. Eusebii, S. Pudentianæ, S. Vitalis, SS. Marcellini et Petri, S. Clementis. Cardinales Sancti Petri sunt ii: S. Mariæ Transtiberim, S. Chrysogoni, S. Cæciliæ, S. Anastasiæ, S. Laurentii in Damaso, S. Marci, SS. Martini et Silvestri. Cardinales Sancti Pauli sunt ii: S. Sabinæ, S. Priscæ, S. Balbinæ, SS. Nerei et Achillei, S. Sixti, S. Marcelli, S. Susannæ. Cardinales Sancti Laurentii sunt ii: S. Praxedis, S. Petri ad Vincula, S. Laurentii in Lucina, S. Crucis in Jerusalem, S. Stephani in Cælio monte, SS. Joannis et Pauli, SS. Quattour Coronatorum." The eldest of these cardinal-priests acted as their head; he was known as archipresbyter, and was the chief and immediate assistant of the pope at all ecclesiastical functions; from the twelfth century he was known as *prior cardinalium presbyterorum*.

II. Cardinal-Deacons.—Besides the clergy attached to each Roman Church, there was in the city a "regionary" clergy of almost equal antiquity, so called because of its relations to the ecclesiastical *regiones* or quarters into which, after the fashion of the municipal regions, Christian Rome was at an early date divided. For the care of the poor the city was divided into seven regions, each of which was administered by a deacon. The "Liber Pontificalis" dates this division into seven regions from the time of Clement I, and ascribes to Popes Evaristus and Fabian the assignment of the regions to as many deacons. It says of Clement I (88–97): "Hic fecit VII regiones, dividit notariis fidelibus ecclesiæ, qui gestas martyrum sollicite et curiose, unusquisque per regionem suam, diligenter perquireret" (ed. Duchesne, I, 123), i. e., he divided the city into seven regions and assigned them to as many faithful notaries of the Church, whose duty it was earnestly and carefully to collect in each region the acts of the martyrs. And of Evaristus (99–107?): "Hic titulos in urbe Româ dividit presbyteris et VII diaconos ordinavit qui custodirent episcopum prædicantem, propter stilum veritatis" (op. cit., I, 126), i. e., he divided among the priests the "titles" of the city of Rome, and ordained seven deacons to bear witness to the preaching of the bishop. Much more credible is the statement in the life of Fabian (236–250): "Hic regiones dividit diaconibus et fecit VII subdiaconos, qui VII notariis imminerent, ut gestas martyrum in integro fideliter colligerent, et multas fabricas per cymeteria fieri præcepit" (op. cit., I, 148), i. e., he divided the "regions" among the deacons and created seven subdeacons, whom he placed over the notaries, that the latter might collect with fidelity and completeness the acts of the martyrs; he also commanded many buildings to be put up in the cemeteries. In this way there arose in each of the regions an edifice (*diaconia*) for the reception of the poor, and close by a church. These regionary deacons were wont to subscribe the acts of Roman synods and other documents as *diaconi ecclesiæ Romanæ*, or deacons of the Roman Church, sometimes, probably, adding their proper region. Thereby also were expressed the fixity of their relations to the church of the Bishop of Rome and their obligation to assist him at liturgical functions. It was natural enough, therefore, that the term *cardinales* should very soon be applied to these regionary deacons (*diaconi cardinales*), as well as to the aforementioned twenty-eight priests of the immediate papal entourage in ecclesiastical functions.

In the Middle Ages the ecclesiastical division of Rome into seven regions disappeared, owing to the changes in Roman topography; consequently, the *diaconi cardinales* ceased gradually to bear the names of their regions. Of the latter there remain only their number, seven, consecrated by antiquity and their dignity. In the course of time other charitable institutions took the place of the original deaconries. At the end of the sixth century Gregory the Great had eighteen deacons. Under Benedict VII (684–85) we meet with *monasteria diaconiæ*. Adrian I (772–95) fixed at eighteen the number of the diaconal churches, nor was there any alteration of this number until the sixteenth century. In consequence, from the end of the eleventh to the end of the twelfth century, the number of cardinal-deacons was fixed permanently at eighteen. The chief source of this enlargement of their number was the addition of the six *diaconi palatini* and their archdeacon, i. e., the ecclesiastical officers whose duty it was to serve in turn during the week at the papal Mass ("Liber Pontificalis", I, 364^{7}, 504^{70}, 509^{110}, and II, 18^{74}, 252^{7}; Duchesne, "Les régions de Rome au moyen-âge", in "Mélanges d'archéologie et d'hist.", X, 144). The abovementioned Johannes Diaconus describes as follows the manner in which these eighteen cardinal-deacons assisted at the papal Mass: "In quibusdam vero dominicis et festivis diebus sanctorumque præcipue sollemnitatibus quandoque sacerdos est regalis et imperialis episcopus, immo patriarcha; et idem apostolicus in supradicto sacratissimo altare Salvatoris huius Lateranensis basilicæ missam debet celebrare; et quando celebrat dominus papa sancti Petri vicarius . . . debet etiam ibi præsens esse archidiaconus cum sex diaconibus palatinis, qui in palatio legere debent evangelium et in basilicâ Lateranensi et alii duodecim diacones regionarii, qui solent evangelium legere in stationibus ecclesiarum Romæ constitutis. Isti decem et octo diaconi totidem ecclesias habent infra muros civitatis. Et tamen omnes sunt canonici patriarchalis basilicæ Lateranensis" ("De Ecclesiâ Lateranensi", C. viii, in "Museum Italicum", II, 567), i. e., on certain great feasts, bishops of superior rank say Mass on the altar of the Lateran Basilica. When the pope says Mass there must also be present, with their archdeacon, the six palatine deacons, whose duty it is to read the Gospel in the [papal] palace, and in the Lateran Basilica; also the twelve regionary deacons (*diacones regionarii*) who are wont to read the Gospel in the "station" churches of Rome. These eighteen deacons have each a church

at Rome; they are also, adds Johannes Diaconus, canons of the Lateran Basilica. The head of the cardinal-deacons was the archdeacon, also known as *prior diaconorum cardinalium*. In his quality of supervisor of ecclesiastical discipline in the city, and curator of the papal finances, he was, after the pope, the most important person in the Roman Church during the early Middle Ages.

Since, according to the foregoing, the name of "cardinal" was linked with participation and co-operation in the papal Mass, or in ecclesiastical services at the principal papal churches of Rome, it need not surprise us that, by reason of analogous participation in these services, other Roman ecclesiastics, from the deacons downwards, came to bear the title of cardinal. Cardinal-subdeacons are often mentioned, and once even cardinal-acolytes. In the "Commentarius electionis Gregorii VII" the electors are said to be "Romanæ ecclesiæ cardinales clerici, acoliti, subdiaconi, diaconi, presbyteri" (Jaffé, Bibliotheca Rer. Germ., Berlin, 1864, II, 9 sqq.).

III. Cardinal-Bishops.—In the course of time and according as the papal headship of the Church manifested itself more and more, the volume of ecclesiastical and temporal business increased greatly at Rome, in consequence of which the popes called in neighbouring bishops to represent them at episcopal functions and to aid them with their counsel. They also followed the custom, widespread in the early medieval period, of dealing with important questions in synodal meetings. The "Liber Pontificalis" says of Stephen III (768–772): "Erat enim hisdem præfatus beatissimus præsul ecclesiæ traditionis observator. Hic statuit ut omni dominico die a septem episcopis cardinalibus ebdomadariis, qui in ecclesiâ Salvatoris observant, missarum sollemnia super altare beati Petri celebraretur et Gloria in excelsis Deo diceretur" (I, 478), i. e., the pope, as a diligent custodian of tradition ordered that every Sunday solemn Mass should be said on the altar of St. Peter, in the Lateran Basilica, by one of the seven cardinal-bishops in weekly service, at which Mass also the "Gloria in Excelsis" should be sung. This statement takes it for granted that at the end of the eighth century the weekly service of the cardinal-bishops was already an ancient custom. That these bishops also received the name of *episcopi cardinales* is intelligible enough after what has been said. Though the number of cardinal-bishops has always been seven, their particular sees have not shared the same fixity. In the entourage and service of the pope we meet not only bishops of Ostia, Porto, Albano, Præneste, and Silva Candida, but also bishops of Velletri, Gabii, Tivoli, Anagni, Nepi, and Segni (Phillips, Kirchenrecht, VI, 178 sqq.; Hinschius, Kirchenrecht, I, 324 sqq.). It is only since the beginning of the twelfth century that the cardinalitial dioceses were finally fixed as the seven in the immediate vicinity of Rome, hence *suburbicariæ;* Ostia, Porto, Santa Rufina (Silva Candida), Albano, Sabina, Tusculum (Frascati), Præneste (Palestrina). (Cf. Johannes Diaconus, "De eccl. Later.", c. xvi, ed. Mabillon, in "Museum Ital.", II, 574; L. Duchesne, "Le sedi episcopali nell' antico ducato di Roma", 1892, 6 sqq.) In the twelfth century the number of the cardinalitial dioceses was diminished by one, when Callistus II united Santa Rufina (Silva Candida) with Porto, so that only six remained. In the Middle Ages, therefore, the cardinals should have numbered fifty-three or fifty-four. As a rule, however, they were fewer; after the thirteenth century their number often sank considerably. Under Alexander IV (1254–61) there were but seven cardinals. During the Western Schism their number increased, inasmuch as each of the contending claimants created his own college of cardinals. The Council of Constance demanded that their number be fixed at twenty-four (Martin V, in his Decree of Reform, 1418, C. 1 "De numero et qualitate cardinalium"; cf. B. Hübler, "Die Konstanzer Reformation und die Konkordate von 1418", Leipzig, 1867, 128). The same number was demanded by the Council of Basle in 1436 (Sess. XXIII, c. iv, "De numero et qualitate cardinalium", in Hardouin, "Acta Conc.", Paris, 1714, VIII, 1206 sq.). In 1555 an agreement was reached between Paul IV and the cardinals, whereby their number was fixed at forty, but this agreement was never carried out. On the other hand, Sixtus V, by his yet valid constitutions "Postquam verus", of 3 Dec., 1586 (§4), and "Religiosa sanctorum", of 13 April, 1587, fixed the number of cardinals at seventy, six cardinal-bishops, fifty cardinal-priests, and fourteen cardinal-deacons, in imitation of the seventy elders of Moses, and declared null and void all nominations in excess of this number (Bullarium Rom., Turin, 1857, VIII, 810 sqq., 833 sqq.). As a matter of fact, such nominations would not be invalid, and have been made (Archiv f. kathol. Kirchenrecht, LXIX, 167 sq.).

IV. Cardinalitial Dioceses, Titles, and Deaconries.—The actual cardinalitial dioceses are Ostia and Velletri, Porto and Santa Rufina, Albano, Frascati (Tusculum), Palestrina (Prænestе), and Sabina. The cardinalitial titles are as follows: S. Lorenzo in Lucina, S. Agnese fuori le mura, S. Agostino, S. Anastasia, SS. Andrea e Gregorio al Monte Celio, SS. XII Apostoli, S. Balbina, S. Bartolommeo all'Isola, S. Bernardo alle Terme, SS. Bonifacio ed Allessio, S. Calisto, S. Cecilia, S. Clemente, S. Crisogono, S. Croce in Gerusalemme, S. Eusebio, S. Giovanni a Porta Latina, SS. Giovanni e Paolo, S. Girolamo degli Schiavoni, S. Lorenzo in Damaso, S. Lorenzo in Panisperna, SS. Marcellino e Pietro, S. Marcello, S. Marco, S. Maria degli Angeli, S. Maria della Pace, S. Maria della Scala, S. Maria della Vittoria, S. Maria del Popolo, S. Maria in Araceli, S. Maria in Cosmedin, S. Maria in Transpontina, S. Maria in Trastevere, S. Maria in Via, S. Maria sopra Minerva, S. Maria Nuova e S. Francesca Romana, SS. Nereo ed Achilleo, S. Onofrio, S. Pancrazio, S. Pietro in Montorio, S. Pietro in Vincoli, S. Prassede, S. Prisca, S. Pudenziana, SS. Quattro Coronati, SS. Quirico e Giulítta, S. Sabina, SS. Silvestro e Martino ai Monti, S. Silvestro in Capite, S. Sisto, S. Stefano al Monte Celio, S. Susanna, S. Tommaso in Parione, SS. Trinità al Monte Pincio, S. Vitale, SS. Gervasio e Protasio. The cardinalitial deaconries are: S. Maria in Via Lata, S. Adriano al Foro Romano, S. Agata alla Suburra, S. Angelo in Pescheria, S. Cesareo in Palatio, SS. Cosma e Damiano, S. Eustachio, S. Giorgio in Velabro, S. Maria ad Martyres, S. Maria in Aquiro, S. Maria in Cosmedin, S. Maria in Dominica, S. Maria in Portico, S. Nicola in Carcere Tulliano, SS. Vito, Modesto e Crescenzio. There are, therefore, in all, seventy-five churches (6 + 53 + 16) disposable for the three orders of cardinals. And since, as a rule, the cardinals number less than seventy, there are usually several churches without any cardinal. (Cf. P. M. Baumgarten, "Der Papst, die Regierung und die Verwaltung der heiligen Kirche in Rom", Munich, 1905, 186 sq., following the data of the "Gerarchia Cattolica", Rome, 1904.)

V. Relations of the Cardinals to the Bishops.—The cardinals were, therefore, from a very early period, assistants of the pope in his liturgical functions, in the care of the poor, the administration of papal finances and possessions, and the synodal disposition of important matters. They took on a very much greater importance, however, after the decree of Nicholas II (1059), "In nomine Domini", regulating papal elections. In accordance with this document the election of the pope and the government of the Church, during the vacancy of the Apostolic See,

fell more and more into their hands; they passed to them exclusively after the Decretal of Alexander III, "Licet de vitandâ", at the Third Lateran Council (1179). The increasing insignificance of the "regionary" and "palatine" clergy, from the middle of the twelfth century, coupled with the disappearance of the *judices palatini*, tended to enlarge the share of the cardinals in the administration of papal justice and finances, also of the fiefs of the Holy See and of the States of the Church. We may add to this that after the cessation of papal journeys to the different nations of Christendom and of the Roman synods under papal presidency, the cardinals remained almost the only counsellors and legates of the popes. Henceforth their functions were equivalent to those of the "permanent synod" and the *syncelli* at Constantinople (Sägmüller, "Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle bis Papst Bonifaz VIII", Freiburg, 1896, 16 sqq., 208 sqq.; S. Keller, "Die sieben römischen Pfalzrichter im byzantinischen Zeitalter", Stuttgart, 1904).

The place and the occasion of this manifold activity of the cardinals was the consistory, i. e. the reunion of the cardinals and the pope. In it were regularly treated questions of faith and important disciplinary matters, e. g. dogmatic decisions, canonizations, approbations of rules of new orders, affairs of the Inquisition and the universities, indulgences for the Universal Church, modifications of the rules for papal elections, the convocation of general councils, also the nomination and mission of Apostolic legates and vicars. Moreover, in the consistory were treated all matters concerning dioceses and bishops, the so-called *causæ majores* par excellence, among them the creation, transfer, division, reunion, and suppression of dioceses, the nomination and confirmation of bishops, also their transfer, resignation, cession, suspension, deposition, and degradation. It was in th consistory that were granted to monasteries the numerous privileges by which they were withdrawn from episcopal, and made subject to papal, jurisdiction; there also took place frequently the confirmation of the abbots and abbesses elected in such exempt monasteries. Before the consistory, moreover, were treated the important questions that arose concerning the properties of the Roman Church (*bona ecclesiæ romanæ*), the papal fiefs, the Crusades, and such grave political matters as the settlement of disputed royal elections, the approbation of newly-elected kings, and the deposition of princes. In the meetings of the consistory, which in the Middle Ages were frequently held weekly, the cardinals also assisted the pope in the disposition of an overwhelming mass of lawsuits. Finally, the cardinals were put in charge of several of the great offices of the Church: in the Chancery a cardinal-chancellor or rather vice-chancellor, in the administration of the papal revenues a cardinal-camerarius, in the conduct of the *penitentiaria* a cardinal-penitentiary. The cardinals were also grand-inquisitors, likewise the "rectors" in the States of the Church. Others were sent abroad as cardinal legates; others again acted as cardinal protectors of nations and religious orders (Sägmüller, Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle, 46 sqq.).

Given the position of the pope and his intimate relations both to the individual cardinals and to such a close corporation as the college itself, at papal functions, in papal elections, in synods, in the consistory, in the conduct of diplomatic negotiations, it is easy to understand how all cardinals, including cardinal-priests and cardinal-deacons came to outrank bishops and archbishops, and after the fourteenth century even patriarchs, just as at Constantinople the *syncelli* eventually outranked bishops and archbishops. This pre-eminence, however, was a matter of slow and uneven development. The cardinal-bishops were the first to outrank other bishops, then archbishops, and finally patriarchs. But as the cardinals formed a college, and the collegiate rights were equally shared by all, the cardinal-priests and cardinal-deacons claimed the same rank as the cardinal-bishops, while the latter were quite willing to see their colleagues placed on their own higher plane. It was occasionally maintained in the Middle Ages that the cardinals were no less successors of the Apostles than the bishops, and that their authority was of Divine origin. For argument appeal was made to the seventy elders of Moses and to Deuteronomy, xvii, 8 sqq., and to other texts. Leo X declared in the Bull "Supernæ" of 5 May, 1514, that the cardinals in a body should come immediately after the pope and should precede all others in the church (Bullar. Rom., V, 604 sqq.). The superior rank of the cardinals was clearly indicated when, after the time of Alexander III, bishops and even archbishops became cardinal-priests, and even (though less frequently) cardinal-deacons (Sägmüller, Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle, 193 sqq.). The cardinals were on an equality with emperors and kings, whom they addressed as "brothers", e. g. the cardinal legate Roland at the Diet of Besançon in 1157. It was only natural, therefore, that in the end the name cardinal, which until late in the Middle Ages was borne by the principal ecclesiastics of the more important churches, should be reserved for the Roman cardinals. Pius V, it is said, issued a decree to this effect 17 Feb., 1567. There were never any "cardinals by birth" (*cardinales nati*), i. e., no other office necessarily implied elevation to the dignity of cardinal.

VI. Relations of the Cardinals to the Pope.—In the Middle Ages the cardinals attempted more than once to secure over the pope the same pre-eminence which they had secured in a permanent way over the episcopate, i. e., they sought to change the monarchical form of government into an aristocracy. What tended to bring about this result was the fact that in all important matters the popes were accustomed not to act without the counsel or the consent of the cardinals (*de fratrum nostrorum consilio, de fr. n. consensu*), or declared that they could not act otherwise. Consequently, the conclusion was often drawn by canonists, or by the enemies of the popes, that they were obliged to govern in this manner. Moreover, this was inferred from the current concert of corporations. It was applied to both pope and cardinals as well as to the bishop and his chapter; to the *Ecclesia Romana* as well as to any other cathedral church. Hence, during the papal conclaves, which often lasted a long time, the cardinals sought occasionally to bind the new pope by "election-capitulations" (see Capitulations), after the manner of the obligations imposed on new bishops by their chapters; prevented the appointment of new cardinals; allied themselves (at least individually) with the civil power against the pope; maintained that the pope could not abdicate without their consent; or even that they could depose him, at least that they could convoke a council for that purpose, as in fact they did convoke the Council of Pisa in 1409 to put an end to the Western Schism. The Council of Basle decreed that it was the duty of the cardinals, first individually and then as a college, to reprove any pope forgetful of his duty, or acting in a way that no longer corresponded to his exalted position (Hardouin, Acta Conc., VIII, 1208). The first "election-capitulations" were drawn up in the conclave of 1352, and were often repeated, especially during the Western Schism, when the cardinal electors were wont to bind the future pope to do all that was possible for the extinction of the schism. Innocent XII finally forbade all such previous agreements by the Constitution "Ecclesiæ Catholicæ" of 22 Sept., 1695. In face of such an attitude on the part of the cardinals, some popes were very cautious and con-

ciliatory and might be classed as "parliamentary popes", e. g. Clement IV; others, like Boniface VIII, resisted, and rightly, with great earnestness. [Cf. Sägmüller, "Zur Geschichte des Kardinalats. Ein Traktat des Bischofs von Feltre und Treviso, Teodoro de'Lelli, über das Verhältniss von Primat und Kardinalat" (Rome, 1893); Idem, "Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle", 215 sqq.; M. Souchon, "Die Papstwahlen von Bonifaz VIII bis Urban VI, und die Entstehung des Schismas 1378" (Brunswick, 1888); Idem, "Die Papstwahlen in der Zeit des grossen Schismas" (ibid., 1898); Wenck, "Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen (1900), 139 sqq.; Sägmüller, "Zur Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle bis Bonifaz VIII", "Die oligarchischen Tendenzen des Kardinalkollegs bis Bonifaz VIII", "Zur Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle bis Papst Bonifaz VIII" in "Tübingen theolog. Quartalschrift", LXXX (1898), 596 sqq., LXXXIII (1901), 45 sqq., LXXXVIII (1906), 595 sqq.; also N. Valois, "La France et le grand schisme d'Occident" (Paris, 1902), and J. Haller, "Papsttum und Kirchenreform" (Berlin, 1903 sqq.).]

VII. Nomination of Cardinals.—In the nomination of cardinals the pope has always been, and is still, free. In the medieval period, according to the detailed account given by Cardinal Giacomo Gaetani Stefaneschi in his "Ordo Romanus XIV" (c. cxvi. sq.), a work of the early part of the fourteenth century, the pope was wont to ask the cardinals for their opinions as to the new members of the college, but afterwards decided quite freely (Mabillon, "Museum Italicum", II, 424 sqq.; J. Kösters, "Studien zu Mabillon's römischen Ordines", Münster, 1905, 65 sqq.). The above-mentioned "election-capitulations" and the Council of Basle demanded that the nomination of cardinals should be made dependent on the consent of the college (Hardouin, Acta Conc., VIII, 1207). According to the demand of the reform-councils (Constance, Basle) and the decrees of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, De ref., c. i), there should be in the college representatives of all Christian nations. Sixtus V decreed, in keeping with the wishes of the reform-councils, that, above all, it should contain doctors of theology (*magistri theologiæ*), and that there should be in the college at least four theologians from the mendicant orders. According to an ancient concession the wishes of Austria, Spain, and Portugal are as far as possible respected, when there is question of raising to the cardinalate a bishop of one of these nations, known thenceforth as a crown-cardinal. It is customary for the governments of the same nations to contribute at the creation of such a cardinal the incident "taxes" or expenses (2832 scudi, or about $3000). Similarly they are wont to provide for the support of their respective national cardinal protectors. At the Vatican Council the demand was made that in the Sacred College and the Roman Congregations there should be from every nation not only scholarly, but also wise and experienced, men ("Coll. Lacensis", Freiburg, 1890—VIII, 838; Granderath-Kirch, "Gesch. des vatik. Konzils", ibid., 1903—I, 440; II, 167). The person nominated must possess the qualifications of a bishop (Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, De ref., c. i). He must, therefore, be at least thirty years of age. However, for the cardinal-deacons it suffices to have entered on the twenty-second year, but the new cardinal-deacon must receive deacon's orders within a year, otherwise he loses both passive and active vote (Postquam verus, § 6). In keeping with the provisions for promotion to nobility, illegitimates, even when legitimated by later marriage, are ineligible (ibid., §12), also (ibid., §16) the fathers of (living) legitimate children, nephews of cardinals, and (ibid., §§ 17, 18) those who are related to a cardinal in the first or second degree of consanguinity. Of course, the pope can occasionally dispense from these disqualifying conditions (Archiv für kath. Kirchenrecht, LXIX, 168).

The creation of cardinals takes place in secret consistory, during which those actually resident in Rome are informed of their nomination. In the afternoon of the same day the newly-created cardinals meet in the pope's apartments, in the antechamber of which the scarlet zucchetta, or skull-cap, is handed to them; thereafter the scarlet biretta is placed by the pope on the head of each. The "red hat" is given in the next public consistory after they have taken the customary oath. At the beginning of the next secret consistory takes place the ceremony known as the "opening of the mouth" (*aperitio oris*), and at the close of the same consistory the "closing of the mouth" (*clausura oris*), symbolizing their duties to keep the secrets of their office and to give wise counsel to the pope. The ring is then given to each, and at the same time the "title" or church by which the new cardinal shall henceforth be known. If the creation of a cardinal takes place outside of Italy, the scarlet zucchetta is sent him by one of the pope's *Guardie Nobili* (Noble Guards), and the scarlet biretta by a special ablegate. In Austria, Spain, and Portugal the biretta is usually imposed by the sovereign or civil ruler. Occasionally it is conferred by some distinguished prelate especially delegated by the pope. In all such cases the recipient must promise under oath, and under pain of nullity of his nomination, that within a year he will go personally to Rome for the further ceremonies above described, and to receive his "title" (Postquam verus, § 19). Formerly the dignity of cardinal was acquired only after public proclamation and reception of the hat and ring. At present any form of publication suffices (Pius V, 29 Jan., 1571; Greg. XV, "Decet", 12 March, 1621, in "Bullarium Romanum", XII, 663 sq.). Creation of cardinals *in petto* is therefore without effect, unless there follows publication of the names. A testamentary publication does not suffice. Pius IX announced (15 March, 1875) a creation of cardinals *in petto* with publication of their names in his testament, but this creation never went into effect. From the reign of Martin V, i. e. from the end of the Western Schism, during which there were many cardinals created by the contending popes, it became customary for the pope to create cardinals without declaring their names (*creati et reservati in pectore*), the Italian equivalent for which is *in petto*. The publication of the names may, in given circumstances, be made at a much later date. Only, at whatever time such publication takes place, the cardinals so created rank in seniority according to the date of their original announcement as reserved *in petto*, and precede all those created after that time (P. A. Kirsch, "Die Reservatio in petto bei der Kardinalscreation", in "Archiv f. kath. Kirchenrecht", LXXXI, 421 sqq.; K. Eubel, "Zur Kardinalsernennung des Dominicus Capranica", in "Röm. Quartalschrift", XVII, 273 sqq.). By virtue of canonical obedience the pope could compel an unwilling person to accept the cardinalitial dignity. (Cf. L. Wahrmund, "Ueber die kirchliche Zulässigkeit der Rekusation der übertragenen Kardinalswürde", in "Archiv f. kath. Kirchenrecht", LXVII, 3 sqq.) The oath taken by the cardinals is quite similar to that taken by bishops. But the cardinal must swear that he will defend conscientiously the papal Bulls concerning non-alienation of the possessions of the Roman Church, nepotism, and papal elections, likewise his own cardinalitial dignity.

VIII. Duties of Cardinals.—It is the duty of the cardinals to assist the pope at the chief liturgical services known as *capellæ papales*, to distinguish them from the *capellæ cardinaliciæ*, at which the pope is not present; also to counsel him and aid in the government of the Church (c. 17 in VI^to de

electione, I, 6; Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, de ref., c. 1, and Sess. XXV, de ref., c. 1). Hence the cardinals are obliged to reside at Rome and cannot leave the Papal States without permission of the pope. The violation of this law entails grave penalties, even the loss of the cardinalitial dignity (C. 2, X, de clerico non residente, III, 4; Leo X, "Supernæ", 5 May, 1514, § 28, in "Bullar. Rom.", V, 604 sqq.; Innocent X, "Cum juxta", 19 Feb., 1646, in "Bullar. Rom.", XV, 441 sqq.). Similarly, they would lose all the benefices possessed by them (Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, de ref., c. 17). It is otherwise with foreign bishops created cardinals; they retain their dioceses and are not obliged to reside at Rome. The "suburicarian" bishops, however, by ancient custom reside at Rome. The share of the cardinals in the government of the Church is exercised partly in the consistories, partly in the curial offices (*Cancellaria, Dataria, Penitentiaria*), in the Roman Congregations, and in various ecclesiastical commissions.

The Consistory.—A papal consistory is the assembly of the cardinals about the pope and recalls the *consistorium principis* of the Roman Empire (G. Paleotti, "De sacri consistorii consultationibus", Rome, 1592; Sägmüller, "Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle", 46 sqq., 97 sqq.). Consistories are public (*publica*) or extraordinary, and secret (*secreta*) or ordinary. Semi-public consistories are a combination of a public and a secret consistory. The public consistories are attended not only by the cardinals, but by the bishops, prelates, princes, and ambassadors to the papal court present in Rome. They are called for the purpose of giving the red hat to new cardinals, the solemn conclusion of canonizations, and public audiences to sovereigns and their ambassadors. Much more important are the secret consistories. As already described, it was in them that during the Middle Ages were heard and decided the numberless lawsuits and judicial matters that came before the Apostolic See. Innocent III was wont to hold such a consistory three times a week ("Gesta Innocentii", c. 41, in Migne, P. L., CCXIV, LXXX; A. Luchaire, "Le tribunal d'Innocent III", in "Séances et travaux de l'Acad. des sciences morales et politiques", 1903, 449 sqq.; M. Späthen, "Giraldus Cambrensis und Thomas von Evesham über die von ihnen an der Kurie geführten Prozesse" in "Neues Archiv d. Gesellschaft f. alt. deutsche Geschichtskunde", XXXI, 595 sqq.). With the transfer of their judicial attributes to the great curial offices, especially the Rota and the Roman Congregations, consistories became less frequent. Under Innocent XI (d. 1689) they were held once a month (J. H. Bangen, Die römische Kurie, ihre gegenwärtige Zusammensetzung und ihr Geschäftsgang, Münster, 1854, 75). Secret consistories are now called more rarely, at intervals of several months, and deal with the few subjects or questions actually pending. The following matters are dealt with in them, and call for the counsel of the cardinals: the creation, i. e. nomination proper, of new cardinals; the publication of names reserved *in petto;* the giving of the cardinalitial insignia with exception of the red hat; the opening and closing of the mouth; the institution of patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops, and the nomination of such titular bishops as do not belong to the missionary territories; the transfer of bishops; the granting of the pallium to archbishops; the creation, division, and union of dioceses; the institution of abbots whose abbeys are in the gift of the Holy See; the nomination of the camerlengo and the vice-chancellor of the Roman Church; the choice and mission of cardinals as *legati a latere;* the conclusion of concordats, consultation on differences and conflicts between Church and State. Generally, however, the consistory is called only to inform the cardinals by a so-called allocution of the status of important ecclesiastico-political matters, or to make known the opinion of the pope. These allocutions are meant for the entire Church, and are therefore published in ecclesiastical organs.

After the death of the pope (*sede vacante*) the duties of the College of Cardinals differ from those exercised by them during his lifetime (*sede plenâ*). In the earliest times the government of the Roman Church was taken over by the presbyterium or presbyteral clergy, as we know from a letter of that body addressed to St. Cyprian of Carthage after the death of Pope Fabian in 250 (Cypriani, Opp. omnia, ed. G. Hartel, Vienna, 1868, 486; A. Harnack, "Die Briefe des römischen Klerus aus der Zeit der Sedisvacanz im Jahr 250" in "Theolog. Abhandlungen Karl von Weizsäcker gewidmet", Tübingen, 1892, 1 sqq.). From the sixth century on it was the *archipresbyter* (archpriest), the *archidiaconus* (archdeacon), and the *primicerius notariorum* (chief notary) who represented the Apostolic See, *locum servantes Apostolicæ Sedis* (Liber Diurnus, ed. Th. Sickel, Vienna, 1889, Formula LIX). After the full development of the authority of the College of Cardinals, as above described, the latter took charge and exercised its power in very many ways; some canonists went so far as to maintain that during the vacancy of the Apostolic See the College of Cardinals possessed the fullness of the papal prerogative. Their authority was exercised chiefly in two ways, in the administration of the States of the Church and in the election of the new pope. (It is to be noted that Art. 6 of the Italian Law of Guarantees, 13 May, 1871, provides for complete liberty of the cardinals in papal elections.) The Bull "Ubi Periculum" of Gregory X, concerning papal elections, issued at the Council of Lyons (1274), confined the cardinals to the exercise of the abovementioned power. Among other things it says: "Iidem quoque cardinales accelerandæ provisioni sic vacent attentius, quod se nequâquam de alio negotio intromittant, nisi forsan necessitas adeo urgens incideret, quod eos oporteret de terrâ ipsius ecclesiæ defendendâ vel eius parte aliqua providere, vel nisi aliquod tam grande et tam evidens periculum immineret quod omnibus et singulis cardinalibus præsentibus videretur illi celeriter occurrendum" (C. 3, § 1, in VI^to^ de electione, I, 6). In other words, the pope commands the cardinals to make all due haste with the election and to concern themselves with nothing else, except in case of necessity, e. g. the defence of the States of the Church or any part of them, or some danger so great and evident that each and every one of the cardinals present thinks it necessary to deal with it immediately.

The law prevailing at present is based on the Constitution "In eligendis" of Pius IV (9 October, 1562) §§ 6–8 (Bullarium Rom., VII, 233 sqq.). This constitution provides that according to ancient custom (evidently closely related to the above-described interimistic administration by the archpriest, the archdeacon, and the chief of the notaries) the administration of the States of the Church shall be confided to the College of Cardinals after the following manner: the cardinal camerlengo (*della Santa Romana Chiesa*) and three other cardinals (a cardinal-bishop, cardinal-priest, and cardinal-deacon, the so-called *capita ordinum*) shall manage all current business. Every three days, however, during the conclave, the *capita ordinum* are renewed according to seniority. These cardinals do not possess papal jurisdiction; they cannot therefore make laws, nor modify the system of papal elections, create cardinals or bishops, nor issue commissions to cardinal legates. They could, however, in case of a grave danger menacing the Church, provide by an absolute majority and secret vote for the necessary ways and means to meet the situation, issue urgent temporary ordinances for particular dioceses, and

order the public recitation of prayers. In case of the death of the cardinal camerlengo, the cardinal grand penitentiary, and individual penitentiaries, this cardinalitial commission could fill their places for the period of the vacancy (C. 2, § 1 in "Clem. de Electione", I, 6; Clement XII, "Apostolatus Officium", 4 Oct., 1732, §§ 6, 15, 18, in "Bullar. Roman.", XXIII, 445 sqq.). No canonical provisions exist regulating the authority of the College of Cardinals *sede Romanâ impeditâ*, i. e. in case the pope became insane, or personally a heretic; in such cases it would be necessary to consult the dictates of right reason and the teachings of history.

IX. Rights of Cardinals.—To the many duties of the cardinals correspond very extensive rights. They enjoy, in a very special manner, the *privilegium fori*, or right to ecclesiastical court and judges; the pope is their only judge, and alone can depose them (C. 2, X, de clerico non residente, III, 4). The provision that for the condemnation of an ecclesiastic seventy-two, forty-four, or twenty-seven witnesses were needed, according as he was bishop, priest, or deacon, is no longer recognized (C. un. in VI^to^ de schismaticis, V, 3; Paul IV, "Cum sæpius", 9 Jan., 1556 in "Bullar. Rom.", VI, 507 sq.). Modern states no longer recognize the *privilegium fori* even for cardinals; in recent times they have often appeared before the civil courts at Rome (S. Brandi, I Cardinali di S.R. Chiesa nel diritto pubblico italiano, Rome, 1905). Inimical persecution of a cardinal, personal injury to, or imprisonment of, him, are counted high treason (*crimen læsæ majestatis*); not only the principals, but also those intellectually responsible for the wrong (originators, participants, auxiliaries), and their male descendants incur the canonical penalties of infamy, confiscation, loss of testamentary rights and civil offices, and excommunication. (C. 5, in VI^to^ de pœnis, V, 9; "Apostolicæ Sedis moderationi", 12 Oct., 1869, I, 5). Apart from excommunication these penalties are no longer practically applicable. In accordance with the historical development of the office, the cardinals obtained place and vote in general councils. They alone can be sent abroad as *legati a latere*. They enjoy all the privileges of bishops. Any censure, canonical, or otherwise threatened, or any odious provision is applicable to cardinals only when it is expressly so provided (C. 4, in VI^to^ de sententiâ excommunicationis, V, 11). They may choose a confessor in any diocese; he must, however, have the approbation of his own bishop (C. 16, X de pœnitentiâ V, 38). Like the bishops, they have the right to a domestic chapel, and may everywhere use portable altars (C. 12 in VI^to^ de privilegiis, V, 7). In their titular churches the cardinals exercise a certain quasi-episcopal jurisdiction, i. e. they may there use the episcopal ornaments (*pontificalia*), give the episcopal blessing, and promulgate indulgences of 200 days (Congreg. Indulg., 28 Aug., 1903). They may confer tonsure and minor orders on the members of their ecclesiastical family, also on persons attached to their titular churches (Benedict XIV, "Ad audientiam", 15 Feb., 1753, § 16, in "Bullar. Bened.", XIV, IV, Const. 11). When actually present in Rome, they may grant benefices in their titular churches (C. 24, X de electione, I, 6; C. 11, X de Metrop. et Ord., I, 33). They may also hold visitations in their own churches, and exercise therein corrective and disciplinary authority; they may not, however, exercise judicial authority (C. 11, X de Metrop. et Ord., I, 33; Innocent XII, "Romanus Pontifex", 17 Sept., 1692, § 9, in "Bullar. Rom.", XX, 464; F. Albitius, "De iurisdictione quam habent cardinales in ecclesiis suorum titulorum", Rome, 1668). If a cardinal is promoted to a bishopric, the usual informational process is omitted; he is not obliged to take the usual oath, and is relieved of the ordinary curial expenses known as *taxæ* (Sägmüller, Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle, 153 sqq.). Every cardinal resident in Rome has a right to a revenue of 4,000 scudi (about $4,000). This is known as his *piatto cardinalicio*, or ordinary means of support. If the ordinary revenues assigned him do not produce as much, the papal treasury makes up the deficit. For their support churches are also assigned to them, e. g. as commendatory abbots. Their right to elect the pope will be treated in the article Conclave.

The honorary rights of the cardinals are also numerous. They come immediately after the pope, and precede all other ecclesiastical dignitaries. As Roman princes they follow immediately the reigning sovereign, and rank with the princes of reigning houses ("Cæremoniale cardinalium", 14 May, 1706, § 6; Decree of 16 April, 1858; Bangen, "Die römische Curie", 462). Hence, only cardinals of reigning houses retain their inherited titles of nobility and their family arms, but without the crown and with the cardinal's hat and the fifteen tassels (Innocent X, "Militantis ecclesiæ", 19 Dec., 1644, in "Bullar. Rom.", XV, 339 sq.). They alone have the right to the name of cardinal, and are addressed as *Eminentia, Eminentissimi* (Your Eminence, or Your Eminences), a title formerly borne by the German ecclesiastical prince-electors and, to the present day, by the Grand Master of the Knights of St. John. Urban VIII instructed them (10 June, 1630) to cease correspondence with any sovereign who refused them this title. It may be added that the legislation of several states takes cognizance of the exalted rank of the cardinals.

Chief among the insignia of the cardinal is the red hat, first worn by the *legati a latere* (cardinal envoys of the pope). It was granted to the secular cardinals by Innocent IV at the Synod of Lyons in 1245, and to the religious cardinals by Gregory XIV in 1591; the latter, it must be noted, continue to wear the distinctive habit of their order (Baumgarten, "Die Uebersendung des rothen Hutes" in "Hist. Jahrbuch", XXVI, 99 sqq.). They wear also the red (scarlet) biretta, that was granted to them, probably, by Paul II (1464–71). They also have the right to wear scarlet, particularly a scarlet mantle, which according to tradition was probably granted them by Boniface VIII (1294–1303). They also wear a ring with a sapphire stone, and use the *ombrellino* that is held over them whenever they quit their carriages to accompany with bare heads the Blessed Sacrament, if perchance they meet it on their way. In their titular churches a baldacchino covers the cardinalitial throne, and they have the right to use in these churches the episcopal ornaments, i. e. the mitre of damask silk (since Paul II), the crosier and the pectoral cross. They also give the *benedictio sollemnis* after the manner of a bishop. Pius X, by a decree of 24 May, 1905, permitted cardinal-priests and cardinal-deacons to wear everywhere the pectoral cross, even in presence of the pope ("Acta S. Sedis", XXXVII, 681; Sägmüller, "Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle", 149 sqq.). During the vacancy of the Apostolic See the colour of the cardinal's dress is saffron (J. M. Suaresius, Dissert. de croceâ cardinalium veste, Rome, 1670).

X. The College of Cardinals.—The cardinals, as already said, are a corporation, a college after the manner of the cathedral chapters. When the latter ceased to lead any longer the *vita canonica* or common life, they became corporations recognized by the canon law, with free administration of their property, chapter-meetings, autonomy, disciplinary authority, and the right to have and use a seal. That the members of the chapter (capitulars, canons) were the only counsellors and auxiliaries of the bishop helped to round out the position of the former, and to unite them as against the other clergy of the cathedral, all the more so as this right of the capitulars to co-gov-

ernment of the diocese (partly by counsel, *consilium*, and partly by consent, *consensus*) was constitutional and recognized by the canon law. The cathedral chapters reached their fullest development as corporations early in the thirteenth century, when they obtained the exclusive right of episcopal elections. In a similar way the cardinal-bishops, cardinal-priests, and cardinal-deacons came to form a corporation, by the fact that since Alexander III (1159–1181) they alone had the right to elect the pope, they alone were his immediate assistants at Mass, and were his only counsellors in all important matters. Since 1150 the corporation of the cardinals becomes more and more known as a *collegium*, though such synonymous terms as *universitas*, *conventus*, *cœtus*, *capitulum* are occasionally used. The dean or head of the College of Cardinals is the Bishop of Ostia; the sub-dean is the Bishop of Porto. The dean is the successor of the former archpriest, the first of the cardinal-priests, known since the twelfth century as *prior cardinalium presbyterorum;* he is also to some extent the successor of the archdeacon, known since the thirteenth century as *prior diaconorum cardinalium*. The archpriest was the immediate assistant of the pope at ecclesiastical functions. The archdeacon, as supervisor of the discipline of the Roman clergy and administrator of the possessions of the Roman Church, was, after the pope, the most important person in the papal court. During a vacancy, as above stated, both archpriest and archdeacon, together with the chief notary (*primicerius notariorum*), governed the Apostolic See. When later on the cardinals became a corporation that included bishops among its members, one of these bishops must naturally assume the headship; it could be no other than the Bishop of Ostia, whose immemorial right it was to bear the pallium at the consecration of the newly-elected pope, in case the latter were not yet a bishop, and to whom fell later the privilege of anointing the Roman Emperor, and of taking in general councils the first place after the pope. As president of the college it is the duty of the dean to convoke the same, to conduct its deliberations, and to represent it abroad.

As a legal corporation the cardinals have their own revenues, which are administered by a camerlengo (*camerarius*) chosen from their own body (not to be confounded with the cardinal camerlengo, administrator of the papal estate), and to some extent the successor of the former archdeacon or *prior diaconorum cardinalium*. In the Middle Ages the revenues of the College of Cardinals were considerable. They were jointly entitled, among other dues, to a share of the moneys paid into the papal treasury on such occasions as the conferring of the pallium, confirmation of bishops, also by nations and fiefs that acknowledged the sovereignty or protection of the Holy See. Therefore, since the thirteenth century, the cardinals have had their own treasury (F. Schneider, "Zur älteren päpstlichen Finanzgeschichte" in "Quellen und Forschungen aus italien. Archiv und Bibl.", IX, 1 sqq.). Nicholas IV allotted to the College of Cardinals (18 July, 1289) one half the revenues of the Apostolic See, i. e. of the pallium taxes, the dues for confirmation of bishops (*servitia communia*), the "census" or tribute from the countries subject to the pope, the Peter's-pence, the visitation dues (paid in on the occasion of their visits to Rome, *visitatio liminum apostolorum*, by all archbishops, by bishops immediately subject to the Holy See or confirmed and consecrated by the pope, and by abbots freed from episcopal jurisdiction and immediately subject to the Holy See), besides other sources of revenues (J. P. Kirsch, "Die Finanzverwaltung des Kardinalkollegiums im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert", Münster, 1895; Baumgarten, "Untersuchungen und Urkunden über die Camera collegii cardinalium für die Zeit von 1295–1437", Leipzig, 1889; A. Gottlob, "Die Servitientaxe im 13. Jahrhundert", Stuttgart, 1905; E. Göller, "Der Liber taxarum der päpstlichen Kammer", Rome, 1905). The common revenue of the College of Cardinals is now inconsiderable; hence the *rotulus cardinalicius*, or dividend paid yearly to the cardinals resident in Rome, is comparatively small.

Precedence or rank among the cardinals is regulated according to the three orders above described, and in each order according to seniority. In the order of bishops, however, seniority is not according to date of reception in the cardinalitial body, but according to the date of episcopal consecration (Clement XII, "Pastorale officium", § 5, 10 Jan., 1731, in "Bullar. Roman.", XXIII, 226). According to an ancient custom dating from the thirteenth century, cardinals resident in Rome enjoy what is known as *jus optionis* or the right of option (Sägmüller, "Die Tätigkeit und Stellung der Kardinäle", 179 sqq.; Baumgarten, "Die Translation der Kardinäle von Innocenz III bis Martin V", in "Hist. Jahrbuch", XXII, 85 sqq.). This means that when a cardinalitial office is vacant, the cardinal next in rank of seniority can choose (*optare*) the vacant office. Thus the oldest of the cardinal-bishops can choose the office of Dean of the College; he becomes at the same time Bishop of Ostia, since according to ancient custom the Dean of the Sacred College is always the Bishop of Ostia. However, in the interest of their dioceses, and apart from the bishoprics of Ostia and Porto, the cardinal-bishops are allowed to make such option but once. The *jus optionis* is also customary for the other two orders, both within each order, and from one to the other, given the necessary qualifications for such elevation. A cardinal-deacon, already ten years in the Sacred College, holds the *jus optionis* ahead of a cardinal-priest of later creation, provided, however, that there remain in the college ten cardinal-deacons (Paul IV, "Cum venerabiles", 22 Aug., 1555, in "Bullar. Rom.", VI, 502 sqq.; Sixtus V, "Postquam verus", § 7, 8, 3 Dec., 1587, ibid., VIII, 810 sqq.; Benedict XIII, "Romani Pontifices", § 5, 7, 7 Sept., 1724, ibid., XXII, 94 sq.; Clement XII, "Pastorale Officium", § 8, 10 Jan., 1731, ibid., XII, 226; L. Brancatius, "Dissertatio de optione sex episcopatuum", Rome, 1692). (See CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN; CONCLAVE; POPE.)

PANVINIUS, *De episcopatibus, titulis et diaconiis cardinalium* (Venice, 1567); BARBATIA, *De præstantiâ cardinalium;* MANFREDUS, *De cardinalibus S. R. E.; De sacrosancto collegio;* ALBANUS, *De cardinalatu;* VILLADIEGO, *De origine ac dignitate et potestate S. R. E. cardinalium.* These treatises are to be found in *Tractatus iuris universi* (Venice, 1587), XIII, 2, 63 sqq. See also BOTERO, *Dell'ufficio del cardinale* (Rome, 1599); PLATUS, *De cardinalis dignitate et officio tractatus* (Rome, 1602); CONTELORIUS, *Elenchus cardinalium ab anno 1294 ad annum 1430* (Rome, 1641); AUBÉRY, *Histoire générale des cardinaux* (Paris, 1642 sqq.); COHELLIUS, *Notitia cardinalatus* (Paris, 1653); PARIS GRASSI, *De cæremoniis cardinalium et episcoporum in eorum diœcesibus* (Rome, 1654); DUCHESNE, *Hist. de tous les cardinaux français de naissance* (Paris, 1660). For Irish cardinals, see *Saturday Review* (1882), LIII, 323; and for English cardinals, WILLIAMS, *Lives of the English Cardinals, etc., from Adrian IV to Wolsey* (London, 1868); also *Dubl. Rev.* (1874), LXXVI, 258, and BAXTER, *England's Cardinals* (London, 1903); see also D'ATTICHY, *Flores historiæ sacri collegii S. R. E. cardinalium* (Paris, 1660); DU PEYRAT, *Traité de l'origine des cardinaux* (Cologne, 1665); LETI, *Il cardinalismo di Santa Chiesa* (s. l, 1668); *Der Kardinalhut oder Bericht von den Kardinälen wie auch von dem Conclave* (s. l, 1667); MATHIAS A CORONA, *Tractatus posthumus de potestate et dignitate S. R. E. cardinalium, nuntiorum, legatorum Apostolicorum et inquisitorum fidei* (Liège, 1677); CIACONIUS, *Historia Pontificum romanorum et S. R. E. cardinalium*, ed. OLDUINUS (Rome, 1677); DE LUCA, *Il Cardinale di S. Chiesa pratico* (Rome, 1680); THOMASSINUS, *Vetus et nova ecclesiæ disciplina circa beneficii* (Paris, 1688), pt. I, lib. II, cc. cxiii–cxvi; BUDDEUS, *De origine cardinaliciæ dignitatis* (Jena, 1693); PALATIUS, *Fasti cardinalium omnium S. R. E.* (Venice, 1701); PIAZZA, *La gerarchia cardinalizia* (Rome, 1793); EGGS, *Purpura docta seu vitæ, legationes, res gestæ, obitus, S. R. E. cardinalium* (Munich, 1714); MURATORI, *De cardinalium institutione in Antiquitates Italicæ* (Milan, 1741), V, 153 sqq.; ANDREUCCI, *Dissertatio de dignitate, officio et privilegiis cardinalium* (Rome, 1766); KLEINER, *Dissertatio de origine et antiquitate S. R. E. cardinalium* (Heidelberg, 1767); TAMAGNA, *Origini e prerogative dei cardinali* (Rome, 1790); CARDELLA, *Memorie storiche*

de' cardinali della S. R. Chiesa (Rome, 1792 sqq.); VALIERI, *Della dignità del cardinalato* (Venice, 1833); FERRARIS, *Prompta bibliotheca canonica*, s. v. *Cardinalis; Dignité des cardinaux* in *Analecta juris pontificii*, II, 1918 sqq.; CRISTOFORI, *Storia dei cardinali di S. R. Chiesa dal secolo V all'anno 1888* (Rome, 1888); SETON, *The Cardinalate* in *The Catholic World* (1875), XXI, 359, 473; HUMPHREY, *Urbs et Orbis* (London, 1899); CROSTAROSA, *Dei titoli della chiesa Romana* (Rome, 1893); KEHR, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum: Italia Pontificia* (Berlin, 1906), I; also CHEVALIER, *Rép. des sources hist.: topobibl.* (Paris, 1894–99), s. v.

JOHANNES BAPTIST SÄGMÜLLER.

Cardinal Protector.—Since the thirteenth century it has been customary at Rome to confide to some particular cardinal a special solicitude in the Roman Curia for the interests of a given religious order or institute, confraternity, church, college, city, nation, etc. He was its representative or *orator* when it sought a favour or a privilege, defended it when unjustly accused, and besought the aid of the Holy See when its rights, property, or interests were violated or imperilled. Such a cardinal came to be known as a cardinal protector. In ancient Rome a similar relationship existed between the client (*cliens*) and his patron (*patronus*); as the power of the city grew, a still closer analogy is visible between the Roman institution and the modern ecclesiastical protectorate. Nearly every provincial city had its *patronus*, or *procurator*, in imperial Rome, usually a Roman patrician or knight, and such persons were held in high esteem. Cicero, e. g., was *patronus* of Dyrrachium (Durazzo) and of Capua, in which city a gilded statue was raised to him. In time the office became hereditary in certain families; Suetonius, in his life of Tiberius, says that the Claudian family (*gens Claudia*) was from ancient times (*antiquitus*) protector of Sicily and the Peloponnesus. The Roman Church adopted this, with many other imperial institutions, as one serviceable for external administration, not that the popes who first conferred this office and title sought to copy an ancient Roman usage, but because analogous conditions and circumstances created a similar situation. The office is conferred by the pope through the secretary of state, sometimes by spontaneous designation of the Holy Father, sometimes at the request of those who seek such protection. Such a cardinal protector had the right to place his coat-of-arms on the church, or main edifice, of the institute, or the municipal palace of the city in question. The first to hold such an office was Cardinal Ugolino Conti (Gregory IX), who sought thereby to paralyze the intrigues of his many enemies at Rome; at the request of St. Francis himself he was named protector of the Franciscans by Innocent III, and again by Honorius III. Alexander IV and Nicholas III retained for themselves the office of protector of the Franciscans. Indeed, the latter were long the only order that boasted of a cardinal protector; it was only in the fourteenth century that gradually the office was extended. As early as 1370 Gregory XI was obliged to restrain the abuses committed by the cardinal protector of the Franciscans; Martin V (1417–31) forbade the acceptance by the protector of a religious order of any payment for his protection. While Sixtus IV and Julius II defined more particularly the limits of the office, Innocent XII (1691–1700) must be credited with the final regulation of the duties and rights of a cardinal protector.

Kingdoms, empires, etc. must have had cardinal protectors previous to Urban VI (1378–89), since that pope forbade such cardinals to receive anything from the respective sovereigns of these states, lest through love of money they should be led to abet works of injustice. In 1424 Martin V forbade the cardinals to accept the protectorate of kings and princes, which prohibition was renewed in 1492 by Alexander VI. This prohibition was not renewed by Leo X in the ninth session of the Lateran Council of 1512; the cardinals, however, were urged to exercise the office in an impartial way and without human respect. At present the only state with a cardinal protector is the Kingdom of Portugal.

HIERONYMI PLATI, *Tractatus de cardinalis dignitate et officio* (Rome, 1836), xxxiii; HUMPHREY, *Urbs et Orbis* (London, 1896).

U. BENIGNI.

Cardinal Sees. See OSTIA; VELLETRI; PORTO; SANTA RUFINA; ALBANO; FRASCATI (TUSCULUM); PALESTRINA; SABINA.

Cardinal Vicar, the vicar-general of the pope, as Bishop of Rome, for the spiritual administration of the city, and its surrounding district, properly known as *Vicarius Urbis*.

LIST OF VICARII.—A complete but uncritical list of the *vicarii in spiritualibus in urbe generales*, was published by Ponzetti (Rome, 1797); it was added to and improved by Moroni (Dizionario, XCIX). From the manuscripts of Cancellieri in the Vatican Library new names were added by Crostarosa (Dei titoli della Chiesa romana, Rome, 1893). Eubel, by his own studies for the first volume of his "Hierarchia Catholica Medii Ævi", and with the aid of the manuscript notes of Garampi in the Vatican Archives, was enabled to present a new list substantially enlarged and improved (1200-1552) Many new discoveries of the undersigned have enabled him to draw up a critical list of the vicars and their representatives from 1100 to 1600. For the period before 1100 a fresh examination of all the original sources is necessary; for the present all names previous to that date must be held as uncertain. The first *vicarius in spiritualibus* clearly vouched for is Bovo (Bobo) *episcopus Tusculanus* (*Lavicanus*) about 1106 (Duchesne, Lib. Pont., II, 299 and 307, note 20; cf. also Jaffé, RR. PP. 12, 6069, 6106). Until 1260 the vicars were chosen from among the cardinals; the first vicar taken from among the bishops in the vicinity of Rome was the Dominican Thomas Fusconi de Berta, *episcopus Senensis* (Moroni, Eubel). This custom continued until the secret consistory of 29 Nov., 1558, when Paul IV decreed that in the future the vicars should be chosen from among the cardinals of episcopal dignity; it was then that arose the popular title of "cardinal-vicar", never used officially; the formal title is, and has always been, *Vicarius Urbis*.

NOMINATION AND OATH.—It seems certain that in the twelfth century vicars were named only when the pope absented himself for a long time from Rome or its neighbourhood. When he returned, the vicar's duties ceased. This may have lasted to the pontificate of Innocent IV (1243-54); on the other hand it is certain that in the latter half of this century the vicar continued to exercise the duties of his office even during the presence of the pope at Rome. Thus the nomination of a vicar on 28 April, 1299, is dated from the Lateran. The office owes its full development to the removal of the Curia to Southern France and its final settlement at Avignon. Since then the list of vicars is continuous. The oldest commissions do not specify any period of duration; in the Bull of 16 June, 1307, it is said for the first time that the office is held "at our good will". It is only in the sixteenth century that we meet with life-tenures; the exact year of this important modification remains yet to be fixed. Formerly the nomination was by Bull; when began the custom of nominating by Brief is difficult to determine. The oldest Bull of nomination known bears the date of 13 Feb., 1264 [Reg. Vat., tom. 28, fol. XC r, cap. XXXVIII (356); Guiraud, Les régistres d'Urbain IV, II, 359]. An immemorial custom of the Curia demands that all its officials shall be duly sworn in, and this was the case with the vicars. In all probability during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries such oaths were taken at the hands of the pope himself. Later the duty fell to the Apostolic Camera (q. v.). The oath, whose text

(though very much older) first appears in a document of 21 May, 1427 (Armar., 29, tom. 3, fol. 194 v, Vatican Archives), greatly resembles, in its first part, the usual episcopal oath (Corp. Jur. Can., ed. Friedbe, II, 360; Tangl, Die päpstlichen Kanzleiordnungen von 1200-1500, p. 51); while the latter part applies to the office in question. The oath is conceived in very general terms and lays but slight stress on the special duties of the vicar. The official named on 18 Oct., 1412, as representative of the vicar was also sworn in, and before entering on his office was admonished to take, in presence of a specified cardinal, the usual oath of fidelity to the pope and of a faithful exercise of the office.

Authority.—According to the oldest known decree of nomination, 13 Feb., 1264, both Romans and foreigners were subject to the jurisdiction of the vicar. In this document, however, neither the special rights of the vicar nor the local extent of his authority are made known, but it is understood that the territory in question is the city of Rome. On 27 June, 1288, the vicar received the rights of "visitation, correction and reformation in spiritual matters . . . . . of dedicating churches and reconciling cemeteries, consecrating altars, blessing, confirming, and ordaining suitable persons from the city" [Reg. Vat., tom. 44, fol. XCIIv, cap. XXVIIII (389); Langlois, Les régistres de Nicolas V, 595]. On 21 July, 1296 [Reg. Vat., tom. 48, fol. CLXXVIIr, cap. 85 (750); Theiner, Monumenta Slavoniæ Meridionalis, I, 112; Potthast, Regesta, 24367; Faucon-Thomas, Les régistres de Boniface VIII, 1640)] Boniface VIII added the authority to hear confessions and impose salutary penances. On 6 July, 1303 [Reg. Vat., tom. 50, fol. CCCLXXXVIr, cap. XLVII (250)] the following variant is met with: "to reform the churches, clergy, and people of Rome itself", and the additional right to do other things pertaining to the office of vicar. His jurisdiction over all monasteries is first vouched for 16 June, 1307 (Reg. Clementis papae V, ed. Bened. cap. 1645). The inclusion among these of monasteries, exempt and non-exempt and their inmates, without the walls of Rome, was the first step in the local extension of the vicar's jurisdiction. He was also empowered to confer vacant benefices in the city. For a considerable length of time the above-mentioned rights exhibit the fulness of the vicar's authority. Special commissions, however, multiply in this period, bearing with them in each case a special extension or new application of authority. Under Clement VI (1342-52) the territory of the vicar-general's jurisdiction was notably increased by the inclusion of the suburbs and the rural district about Rome (Reg. Vat., tom. 142, fol. 152r, cap. VII, XXXI). Until the time of Benedict XIV (1740-58) this was the extent of the vicar's jurisdiction. By the "district of the city of Rome" was understood a distance of forty Italian miles from the city walls. Since, however, the territory of the suburbicarian sees lay partially within these limits, the vicar came to exercise a jurisdiction concurrent with that of the local bishop and cumulatively. This was a source of frequent conflicts, until 21 Dec., 1744, when the local jurisdiction of the suburbicarian bishops was abolished by Benedict XIV, in so far as their territory fell within the above-mentioned limits (Bangen, Die römische Curie, Münster, 1854, 287).

In the course of time the vicar acquired not only the position and authority of a vicar-general, but also that of a real ordinary (q. v.), including all the authority of the latter office. This is quite evident from his acquired right of subdelegation whereby he was allowed to name a *vicesgerens*, his representative not alone in pontifical ceremonies (as many maintain), but also in jurisdiction. For the rest, being already *delegatus a principe* he can canonically subdelegate (Bangen, op. cit., 288, note 2). By a Constitution of Clement VIII, 8 June, 1592, the vicar's right to hold a visitation ordinary and extraordinary of churches, monasteries, clergy, and the people (dating from 16 June, 1307) was withdrawn in favour of the *Congregatio Visitationis Apostolicæ*, newly founded, for the current affairs of the ordinary visitation. Henceforth this duty pertains to the *vicarius urbis* only in so far as he may be named president or member of this congregation, the prefect of which is the pope himself. The great "extraordinary" visitations, held generally at the beginning of each pontificate, are executed by a specially-appointed commission of cardinals and prelates, the presidency of which falls by custom to the vicar. The Congregation of the Visitation is quite independent of the vicar, being constituted by Apostolic authority. The authority of the vicar does not cease with the pope who appointed him. But should he die during a vacancy of the Holy See, his successor cannot be appointed by the College of Cardinals; all current affairs are transacted by the vicesgerens who thus becomes a quasi vicar-capitular (q. v.). Theoretically at least, the vicar may hold diocesan synods; he could also formerly grant a number of choir-benefices. Leo XIII reserved this right in perpetuity to the pope.

The Vicesgerens.—The first episcopal assistant of the vicar known is Angelus de Tineosis, *Episcopus Viterbiensis*, named 2 Oct., 1321, as assistant to the Vicar Andreas, *Episcopus Terracinensis*. His position is not so well outlined in the documents that we can form a clear idea of his duties. It is significant that Angelus officiated as assistant even when the Vicar Andreas was in the city. On the other hand, the Vicar Franciscus Scaccani, *Episcopus Nolanus*, was allowed to choose an assistant for the business of the vicariate only in the case of his own absence from Rome (Reg. Lateranense, tom. 68, fol. 83v, 19 Aug., 1399). According to this document it was not the pope but the vicar himself, though authorized thereto by the pope, who chose his own assistant and gave over to him all his authority or faculties, in so far as they were based on law or custom. This shows that the *vicarius urbis* was firmly established in the fulness of his office and externally recognized as such; certain consuetudinary rights had even at this date grown up and become accepted. We see from the Bullarium Magnum (II, 75) that on 18 Oct., 1412, John XXII nominated Petrus Saccus, a canon of St. Peter's, as locum tenens of the Vicar Franciscus, *abbas monasterii S. Martini in Monte Cimino O. S. B.*, and himself conferred on this official all the faculties of the vicar. The new locum tenens was bidden to take the usual oath before the Apostolic Camera (see above). A similar case is that (1430) of Lucas de Ilperinis, another canon of St. Peter's. When Petrus Accolti, Bishop-elect of Ancona, was named *vicarius urbis* (1505) he took over the jurisdiction, but the *pontificalia* or ceremonial rights were given to Franciscus Berthleay, Bishop of Mylopotamos, until the consecration of Accolti. A similar case is that of Andreas Jacobazzi, a canon of St. Peter's, named vicar in 1519, but not consecrated as Bishop of Lucera until 1520; the *pontificalia* were committed to Vincentius, Bishop of Ottochaz-Zengg.

The series of assistants to the vicar, now known as vicesgerens, begins with 1560. Until the time of Clement XI (1700) they were named by the vicar; since then the pope has appointed them by a special Brief. The vicesgerens is therefore not a representative (locum tenens) of the vicar, but a subordinate auxiliary bishop appointed for life, though removable at any time. His authority (faculties) relative to jurisdiction and orders is identical with that of the vicar; for its exercise, however, he depends on the latter, as is expressly stated in the Brief of his nomination. In particular, the vicar has committed to him the administration of the treasury of relics known as the

Lipsanotheca or relic-treasury of the vicariate, the censorship of books, and the permission to print. The censorship of books was entrusted to the vicar by a Bull of 4 May, 1515 (in the Magnum Bullarium); this right, however, is now exercised by the vicesgerens subject to the *Magister sacri palatii*, to whose imprimatur he adds his own name without further examination of the book in question. The really responsible censor is therefore the *Magister sacri palatii*, not the vicesgerens. Occasionally there have been two assistants of the vicar, to one of whom were committed all matters of jurisdiction, to the other the *pontificalia* and ordinations; the latter was known as suffragan of the vicar.

ORGANIZATION OF THE VICARIATE.—*Ordinations.*—In this respect the duties of the vicar are of primary importance, since a multitude of ecclesiastics from all parts of the world pursue their studies at Rome and receive orders there on presentation of the required authorization of their respective bishops. For every order conferred at Rome there is a special examination conducted by a body of twenty-five learned ecclesiastics from the secular and the regular clergy, which operates in sections of three. Orders are regularly conferred on the days prescribed by ecclesiastical law and in the cathedral of the Bishop of Rome, i. e. in the Lateran Church; they may, however, be conferred on other days and in other churches or chapels. They are usually conferred either by the vicar himself or by the vicesgerens; by special delegation from the vicar, however, another bishop may occasionally ordain candidates. For the rights of the cardinals to ordain in their own churches (*tituli, diaconiæ*) see CARDINAL. By a general pontifical indult any bishop resident in Rome may administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, it being still customary at Rome to confirm all children who seem in danger of death.

Religious Orders.—All matters concerning the monasteries of Rome and their inmates pertain to a special commission in the vicariate composed of about eight members and under the direction of the vicar.

Preaching.—Strict regulations of Pius X permit only those to preach in Rome who have been found worthy after a thorough examination, scientific and practical, before a special commission which issues to each successful candidate the proper authorization. A similar regulation exists for priests desirous of hearing confessions in the city.

Parochial Clergy.—The parochial clergy of Rome form a special corporation, under a camerlengo (q. v.) chosen annually by themselves. Apart from the rights secured them by their statutes, in so far as approved by the pope, they are entirely subject to the vicar.

Treasury of Relics (*Lipsanotheca*).—The administration of the large collection of relics preserved in that part of the *vicariato* (palace of the vicar) known as the Lipsanotheca, and whence relics are regularly distributed to corporations, churches, or private persons, is confided by the vicar to his vicesgerens. On the other hand the vicar himself is at all times the president of the pontifical Commission of Sacred Archæology (see ARCHÆOLOGY, COMMISSION OF SACRED) which has charge of the catacombs (q. v.); he cannot confide this duty to another.

Court.—Since the vicar is the ordinary judge of the Curia Romana (see CURIA, THE ROMAN) and its territory, it follows that he has always had and now has his own court or tribunal. Formerly it took cognizance of both civil and criminal matters, either alone or concurrently with other tribunals, whether the case pertained to voluntary or to contentious jurisdiction (q. v.). This court no longer deals with criminal cases, though it still exists for certain matters provided for in the ecclesiastical law, the details of which may be seen in any of the larger manuals of canon law. The principal officials of the court of the vicariate are the above-mentioned vicesgerens, the *locum tenens civilis*, the *promotor fiscalis* for cases of beatification and canonization (q. v.), the *promotor fiscalis* for other ecclesiastical matters, chiefly monastic vows. In former times the auditor of the vicariate was a very busy person, being called on to formulate or to decide the various processes brought before the vicar; to-day the office is mostly an honorary one. Matrimonial cases are dealt with by two officials who form a special section of the vicariate.

Secretariate.—Among the minor officials of the vicar the most important are those who have charge of the secretariate, i. e. the secretary, his representative, two *minutanti* or clerks, and the aforesaid auditor of the vicar. The secretary is daily at his post and is authorized by subdelegation to decide or settle a number of minor matters of a regularly recurring nature; he also makes known the decisions of the vicar in more important matters; and is accessible to every one daily during a period of two hours. In view of a speedier administration corresponding to modern demands Pius X has very much simplified the workings of the vicariate; some of its departments he suppressed, others he combined, so that now of its former fifteen sections and sub-sections only seven remain.

For the latest complete account of the Vicariate of Rome see BAUMGARTEN, *Die päpstliche Kirche unserer Zeit und ihre Diener* (Munich, 1906), 483–510; note, however, that the above-mentioned reform of Pius X was published after the appearance of this work. See also HUMPHREY, *Urbs et Orbis: or The Pope as Bishop and as Pontiff* (London, 1899), 172–186.

PAUL MARIA BAUMGARTEN.

Cardinal Virtues, the four principal virtues upon which the rest of the moral virtues turn or are hinged. Those who recite the Divine Office find constantly recurring what seems to be the earliest instance of the word *cardinal* as applied to the virtues. St. Ambrose, while trying to identify the eight Beatitudes recorded by St. Matthew with the four recorded by St. Luke, makes use of the expression: "Hic quattuor velut virtutes amplexus est cardinales". A little later we find *cardinal* employed in like manner by St. Augustine (Common of Many Martyrs, third nocturn, second series; also Migne, P. L., XV, 1653; St. Thomas, Summa Theol., I–II, Q. lxix, a. 1, ad 1). That St. Jerome also uses the term is a statement which rests on a treatise not written by him, but published among his works; it is to be found in Migne, P. L., XXX, 596.

The term *cardo* means a hinge, that on which a thing turns, its principal point; and from this St. Thomas derives the various significations of the virtues as cardinal, whether in the generic sense, inasmuch as they are the common qualities of all other moral virtues, or in the specific sense, inasmuch as each has a distinct formal object determining its nature. Every moral virtue fulfils the conditions of being well judged, subserving the common good, being restrained within measure, and having firmness; and these four conditions also yield four distinct virtues.

FOURFOLD SYSTEM.—The origin of the fourfold system is traceable to Greek philosophy; other sources are earlier, but the Socratic source is most definite. Among the reporters of Socrates, Xenophon is vague on the point; Plato in "The Republic" puts together in a system the four virtues adopted later, with modifications by St. Thomas. (In "The Laws", Bk. I, 631, Plato recurs to his division: "Wisdom is the chief and leader: next follows temperance; and from the union of these two with courage springs justice. These four virtues take precedence in the class of divine goods".) Wishing to say what justice is, the Socratic Plato looked for it in the city-state, where he discovered four classes of men. Lowest was the producing class—the husbandmen and the crafts-

[illegible] the precepts for the bodily needs [illegible] the sensual appetites which require the restraint of temperance [illegible] [illegible] the police or [illegible] these mental states was fortitude [illegible]

In this part of cardinal virtues is established not [illegible] portion of Greek psychology which the scholastics have perpetuated in the division of appetites as [illegible] and [illegible] the latter annexed to [illegible] the characteristic that it must seek its purpose by an arduous endeavour against obstacles. This is [illegible] modification of [illegible] and [illegible] neither of which are rational faculties, while they are both amenable to reason [illegible] and it is the latter of them especially which is to help the reason as leading faculty [illegible] to subdue the concupiscence of the human [illegible] This idea of leader-ship gives to the third cardinal virtue, called by Plato [illegible] and [illegible] but by Aristotle [illegible] the practical wisdom which is distinguished from the speculative. The fourth cardinal virtue, found outside the scheme of the other three, which exhaust the psychological [illegible]

[illegible] The Platonic justice of the Republic at least in this connexion is the harmony between these three departments, in which each faculty discharges exactly the [illegible] proper function without [illegible] to the functions of the others. Obviously the [illegible] rational reason, not so obviously yet clearly to every one of us, it must [illegible] to assert [illegible] on the principles proper to an angel [illegible] bodily appetites. In this idea of justice [illegible] consideration of parts within the individual [illegible] the Platonic notion differs from the Aristotelian which is that justice is [illegible] and towards [illegible] Aristotle [illegible] conception of [illegible] does not [illegible] which Plato had sketched. But to [illegible] Either [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] They are to act in [illegible] general [illegible] which does not [illegible] complete [illegible] of virtue, and leaves to temperance [illegible]

The [illegible] represented by Cicero repeated Plato and Aristotle. Each man should so conduct himself that cardinals appear to [illegible] and dangerous temptations to [illegible] [illegible] prudence in the choice [illegible] and [illegible] justice in giving every one [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

The cardinal virtues unite the intellectual element and the affective. Much has been said recently of heart going beyond intellect in virtue; but the cardinal virtues, while concerned with the appetitive or affective parts, place prudence as the judge over all. Similarly the theological virtues place faith as the foundation of hope and charity. There is thus a completeness about the system which may be asserted without the pretence that essentially these four virtues must be marked off as a quartet among virtues. If the Greeks had not written, perhaps the Church would not have had exactly this fourfold arrangement. Indeed the division of good conduct into separate virtues is not an instance of hard and fast lines. The solidarity of the virtues and their interplay must always be allowed for, while we recognize the utility of specific differentiations. Within limits the cardinal virtues may be said to be a scientifically arranged group, helpful to clearness of aim for a man who is struggling after well-ordered conduct in a disordered world, which is not prudent, just, brave, temperate.

PLATO, *Republic*, Bk. IV, 427–434; IDEM, *Laws*, Bk. I, 631; IDEM, *Theætetus*, 176B; ARISTOTLE, *Ethics*, VI, 5; V, 1, III, 7 and 10; PETER LOMBARD, *Sent.*, Pt. III, Dist. XXXIII, with the various commentators on the text; ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theol.*, I–II, Q. lxi; WAFFELAERT, *Tractatus de Virtutibus Cardinalibus* (Bruges, 1886).

JOHN RICKABY.

Cardot, ALEXANDER. See BURMA, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

Carducci, BARTOLOMMEO and VINCENZO, both known in Spain as Carducho, Florentine painters, brothers, usually grouped under the Spanish School. Of these two artists Bartolommeo, the elder (b. 1560; d. 1608), after executing a few paintings in Florence, only two of which are worthy of note—those representing the Immaculate Conception and the Nativity in the Jesuit Church—accompanied Zuccaro to the court of Philip II and assisted him in his paintings in the Escorial. Here Bartolommeo worked in conjunction with Tibaldi upon the decoration of the library, the latter doing the ceiling and the former the walls. He took with him, in 1585, his younger brother, who was then at so tender an age that he declares he "had very faint recollections of Italy and spoke Castilian as his mother tongue". The elder brother worked also as an architect and as a sculptor, and executed a considerable amount of fresco work in the Escorial for Philip II, notably the painting in the Cloister, and commenced to decorate a gallery in the palace of the Pardo, for Philip III, with scenes taken from the life of Charles V. He died, however, before he had made much progress in this work. His most important production is his "Descent from the Cross", in the church of San Felipe in Madrid.

Vincenzo was appointed court painter by Philip III, in 1609, and completed the work commenced by his brother, adopting the history of Achilles as his subject. He was also court painter to Philip IV. He did not live to finish his last picture, a St. Jerome, which is inscribed "Vincencius Carducho hic vitam non opus finit 1638", and his death occurred while under confinement, as he lost his reason early in 1638. He painted for the Carthusians at Paular fifty-four large pictures representing the life of St. Bruno; the National Museum of Madrid, too, and the churches and palaces of that city abound in his paintings. He was also the author of an excellent book on painting, "Dialogos de las excelencias de la Pintura", and was responsible for obtaining in 1633 the remission of a tax on paintings which was a serious burden upon the artists of his day. Four years later he secured the total abolition of the tax. He was also commissioned to decorate the Palace of Buen Retiro, and executed a series of historical frescoes which were practically the first secular pictures seen in Castile.

BUTRÓN, *Discursos apologéticos en que se defiende la ingenuidad del arte de la pintura* (Madrid, 1626); CEÁN BERMÚDEZ, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las Bellas Artes en España* (Madrid, 1800); BALDINUCCI, *Notizie de Profesori del disegno* (Florence, 1688); CONCA, *Descrizione odeporica della Spagan* (Parma, 1793); COSSIO, *La pintura española* (Madrid, 1886); MADRAZO, *Catálogo descriptivo é histórico de los cuadros del Museo del Prado* (Madrid, 1872); ORLANDI, *Abecedario Pittorico* (Naples, 1733); PACHECO, *Arte de la pintura* (Seville, 1649); SMITH, *Painting, Spanish and French* (London, 1884); HARTLEY, *Spanish Painting* (London, 1904); ZARCO DEL VALLE, *Documentos méditos para la Historia de las Bellas Artes en España* (Madrid, 1870); STIRLING, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (London, 1848).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Carem (Sept., *καρέμ*; Hebrew, כרם, vine or vineyard), name of a town in the Tribe of Juda. The name, at least in this form, occurs but once in the Bible, viz. in Josue, xv, 59, and here only in the Septuagint translation; it is therefore absent, together with some other names mentioned in the same passage, from the Vulgate and from the English versions.

By some scholars Carem has been identified with the Bethacarem or Bethacharam mentioned in Jeremias vi, 1, and II Esdras, iii, 14; but be that as it may, there is a general consensus of critical opinion to the effect that the ancient Carem occupied the site of the modern 'Ain Karim, a flourishing village situated about four miles west of Jerusalem. In favour of this identification is alleged, besides the substantial identity of the name, the fact that around 'Ain Karim are found other villages whose modern names correspond with considerable accuracy to the names mentioned with Carem in the Greek text of Josue, xv, 59. It is probable that the remarkable fountain which springs up close to the village on the north took its present name, 'Ain Karim (Fountain of Karim), from the ancient Carem, which has been replaced by the modern town. The latter is a village of about 1000 inhabitants, more than half of whom are Mohammedans. It is located on a hill beyond the mountains that lie to the west of Jerusalem, and overlooks the beautiful valley of Colonieh, in which olives and fruit-trees flourish in great abundance. Towards the eastern extremity of the village stands the church of the Nativity of John the Baptist, to which are attached a monastery and lodging-place for pilgrims. The present church and monastery were built by the Franciscan friars who have been established in the place since 1690. The older sanctuary which occupied the same site had been abandoned after the Crusades and had fallen to ruin. Five hundred yards south of the church is the fountain of Carem ('Ain Karim), which is sometimes designated by the Christians as the Fountain of the Virgin. It flows from the side of a high mountain and is covered by a roofed structure with stone arches, which is a place of prayer for the Mussulmans. At a short distance from the fountain is another convent, erected by the Franciscans in 1892 on the ruins of an ancient monastery.

'Ain Karim has acquired celebrity in the later Christian tradition, not only of the Latin, but also of the Oriental Churches. From the twelfth century onward many writers affirm that it is the "city of Juda" in the "hill country" whither, according to St. Luke (i, 39), the Virgin Mary went to visit her cousin Elizabeth; consequently, the dwelling-place of Zachary, the birthplace of John the Baptist. This identification is noted in certain manuscript copies of the Gospel in Arabic and Coptic, sometimes in the margin, sometimes in the text, a fact which would seem to indicate a standing tradition in the Christian communities of Egypt and Abyssinia, received, doubtless, from their neighbours of Syria and Palestine. There has been, moreover, since the twelfth century, a fairly constant tradition, based chiefly on the relations of

pilgrims to the Holy Land, according to which 'Ain Karim was revered, at least during the Middle Ages, as the birthplace of the Precursor. In most of the descriptions given by travellers the place is called St. John, the home of Zachary, etc., but it is described as located about five miles west of Jerusalem, and this corresponds well with the location of 'Ain Karim. Besides, the characteristic features of the modern town are recognizable in the various descriptions. A text of the monk Epiphanius (Descriptio Terræ Sanctæ, CXX, 264), whom Röhricht (Bibliotheca Geographica Palestinæ, Berlin, 1890, p. 16) assigns to the middle of the ninth century, shows that the tradition is at least of earlier origin than the time of the Crusades. This writer calls the birthplace of the Precursor "Carmelion", a name evidently derived from Carem, and locates it about six miles west of the Holy City, and about eighteen miles from Amoas (Emmaus). Against this nearly unanimous agreement of medieval descriptions there are recorded only two or three dissenting texts, and these being associated with erratic topographical statements concerning other localities have little weight against the existing tradition.

A far stronger objection is deduced from the silence of early writers, notably of St. Jerome, who wrote an *ex professo* treatise on the Biblical places of the Holy Land; and, as a matter of fact, the tradition concerning 'Ain Karim has never been recognized as conclusive by the scholars, either ancient or modern, who have written commentaries on the New Testament. Thus (1) the chief commentators of the medieval period, understanding the words of St. Luke in a determined sense, viz. "the city of Juda", referred them to Jerusalem, the city of Juda *par excellence*, giving to the word Juda a somewhat wide and indefinite meaning. This opinion was given up by nearly all later scholars. (2) Baronius, Papebroch, Cornelius a Lapide, and after them a great number of others, have for much better reasons identified the city of the "hill country" with Hebron, the most celebrated and important of the cities originally within the confines of Juda; Jerusalem, strictly speaking, belonged to Benjamin. But this opinion also has been abandoned by the majority of modern commentators. (3) Other writers, following a conjecture of Reland (Palæstina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata, Utrecht, 1714, p. 870), take the word Ἰούδα in this instance to be a proper name, and identify it with Jota or Jeta, a levitical town of Juda mentioned in the Book of Josue (Jos., xv, 55; xxi, 16). This opinion, though lacking positive historical evidence, has been followed not only by the majority of Protestant commentators, but also by not a few Catholic scholars, for instance the Abbé Constant Fouard in his work "Christ the Son of God" (London, New York, 1891). Nevertheless, some modern Catholic writers, among whom is Victor Guérin, still adhere to the tradition of 'Ain Karim; but in the absence of positive early documentary evidence the controversy cannot be definitely settled.

HEIDET in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Carey, MATHEW, author and publisher, b. in Dublin, Ireland, 28 January, 1760; d. in Philadelphia, U. S. A., 15 September, 1839. He was the first Catholic of prominence in the publishing trade in the United States, and brought out in 1790 the first edition of the Douay Bible printed in America. His father was a baker who acquired a small fortune. In early youth Mathew was a dull pupil, but later exhibited remarkable ability in languages and mathematics. When fifteen years of age he disappointed his father by deciding to be a book-seller and printer, and began at once to learn the business as an apprentice. He was an omnivorous reader and acquired a fund of knowledge through persistent application to study. His first article, published in the "Hibernian Journal" in 1777, was on duelling. A duel fought by one of Carey's friends suggested the article which was a strong argument against this means of settling differences. In 1779 he published a pamphlet on the "Urgent Necessity of an Immediate Repeal of the Whole Penal Code against Roman Catholics". Before its publication the work was advertised and the preface, which was a radical statement of the situation, was printed. The pamphlet was regarded by Parliament as an evidence of the seditious character of the Irish people. The leaders of the Catholic party in Dublin, who hoped for favourable legislation from Parliament at this time, took up the matter, offered forty pounds for the detection of the author and made arrangements for his prosecution in the event of his capture. Carey escaped to France where he remained a year. While there he met Lafayette and worked for a time in the printing office of Franklin at Paris. After his return to Ireland he conducted the Dublin "Freeman's Journal". With funds supplied by his father he founded in 1783 the "Volunteers Journal". "The object of the paper", to use his own words, "was to defend the commerce, the manufactures, and the political rights of Ireland against the oppression and encroachment of Great Britain." It was a radical paper suited to the temper of the times, and did much to form public opinion. On 5 April, 1784, an article attacking Parliament and the Premier was published. For this Carey was arrested, tried before Parliament, and sent to Newgate. When Parliament was dissolved he was released. He then accepted the advice of his friends, left Ireland in disguise and emigrated to America, landing in Philadelphia.

Lafayette visited him in Philadelphia and gave him $400 to establish the "Pennsylvania Herald". He began to publish the debates of the House of Assembly in 1785 from notes he took himself, and as this was an innovation in the newspaper business in America, the paper immediately had a large circulation. There was great political bitterness at this time in Pennsylvania, between the Constitutionals and the Republicans. Carey became one of the leading advocates of the Constitutionals, and Oswald, who published the "Independent Gazetteer", was the mouthpiece of the Republicans. The foreigners in America were generally on the side of the Constitutionals. Through his paper Oswald attacked them and Carey became their defender. As a result of a personal attack by Oswald, Carey challenged him to a duel. It was fought in New Jersey, and Carey was seriously wounded. It is strange, as Carey admits in his autobiography, that he should have been led to fight a duel after he had denounced duelling in his earliest essay. In partnership with five others he began the "Columbian Magazine" in 1786. The discordant views of the publishers and the small profits accruing to the proprietors led Carey to withdraw from the enterprise within a year. In January, 1787, he began the publication of the "American Museum" which continued until December, 1792. It was dedicated to "Dr. Carroll, Bishop-elect of the Catholic Church" and contained no essays of the editor, but was filled with valuable articles from papers and documents which were deemed of general interest and worthy of preservation. It was not a financial success. After quitting the "Museum" he began on a small scale the business of book-selling and printing, to which he devoted himself closely for over twenty-five years, abandoning it altogether in 1821. In 1793 the yellow fever epidemic broke out in Philadelphia, and he was appointed a member of the Committee of Health to devise means for the relief of the sufferers. He applied himself in a painstaking way to arrest the spread of the disease and published the results of his investigations in a volume on the "Rise, Progress, Effects, and

Termination of the Disease" in 1793. Five editions were published. In 1793 Carey called a meeting of prominent Irishmen in Philadelphia, and with them founded the "Hibernian Society for the Relief of Immigrants from Ireland". In 1796 he was engaged with several others in founding the "Sunday School Society", the first of its kind established in the United States. Becoming involved in a quarrel with a publisher, William Cobbett, he published a scathing reply in a Hudibrastic poem, "The Porcupiniad", in 1799.

In 1810 the question of the re-charter of the first United States Bank came up and Carey, although a Democrat, took sides with those who favoured the bank. At first he published a series of articles in "The Democratic Press", a paper which strongly opposed the bank. Later he went to Washington, took an active part in the discussions there when the question of a re-charter came before Congress, and published two pamphlets favouring the re-charter. In 1814 he published the work for which he is best known, "The Olive Branch". The second war with Great Britain was still in progress, and the country was divided into rival factions, and the aggressions of the party hostile to American interests endangered the success of the war. The work was written in the interests of harmony and was, as stated in the preface, "An Appeal to the patriotism, the honour, the feeling, the self interest of your readers to save a noble nation from ruin". It had a large circluation and exercised a good influence, but was not welcomed in New England. In 1820 a second "Olive Branch" was written to harmonize factional interests.

In his boyhood Carey had read everything published in behalf of the Irish cause, and, aroused by Great Britain's treatment of Ireland, he had resolved to write some day in defence of his native country. In 1818 the famous Godwin wrote "Mandeville", a novel in which the fictions of the massacre of 1641 were exploited. This occasioned the publication by Carey of "Vindiciæ Hibernicæ" (1818). In it the general unreasoning attitude of Great Britain toward Ireland was discussed, but special emphasis was placed on Catholic emancipation and the legendary massacre of 1641. The plan pursued throughout the work to vindicate Ireland and the Catholics was the use of testimony taken exclusively from Protestant historians. In doing this some of the best material available was excluded. The alleged plots against the Protestants in the so-called massacre of 1641 were shown to be absurd and the number of persons killed greatly exaggerated. The claims of Temple and Clarendon and the assertions of later and uncritical historians were refuted in detail.

Carey began writing on the Tariff question in 1819. In seeking the cause of the financial depression of 1818 and 1819 he was led to believe that the failure to put a high tariff upon goods manufactured in the United States was responsible for the general disaster. Prior to this he found political economy as presented in Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" abstruse and uninteresting. He now took up this work again with the purpose of answering the Free Trade arguments, and published in 1822 his "Essays on Political Economy". Subsequently he published and distributed at his own expense numerous pamphlets on the tariff question. His essays had a large circulation and went far towards turning sentiment in the direction of a protectionist policy. In 1820 he founded the "Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of National Industry" which consisted of the leading citizens of Philadelphia. Because the organization was not sufficiently aggressive Carey withdrew from it and it soon ceased to exist. Carey's tariff arguments will not bear the test of scientific criticism, but it must be remembered that he had no economic training. While the soundness of his conclusions cannot be admitted, the policy advocated had much to commend it when Carey wrote.

He was married in 1791 while he was living in very limited circumstances. Later he acquired a considerable fortune, but retained throughout habits of frugality. He was the father of nine children, one of whom was the distinguished economist, Henry C. Carey. In 1833–34 he published his Autobiography in the "New England Magazine". A valuable collection of Carey's letters is in the "Records" of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia for 1898, 1899, 1900, 1902, vols. IX, X, XI, XII, and XIII. Carey took a very active though anonymous part in the disastrous schism occasioned in St. Mary's parish, Philadelphia, by the rebellious priest William Hogan (1819–22). He is credited with writing or inspiring, as well as publishing, many of the pamphlets issued at the time. An extended list of these publications is given in Finotti, "Bibliographia Catholica Americana" (Boston, 1872), 137–172.

ALLIBONE, *Dict. of British and American Authors* (Philadelphia, 1859–71); *Imperial Biog. Dict.* (London, s. d.); WEBB, *A Compendium of Irish Biography* (Dublin, 1878); HUNT, *Our American Merchants* (Boston, 1864); *Life of William Cobbett* (Philadelphia, 1835); JANSEN, *The Stranger in America* (London, 1807); *Niles' Register* (Baltimore, 1811–47); *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine* (New York, 1839); *American Almanac* (Boston, 1841).

J. E. HAGERTY.

Carheil, ETIENNE DE, French missionary among the Indians of Canada, b. at Carentoir, France, Nov., 1633; d. at Quebec, 27 July, 1726. He entered the Society of Jesus at Paris, 30 August, 1652; studied in Amiens, La Flèche, and Bourges, and acted as instructor in Rouen and Tours. After his ordination in 1666, Carheil left for Canada, and spent two years at Quebec in preparation for mission work. From his entrance into the novitiate he had longed to shed his blood for Christ; the only martyrdom he found in Canada was that of thirty years of hardships and sufferings among the Hurons and the Iroquois. The first scene of his missionary labours was Cayuga, where he remained until the chiefs drove him from their canton in 1684. He taught grammar for three years at the College of Quebec, and was then assigned to the Mission of Mackinac. His strenuous opposition to the brandy traffic provoked the enmity of La Mothe Cadillac, the French commandant at that post, and he was compelled to return to Quebec in 1703. During most of the ensuing years he ministered to the French in Montreal and other towns. Father Carheil was a ripe scholar and possessed a rare knowledge of the languages of the tribes he evangelized. He left two manuscript volumes entitled "Racines Huronnes".

ORHAND, *Un admirable inconnu* (Paris, 1890); THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896–1901), I, 325, 326, LXX, 129; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* II, 747; SHEA, *History of the Catholic Missions* (New York, 1855), CXV; IDEM, *Cath. Ch. in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886), index; ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1895–96), III, c. x.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Cariati (PATERNUM), DIOCESE OF (CARIATENSIS), suffragan of Santa Severina. Cariati is a city of Calabria in the province of Cosenza, Italy, healthfully situated near the sea. The first bishop mentioned in history is Menecrates, present at the Synod of Rome in 499. In one of his letters St. Gregory the Great recommends the Church of Cariati to the Bishop of Reggio. According to some, during the eleventh or twelfth century the Diocese of Cerenza (*Geruntia*) was united to Cariati, though it is only in 1342 that mention is made of a Bishop of Cariati and Cerenza. Noteworthy bishops were: Polychronius (1099), founder of the monastery of S. Maria di Attilia in Santa Severina; the Cistercian Blessed Matteo (1234), first Abbot of San Giovanni di Fiore; Alessandro Crivello (1561), a gallant soldier, afterwards nuncio in Spain; Fra Filippo Gesualdo (1602), a Minor Con-

ventual who died in the odour of sanctity. In 1818 Pius VII united with this diocese Strongoli and Umbriatico. The diocese contains a population of 60,000, with 28 parishes, 70 churches and chapels, 1 regular and 60 secular priests.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 257; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 368.

U. BENIGNI.

Caribs, next to the Arawaks, probably the most numerous Indian stock, of more or less nomadic habits, in South America. They cannot, however, compare in numbers with the sedentary aborigines of Peru and Bolivia. The Caribs were the second group of Indians met by Columbus on the Antilles, and even at that time the name was a synonym for "cannibals". At the time of Columbus they held the whole of the Lesser Antilles, whence they made constant and cruel inroads upon the Arawaks of the larger northern islands, killing the men and capturing the women, whom they carried to their homes on Guadalupe, Martinique, etc. as slaves. The Arawaks were in great dread of them and of their weapons, which were superior to the primitive fire-hardened javelins and wooden war-clubs in use on the Greater Antilles, although some of the natives had also acquired the bow and arrows, probably from contact with their hereditary foes, the Caribs. The latter were also hardy and daring sailors, paddling fearlessly from island to island comparatively long distances. In costume, mode of living, dwellings, etc., the Caribs differed but little from the Arawaks. Their language is totally different. The distinctive feature in dress consisted in this, that the Arawaks wore the hair short, while the Caribs allowed it to flow at full length.

The proper name of the Caribs is given as "Karina". How far the word may have been applied to designate the stock in general is not certain. Of their pre-Columbian history only so much seems ascertained, that they originally occupied Northern Venezuela and parts of Guiana, and from the northern shores of South America gradually extended to the Lesser Antilles, driving northward the Arawaks. Had the landing of Columbus not interfered, they in all probability would have exterminated the Arawaks and spread over the Greater Antilles also. The enmity between the Caribs and the Arawaks is hereditary. But the former were not always successful. On the Orinoco, for instance, the Arawaks held their own. There was and is, on the South American mainland, less disparity in warlike features between the stocks than between the Caribs and Arawaks of the Antilles, especially those of the Bahamas. In general culture and social organization the two stocks are much alike. The Caribs build excellent boats which they equip with sails, and some groups make rather fair pottery. Their religious creed is the animism and fetichism characteristic of all Indians, witchcraft forming the leading part of their rites and ceremonials. Of the numerous groups into which the Caribs are divided, the Bakairis, on the upper Shingu River in Brazil, are the most southerly, so that the stock is scattered from the fourteenth degree of latitude south to near the coast of Venezuela, and from the Galibis in Guiana as far west, at least, as the eastern confines of Colombia.

The almost complete extermination of the Antillean Caribs was brought about by their indomitable ferocity and particularly by their addiction to cannibalism. Every effort on the part of the Spaniards and French to abolish it proved fruitless. In central South America the Catholic missionaries, chiefly the Jesuits, worked with considerable success among Carib tribes along the Amazon, devoting special attention to the Motilones and establishing missions among them. During the seventeenth century Father Samuel Fritz laboured among them, as well as among tribes of Arawak stock. These efforts, which had already been very much hampered by the aggressions of the Portuguese from Brazil, came to naught, owing to the expulsion of the Jesuits. The Franciscans continued the missions on a limited scale after 1767, but the blow had been too severe to allow more than a feeble recovery. A few missions still subsist wanting, however, the strength of their early organization.

The Caribs have been considered the cannibals *par excellence* of Northern South America. This is true of those formerly located on the Antilles; but on the mainland, where not under strict control, all the forest tribes of Indians are more or less anthropophagous. There is, in this respect, no difference between Caribs, Arawaks, Tapuyas, and other natives of the Amazonian basin. It is surmised, from results of linguistic investigations, that the original home of the Caribs was where the branch known as the Bakairis is located to-day namely, on the upper Shingu in north-eastern Matto Grosso (Brazil), and that from there they spread to the north and north-east, driving the Arawaks before them.

The earliest information concerning the Caribs is contained in the letters of COLUMBUS, beginning with the year 1493. Of subsequent old sources must be mentioned: OVIEDO, *Historia general y natural* (Madrid, 1850); HERRERA, *Historia general* (Madrid, 1601–15).

From the seventeenth century we have very important sources: BOYER, *Véritable relation*, etc. (Paris, 1654); PELLEPART, *Relation des Missions des R. P. de la c. de J.*, etc. (Paris, 1655); DU TERTRE, *Histoire des Antilles* (Paris, 1667–1671); ROCHEFORT, *Histoire naturelle et morale des Iles Antilles* (Rotterdam, 1681); BIET, *Voyage de la France équinoxiale en l'isle de Cayenne* (Paris, 1664); GUMILLA, *Historia del Orinoco* (Madrid, 1745).

Modern literature on the Caribs is largely in the shape of transactions of European and American scientific societies. Monographs: SCHOMBURGK, *Comparative Vocabulary*, etc. (British Association Report, 1848); *A Vocabulary of the Maiongkong Language* (Proceedings of the Philological Society, London, 1850), IV; EHRENREICH, *Verhandlungen der Berliner anthropol. Gesellschaft* (1888).

Modern books: VON DEN STEINEN, *Durch Central-Brasilien* (important also for Arawaks and other stocks); THURN, *Among the Indians of Guiana;* BRETT, *Indian Tribes of Guyana* (New York, 1852).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Carisiaca Capitula. See QUIERCY, COUNCIL OF.

Carissimi, GIACOMO, the most influential and prolific Italian composer of his time, b. in 1604 at Marino in the Papal States; d. 12 Jan., 1674, in Rome. After completing his musical education in Rome, Carissimi became choirmaster at Assisi, and, in 1628, he was appointed to a like position at the church of St. Apollinaris in Rome. He is considered the father of the modern oratorio form, which had its origin in the simple *laudi sacri* composed by Palestrina and Annimuccia for St. Philip Neri's meetings of young people, held in his *oratorio* or place of prayer. By imparting a lyric quality to the recitative, lending variety to the orchestral accompaniments and dramatic movement to the whole, he developed this form to the point where it was taken up and carried to its perfection by Händel and Bach. Although many of Carissimi's oratorios and other works have been lost, the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris contains the following oratorios in MS.: "La plainte des damnés", "L'histoire de Job", "Ezéchias", "Baltazar", "David et Jonathan", "Abraham et Isaac", "Jephté", "Le jugement dernier", "Le mauvais riche", "Jonas". An almost complete collection of the works of this master made by Dr. Henry Aldrich (1647–1710) is found in the library of Christ Church College, Oxford. Of Carissimi's settings to liturgical texts two printed collections of motets for two, three, and four voices, and masses for five and nine voices are mentioned. An eight-part "Nisi Dominus" and a "Lauda Sion" in MS. are preserved in the Santini Library in Rome. Among Carissimi's pupils were Alessandro Scarlatti, J. K. Kerll, Johann Ph. Krieger, Chr. Bernard, and M. A. Charpentier.

AMBROS, *Gesch. der Musik* (Leipzig, 1881); MENDEL, *Musikalisches Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1870).

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Caritas, SAINT. See FAITH, HOPE, AND CHARITY, SS. MM.

Carletus, ANGELUS. See ANGELO CARLETTI DI CHIVASSO.

Carli, DIONIGI DA PIACENZA, one of a band of Franciscan friars of the Capuchin Reform, sent out to the Congo in 1666. One of his companions was Padre Michele Angelo Guattini da Rhegio, who wrote an account of the voyage of the missionaries from Genoa to Lisbon and thence to Brazil, Loanda, and the Congo, that being the route the missionaries had to take to get to their destination. Padre Michele Angelo died shortly after his arrival in the Congo, leaving his manuscript in the hands of Dionigi Carli, who, on his return to Italy a few years afterwards owing to sickness, wrote an account of his own experiences in the Congo and on his homeward journey. Carli gives a detailed description of the manners and customs of the natives and of the doings of the missionaries. He tells how the friars died in numbers, owing to the climate, and speaks with discouragement of the peculiar difficulties of the situation. He trusts that some of the 2700 children he baptized will reach Heaven and be to his credit as a missionary in the judgment book of God. Finally he gives some account of the various cities he passed through in Portugal, Spain, and France on his way home. Carli published at Rhegio in 1672 his own work together with that of Guattini under the title: "Il Moro transportato in Venezia ovvero curioso racconto de' Costumi, Riti et Religione de' Populi dell' Africa, America, Asia ed Europa". A second edition appeared at Bologna in 1674. An English translation is published in Churchill, "Voyages" (London, 1704), I.

FATHER CUTHBERT.

Carlisle (CARLEOL, KARLIOLUM), ANCIENT DIOCESE OF (CARLEOLENSIS, KARLIOLENSIS).—The Catholic was smaller in extent than the present Anglican diocese, which was enlarged in 1856. The territory it originally included first became a political unit in the reign of William Rufus (1087–1100), who made it into the Earldom of Carlisle, including therein most, but not all, of the two counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland. In the reign of his successor, Henry I, the earldom was made a bishopric. Till that time it had formed part of the Diocese of Durham, though there was a strong Celtic element that looked to Glasgow for episcopal administration. For the first bishop, the king secured the appointment of his former confessor, Æthelwulf (1133–1155), an English monk, Prior of the Augustinian Canons, whom the king had established at Carlisle in 1102. At the time of his consecration, however, Æthelwulf seems to have been Prior of the Augustinian house at Nostell in Yorkshire. He ruled the diocese until his death in 1156, and from his charters it is clear that the see was from the first well administered, and that there was a vigorous diocesan life. Æthelwulf built a moderate-sized Norman minster of which the transepts and part of the nave still exist, and to serve this cathedral he introduced his own Augustinians, with the result that Carlisle was the only see in England with an Augustinian cathedral chapter, the other monastic cathedral chapters being Benedictine. Of the next bishop, Bernard, little is known, and after his death, in or about 1186, there was a long vacancy, during which the diocese was administered by another Bernard, Archbishop of Ragusa. During this period Carlisle suffered severely from the incursions of the Scots, and early in Henry III's reign we find the king complaining to the pope that Carlisle had revolted to Scotland, and that the canons had elected a bishop for themselves. The papal legate, Gualo, punished this action by exiling the canons and appointing Hugh, Abbot of Beaulieu, a good administrator, as bishop. It was important to the English Government to have a reliable prelate at Carlisle, as they constantly looked to the bishop to attend to Scottish affairs, negotiate treaties, and generally play the part of diplomat. The next bishop was Walter Malclerk, formerly agent of King John, and a prominent figure in the reign of Henry III. Always a patron of the Friars Preachers, he introduced both Dominicans and Franciscans into the city and diocese. He resigned his see in 1246 in order to join the Order of St. Dominic. About this time a new choir was begun and carried to completion, only to be destroyed in the great fire of 1292. A fresh beginning was made by energetic Bishop Halton (1292–1324), a favourite of Edward I, and for nearly a hundred years the building of the present choir proceeded, though with many interruptions. Its chief glory is the great east window, remarkable both for its own beauty and as marking a transition from the earlier style to the perfection of tracery. During this time the see was governed by a line of bishops, busy and useful diplomats in their day, but not remarkable in other respects. One of these was Thomas Merke, the intimate friend of Richard II, who was later on tried for high treason under Henry IV and deprived of his bishopric. The subsequent bishops preserved the character of statesmen and scholars, being frequently employed in negotiating truces and treaties with Scotland, while several of them were Chancellors of Oxford or of Cambridge. Among them was Wolsey's friend, John Kite (1521–1537), who remained faithful to his master, and who supported him in the poverty of his latter days. The last of the Catholic bishops was Owen Oglethorpe, the kindly-tempered prelate who was prevailed on to crown Elizabeth when no other prelate could be found to do that office for her—an act he so much regretted that, Antony à Wood says, the rest of his days "were both short and wearisome". He disobeyed the queen openly when she forbade him to elevate the Sacred Host in her presence; he refused to appear at a disputation on religion, or to take the Oath of Supremacy, was deprived of his bishopric with the other Catholic bishops, and died a prisoner 31 December, 1559. With him the history of the Catholic see of Carlisle came to an end. It was a poor diocese, and when the Reformers plundered the churches they found little but a chalice in each, and even of these some were of tin. There was only one archdeaconry, that of Carlisle. The cathedral was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, though this was changed at the Reformation to the Holy Trinity. The arms of the see were: Argent, on a cross, sable, a mitre with labels, Or.

NICOLSON AND BURN, *History of Westmoreland and Cumberland* (London, 1777); HUTCHINSON, *History of Carlisle* (Carlisle, 1796), an extract from his *History of Cumberland* (Carlisle, 1794); JEFFERSON, *History of Carlisle* (Carlisle, 1838); PRESCOTT, *Statutes of Carlisle Cathedral* (Carlisle, 1879); PRESCOTT, *Visitations in the Ancient Diocese of Carlisle* (Carlisle, 1888); FERGUSON, *Diocesan History of Carlisle* (London, 1889); ELEY, *The Cathedral Church of Carlisle* (London, 1900).

EDWIN BURTON.

Carlovingian Books. See CAROLINE BOOKS.

Carlovingian Schools.—Under the Merovingian Kings there was established at the court a school—*scola palatina*, the chroniclers of the eighth century styled it—for the training of the young Frankish nobles in the art of war and in the ceremonies of the court. This was not, however, a school in the modern acceptation of the term. Whatever education there was of the literary kind at that time was imparted at the monastic and cathedral schools. With the accession of Charlemagne (768) a scheme of educational reform was inaugurated, first in the palace school it-

self, and later in the various schools established or reformed by imperial decrees throughout the vast empire over which Charlemagne reigned. The reform of the palace school, the change, namely, from a school of military tactics and court manners to a place of learning, was begun in 780, as soon as the victories over the Lombards, Saxons, and Saracens afforded leisure for domestic improvements. It was not, however, until the arrival of Alcuin at Aachen in 782 that the work of educational reform began to have any measure of success. Alcuin was not only placed at the head of the emperor's school in the palace, but was admitted to the council of the emperor in all educational matters and became Charlemagne's "prime minister of education". He represented the learning of the school of York, which united in its traditions the current of educational reform inaugurated in the South of England by Theodore of Tarsus and that other current which, starting from the schools of Ireland, spread over the entire northern part of England. He was not, indeed, an original thinker. Nevertheless, he exerted a profound cultural influence on the whole Frankish Kingdom, by reason of the high esteem in which Charlemagne and his courtiers held him. He taught grammar, rhetoric, dialectic and the elements of geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music (see ARTS, SEVEN LIBERAL). And his success as a teacher of these branches seems to have been generally acknowledged by all the courtiers as well as by his royal patron. We know from Einhard's biography of Charlemagne that the emperor, the princes and the princesses, and all the royal household formed a kind of higher school at the palace in order to learn from Alcuin what would nowadays be considered the merest rudiments.

Charlemagne was not content with securing for his palace school the services of the ablest teacher of that age. Acting under Alcuin's advice he proceeded by a series of enactments dating from 787 (two years after the final triumph over the Saxons) to 789, to inaugurate a reform in the educational conditions throughout the empire. In 787 he issued the famous capitulary which has been styled the "Charter of Modern Thought". In it he addresses himself to the bishops and abbots of the empire, informing them that he "has judged it to be of utility that, in their bishoprics and monasteries committed by Christ's favour to his charge, care should be taken that there should not only be a regular manner of life, but also the study of letters, each to teach and learn them according to his ability and the Divine assistance". He has observed, he says, in the letters which, during past years, he has received from different monasteries, that though the thoughts contained therein are most just, the language in which those thoughts are expressed is often uncouth, and the fear arises in his mind lest if the skill to write correctly were thus lacking, so too the power of rightly comprehending the Scriptures might be less than it should be. "Let there, therefore, be chosen [for the work of teaching] men who are both willing and able to learn and desirous of instructing others; and let them apply themselves to this work with a zeal equal to the earnestness with which we recommend it to them". Copies of this letter are to be sent to all suffragan bishops and to all (dependent) monasteries. In the great council held at Aachen (789) he issued more explicit instructions regarding the education of the clergy. From the wording of the capitulary of 787, it is clear that Charlemagne intended to introduce the reform of education into all the cathedral and monastic schools of the empire.

Again in the capitulary of 789 we read: "Let every monastery and every abbey have its school, in which boys may be taught the Psalms, the system of musical notation, singing, arithmetic and grammar". There can be no doubt that by boys are meant not only the candidates for the monastery and the wards (generally the children of nobles) committed to the care of the monks, but also the children of the village or country district around the monastery, for whom there was usually an external school attached to groups of monastic buildings. This is made evident by an enactment of Theodulf, Bishop of Orléans, who, when Alcuin retired to the monastery of Tours in 796, succeeded him at the Court as advisor of the emperor in educational matters. The document dates from 797, ten years after Charlemagne's first capitulary was issued, and enacts explicitly "that the priests establish schools in every town and village, and if any of the faithful wish to entrust their children to them to learn letters, that they refuse not to accept them but with all charity teach them . . . and let them exact no price from the children for their teaching nor receive anything from them save what parents may offer voluntarily and from affection" (P. L., CV., col. 196). To Alcuin himself tradition has assigned the lines set up in the streets of Strasburg in which the attractions of a school are compared with those of a nearby tavern: "Choose, O traveller; if thou wilt drink thou must also pay money, but if thou wilt learn thou wilt have what thou seekest for nothing." In these free schools the teacher was, apparently, the priest of the town or village, and, as far as we can judge, the curriculum comprised what may be called the rudiments of general education, with an elementary course in Christian Doctrine.

The "new learning" inaugurated at the palace school, which seems to have had no fixed location, but to have followed the court from place to place, was not slow in spreading throughout the empire. Its first noticeable success was at Fulda, which since the days of its first abbot, Sturm, had maintained a tradition of fidelity to the ideals of St. Benedict. The man to whose enlightened zeal the success of the schools of Fulda was largely due was Rhabanus Maurus. While still a young monk at Fulda, Rhabanus, learning of the fame of Alcuin, begged to be sent to Tours, where, for a year, he listened to the aged teacher, and imbibed some of his zeal for the study of the classics and the cultivation of the sciences. On his return to Fulda he was placed at the head of the monastic school and, amid many difficulties, continued to labour for the intellectual reform of his own monastery and his own land. What these difficulties were we may judge from the treatment which he received at the hands of his abbot, Ratgar, who, believing that the monks were better employed in building churches than in studying their lessons, closed the school of the monastery and confiscated the teacher's note-books. Rhabanus' unpleasant experiences on this occasion are reflected by his saying: "He alone can escape calumny who writes nothing at all." He was not, however, discouraged, and the day finally came when, as Abbot of Fulda, he could give full authority to his measures for educational reform. Later, as Archbishop of Mainz, he continued to sustain the programme of the Carlovingian revival, and by his efforts for the improvement of popular preaching, and by his advocacy of the use of the vernacular tongue, earned the title of the "Teacher of Germany". His influence, indeed, may be traced beyond the territory which belonged to the monastery of Fulda; to him and to his educational activity is due the revival of learning in the schools of Solenhofen, Celle, Hirsfeld, Petersburg and Hirschau. Even Reichenau and St. Gall owe much to him, and it is perhaps no exaggeration to say that he is the inspiration of all those who, like Otfried of Weissenberg in Alsace, author of "Der Krist", first tried in the ninth century to make the Old High German an instrument of literary expression.

In France, the Carlovingian revival was, as has been

said, taken up by Theodulf, Bishop of Orléans, who, both by his own diocesan enactments and by the advice which he gave the emperor, proved his right to the title of Alcuin's successor. Alcuin, himself, after his retirement to the monastery of Tours, devoted his attention almost exclusively to monastic education and the transcription of liturgical and theological works. Whatever love he had for the classics changed towards the end of his life into a deep-seated suspicion of all "pagan literature." In this he offers a striking contrast with Lupus Servatus, a disciple of Rhabanus, who, as Abbot of Ferrières, early in the ninth century encouraged and promoted the study of the pagan classics with all the ardour of a fifteenth century Humanist. Through the influence of Alcuin, Theodulf, Lupus and others, the Carlovingian revival spread to Reims, Auxerre, Laon, and Chartres, where even before the schools of Paris had come into prominence, the foundations of scholastic theology and philosophy were laid. In Southern Germany and Switzerland the Carlovingian revival was felt before the close of the eighth century in Rheinau, Reichenau, and St. Gall, and early in the following century in Northern Italy, especially in Pavia and Bobbio. Under the successors of Charlemagne there sprang up the schools of Utrecht, Liège, and St. Laurent in the Low Countries which continued the movement.

With the extension and promotion of the Carlovingian revival of education are associated the names of the Irish teachers who were Alcuin's rivals and who are certainly entitled with him to a share in the credit of having been the first masters of the schools. According to the St. Gall chronicler who wrote the history of Charles the Great, two Irish monks arrived in France before Alcuin had received Charlemagne's invitation, and having made known somewhat boastfully their desire to teach wisdom, were received by the emperor with honour, and one of them placed at the head of the palace school. The story, however, is not accepted as reliable. We know for certain that after Alcuin left the court of Charlemagne, Clement the Irishman succeeded him as master of the palace school, and that he had pupils sent to him even from the monastery of Fulda. The grammarian, Cruindmelus, the poet Dungal, and Bishop Donatus of Fiesole were among the many Irish teachers on the Continent who enjoyed the favour of Charlemagne. Indeed, the emperor, according to Einhard, "loved the strangers" and "had the Irish in special esteem". His successors, likewise, invited the Irish teachers to their court. Louis the Pious was the patron of the Irish geographer Dicuil, Lothair II stood in a similar relation to the Irish poet and Scribe Sedulius, founder of the school at Liège, and Charles the Bald equalled his grandfather in his affectionate esteem for the Irish teachers. Under him Elias taught at Laon, Dunchad at Reims, Israel at Auxerre, and, the greatest of all the Irish scholars, John Scotus Eriugena, was head of the palace school. Naturally the Irish teachers flocked to the places already known to them by the missionary activity of their fellow-countrymen of former generations. We find them at Reichenau, St. Gall, and Bobbio, "a whole herd of philosophers" as a ninth century writer expresses it. Every monastery or cathedral school at which they appeared soon showed the effect of their influence. To the curriculum already in vogue in the Carlovingian Schools the Irish teachers added the study of Greek, and wherever they taught philosophy or theology (dialectic and the interpretation of the Scriptures) they drew largely from the writings of the neo-Platonists and from the works of the Greek Fathers.

With regard to the details of schoolwork in the institutions founded or reformed by Charlemagne, the chronicles of the time do not furnish us as much information as one would desire. We know that the course of studies in the town and village schools (*per villas et vicos*) comprised at least the elements of Christian Doctrine, plain-song, the rudiments of grammar, and perhaps, where the influence of St. Benedict's rule was still felt, some kind of manual training. In the monastic and cathedral schools the curriculum included grammar (corresponding to what we now call language-work in general, as well as the study of poetry), rhetoric, dialectic, geometry, arithmetic, music and astronomy. The text-book in these subjects was, wherever the Irish teaching prevailed, Martianus Capella, "De Nuptiis Mercurii et philologiæ"; elsewhere, as in the schools taught by Alcuin, the teacher compiled treatises on grammar, etc. from the works of Cassiodorus, St. Isidore of Seville, and Venerable Bede. In some instances the works of Boethius were used as texts in dialectic. The master, *scholasticus* or *archischolus* (earlier *capiscola*), had at his command, besides his assistants, a *proscholus*, or prefect of discipline, whose duty it was (in the monastic school of Fulda, at least) to teach the children "how to walk, how to bow to strangers, how to behave in the presence of superiors". The teacher read (*legere* was synonymous with *docere*) while the pupils took down his dictation in their wax-tablets. The "schoolroom" was, until as late as the twelfth century the cloister of the monastery and, in the case of some very popular teachers, the street or a public square. The floor of the schoolroom was strewn with straw on which the pupils sat—boarded floors and benches do not appear to have been in use in schools until the fifteenth century, although seats of a certain kind were provided at Cluny, in the twelfth century, namely, wooden boxes which served the double purpose of a seat and a repository for writing materials. Discipline in the Carlovingian schools was maintained by the *proscholus*, and that the medieval scholar dreaded the rod is clear from an episode in the history of the school of St. Gall where, in order to escape a birching, the boys set fire to the monastery. Regulations regarding neatness, the hours to be given to work, and provision for the mid-day siesta, etc. show that some attention was paid to the health and comfort of the pupils. After the death of Charlemagne and the dismemberment of the empire, the educational reforms introduced by him received a set-back. There was a brief period under Charles the Bald, when royal favour was once more bestowed on scholars. But with the advent of the tenth century came other cares and occupations for the royal mind. Nevertheless, the monastic and episcopal schools, and no doubt the village schools too, continued wherever war and pillage did not render their existence impossible. Thus the educational influence of the Carlovingian revival of learning was continued in some way down to the dawn of the era of university education in the thirteenth century.

MULLINGER, *The Schools of Charles the Great* (London, 1877); DRANE, *Christian Schools and Scholars* (London, 1867), I, 161 sq.; AZARIAS, *Essays Educational* (Chicago, 1896), 3 sq., 171 sq.; GASKOIN, *Alcuin, His Life and Work* (London, 1904); NEST, *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools* (New York, 1892); OZANAM, *La civilisation Chrétienne chez les Francs* (Paris, 1894); LAFORET, *Alcuin restaurateur des sciences, etc.* (Louvain, 1851); MONNIER, *Alcuin et son influence littéraire, etc.* (Paris, 1855); WERNER, *Alcuin u. sein Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1881). For documents, cf. *Mon. Ger. Hist., Legg.*, I, II; MANSI, *Amplissima Collectio, etc.*, XII; MAITRE, *Les écoles épiscopales et monastiques de l'Occident* (Paris, 1866); SPECHT, *Geschichte des Unterrichtswesens in Deutschland* (Stuttgart, 1883). For an account of the educational activity of the Irish teachers in the Carlovingian revival, cf. *Catholic University Bulletin* (1907), XIII, 382, 562.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Carmel (Heb. כַּרְמֶל, *Kármél*, "garden" or "garden-land"), designates in the O. T. a certain city and its adjacent territory in the tribe of Juda. The city was in the hill country of Juda, and its territory was contiguous to that of Maon, Ziph, and Jota (cf. Josue, xii, 22; xv, 20, 55). It was in Carmel that Saul set up the trophy of his victory over Amalec [I Kings (A. V., I Samuel), xv, 12]. As Nabal, a man

of Maon, was shearing his sheep in the pasture-land of Carmel, there occurred between him and David, then a fugitive from the anger of Saul, the episode in which Abigail, Nabal's wife, played so conspicuous a part (I Kings, xxv, 2, 5, 7, 40). It was apparently in Carmel of Juda that King Osias, son of Amasias, had arable lands and vineyards [II Paralipomenon (A. V., II Chronicles), xxvi, 10]. These simple Biblical data enable us to understand why this city and its district were actually called "Carmel"; in contrast to the wilderness a little farther to the south and to the east, the region appeared like a "garden" to the Hebrews of old, and the city naturally derived its name from that of the adjacent territory. In the fourth century of our era St. Jerome describes the town of Carmel as a village with a Roman garrison and speaks of the district as a mountain. In the time of the Crusades, the city was held by King Amalrich against Saladin, and then passed into oblivion till the nineteenth century, when it was recognized by travellers under the name of Kurmul. The place is now utterly desolate, but its ruins—conspicuous among which are three churches and a strong castle with bevelled stones—indicate a town of considerable extent and importance. The ruins of the town are about ten miles S.E. of Hebron, and close to those of Maon.

ROBINSON, *Biblical Researches*, II, 193–196 (Boston, 1841); STANLEY, *Sinai and Palestine*, 100, 479, 484 (New York, 1859); SMITH, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (New York, 1897), 306, 317, note.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Carmel, MOUNT, a well-known mountain ridge in Palestine, usually called in the Hebrew Bible הכרמל, *Hákkármél* (with the definite article), "the garden" or "the garden-land". In later Hebrew it is known simply as *Kármél*, and in modern Arabic as *Kurmul*, or more commonly as *Jebel Mâr Elias* (Mountain of St. Elias). At its extremity, near the sea, Mount Carmel looks like a bold promontory which all but runs into the waves of the Mediterranean. This north-western end of Carmel is about nine miles south-west of Acre, and in 32° 50′ N. lat. and 35° E. long. From this point, the ridge gradually retires from the coast and stretches south-east, ascending for about ten miles to its highest point and then sinking for nearly three miles more. Like its northern, its southern end is marked by a bold bluff above Wady el-Milh. This is the range of mountains which is usually designated under the name of Mount Carmel. The name is also applied at times to the lower hills which, for another twelve or thirteen miles, form the prolongation of the main range and extend to the south-east as far as the neighbourhood of Jenin. These lower hills, however, are of a softer formation than the main range of Carmel, and really separate it from the Hill Country, or central longitudinal section of Western Palestine. Hence they should rather be considered as forming a chain of heights distinct from Carmel, and be simply spoken of as hills of Samaria. The three principal summits of the main range of Carmel are far inferior in altitude to those of the mountains of either Galilee or Judea. Its highest peak, a little to the south of the Druse village of 'Esfiyeh, is only 1810 feet. Next in altitude comes the south-eastern summit of Carmel, near the ruins called El Mahraka, and some 1700 feet high; and last, the north-western promontory or cape of Carmel, where the Carmelite monastery is situated 560 feet above the sea. The general shape of the range is that of a triangle, the apex of which is near the Mediterranean, while the sides, to the east and west, look very different from each other. The western side sinks slowly by long ridges and dales upon that part of the sea-coast which is known as the plain of Saron. The eastern side, on the contrary, is abrupt above the plains of Haifa and Esdrelon, and in many places descends almost by precipices to the River Cison, which flows at the foot of the mountain and is generally parallel to its axis. Its geological structure is no other than that of the central longitudinal section of Palestine, west of the Jordan. It is made up of the same hard limestone. In it there are numerous caves, and it abounds in flints, geodes, and fossils. On the north-east, igneous rocks break out from a basalt formation which runs through the plain of Esdrelon and extends to the Sea of Galilee. As nearly the whole range of Carmel is covered with abundant and rich vegetable earth, it has still much of that appearance which no doubt was the origin of its name: "the garden" or "the garden-land". Most of the ridge is covered with thickets of evergreens. Besides the pine, its most common trees are the prickly oak, myrtle, lentisk, carob, and olive. Carmel is also remarkable for its profusion of aromatic plants and wild flowers. Its woody heights are tenanted chiefly by the roebuck, leopard, and wild cat. In various places of the range, ancient wine presses can still be pointed out; but the vine is almost entirely extinct except in the neighbourhood of 'Esfiyeh and of the German colony which was established in

CONVENT, MOUNT CARMEL

1869 near Haifa. Of its former numerous villages but a few are at present inhabited, and only small patches of land around these and near the sea-coast are now cultivated. Besides 'Esfiyeh, its principal extant villages are Et Tireh, Daliet El Kurmul, and Um Ez Zeinat. Most of the villagers are Druses and Christians. In the present day, Carmel belongs to the pashalic of Acre.

Mt. Carmel is never mentioned in the New Testament; but it is oftentimes spoken of in the Old Covenant. Its conquest is referred to the time of Josue (xii, 22), and its territory is given as forming the southern boundary of the tribe of Aser (xix, 26). Its luxuriant verdure, chiefly caused by the vicinity of the Mediterranean Sea and by abundant dew, was regarded as singularly beautiful; hence the poetical comparison, "thy head is like Carmel", found in the Canticle of Canticles (vii, 5; Heb., vii, 6), and the distinct reference to the "beauty of Carmel" in Isaias (xxxv, 2). As Nabuchodonosor towered proudly above the kings of the earth, so Carmel was prominent above the sea (Jer., xlvi, 18). Its great fertility made it the type of a country which was favoured with the Divine blessing (Jer., l, 19; Mich., vii, 14); and its devastation was conceived as the surest sign of God's severe punishment of His people (Is., xxxiii, 9; Jer., iv, 26; Amos, i, 2; Nah., i, 4). Its woody summits and its tortuous caverns formed a secure hiding place for a fugitive [Amos, ix, 3. See also III (A.V., I) K., xviii, 4, 13]. The sacredness of its heights was well known in ancient Israel. Apparently long before Elias' time —how long before cannot now be made out—an altar had been erected in honour of Yahweh on Mt. Carmel, and its ruins were repaired by that prophet as soon as this could be done with safety (III K., xviii, 30). It was the ridge of Carmel that the same Prophet

Elias chose for the assembly of the people, such assemblies being usually held at some holy place (III K., xviii, 19 sq.). Again, in IV K., iv, 23, there is a manifest allusion to the custom of resorting to Carmel for the celebration of the new moon and of the sabbath. From various passages of Holy Writ it has been inferred that this sacred mountain was the actual place of residence of both Elias and Eliseus (Cf. IV K., ii, 25; iv, 25, 27, etc.); and, as a matter of fact, Elias' grotto and the cavern known as the School of the Prophets are still pointed out. There is likewise some reason to believe that the incident told of Elias in IV K., i, 9–15, took place on the mountain of Carmel. In this passage our English translation speaks indeed of the prophet as sitting down on "a hill", when he caused fire to come down from heaven on the two "fifties" and their respective captains who had been sent by King Ochosias to put him under arrest. But the rendering of the Hebrew original word הרר by "a hill", which would naturally suggest a place different from the mountain range of Carmel, is very probably a defective one. The Hebrew expression rather means "the mountain" with an implicit reference to Mt. Carmel, since that expression, in connexion with Elias, is used for that range only, with the exception of Sinai, which, of course, is not intended in IV K., i, 19–15.

However this may be, there is another incident in Elias' life which Holy Writ distinctly places on the ridge of Carmel, and on account of which that mountain has been, and will ever be, particularly renowned. The event is narrated in detail in III K., xviii. It was that of a public contest between Elias, the great champion of Yahweh worship, and the prophets of Baal, the Phœnician deity whose cult had lately been fully organized by the wicked Achab in the new capital of the Northern Kingdom. For two years a severe drought, foretold by Elias, had prevailed in Israel. Yet it had not sufficed to convince the people that Yahweh, not Baal, was indeed the true God. In the third year, when the drought was about to be broken, Elias, according to the Lord's command, met King Achab, and obtained from him that all the people be gathered together with the prophets of Baal unto Mt. Carmel. There, in the presence of all, he, the only surviving prophet of the Lord, proposed that the God who would consume by fire a bullock laid upon wood and with no fire under it be alone recognized as God. The challenge was accepted. In vain did the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal call upon their sun-god till noon, nay even till the time of the evening sacrifice. It was now the turn of Elias. Having repaired an ancient altar of Yahweh by means of twelve stones, the prophet disposed the wood, laid a bullock upon it, and got filled with water the trench which he had dug around the whole. His prayer to Yahweh was heard. The fire from heaven consumed all, to the very water in the trench, and all the people seeing this worshipped, saying: "Yahweh is God. Yahweh is God". Then followed in rapid succession, the slaying of all the prophets of Baal who had been brought down to the brook Cison; Elias' prayer on the top of Carmel for rain and his repeated bidding to his servant: "Go up and look toward the sea"; the arising of a cloud, the forerunner of a violent storm; the king's prompt departure for Jezrahel, lest he should be stopped by the rain; and, lastly, Elias' swift running before Achab to the entrance of Jezrahel. The scene marked out alike by tradition and by natural features as the place of this glorious victory of Yahweh and Elias over Baal and his prophets is the south-eastern extremity of Mt. Carmel, the part of the mountain nearest to, and most accessible from Jezrahel. The place now known as El Marahka, "the burning" or "the sacrifice", is very probably the spot on which stood the altar of Yahweh which Elias repaired. It is marked by shapeless ruins whither Druses of neighbouring villages come to perform a yearly sacrifice. Its position, at the south-eastern point of the ridge, easily allowed the altars thereon erected to be seen by Achab and the priests of Baal and the multitude who stood on a wide upland sweep close beneath it. Not far from it there is a well always supplied with water even in the driest seasons, and from which Elias could draw the water with which he could fill the trench around his altar. On the lower declivities of the mountains is a mound called Tell El Kassis, which means "the hill of the priest", or "of the priests", which may mark the place where the prophets of Baal were put to death. The brook Cison which runs at the foot of Carmel was no doubt absolutely dry after the two years' drought, so that the multitude could easily go across its bed to witness Yahweh's victory on Mt. Carmel, and King Achab hasten across it to Jezrahel before the threatening storm should fill it with water and render it impassable. The corpses of the slain prophets of Baal were hurled down into the Cison, and when the brook was changed by the storm into an impetuous torrent, they were carried swiftly to the Mediterranean Sea. From the slaughter by the side of the river, the prophet of the Lord "went up" again to El Marahka, and there prayed fervently for the breaking of the drought. There, too, he naturally bade his servant to "go up and look toward the sea", for while from the place where he prayed the view of the Mediterranean is intercepted by an adjacent height, the height itself may be ascended in a few minutes and a full view of the sea be obtained from the top. Finally, both Achab and Elias having rushed down to the plain, safely crossed the Cison before the rain could interfere with them, because at this point the river is very close to Mt. Carmel.

Thus it can readily be seen that the traditional site of the public contest between Elias and the prophets of Baal fulfils all the conditions required by the sacred narrative. The last Scriptural reference to the Carmel range is found in the opening chapter of the deutero-canonical book of Judith. There we find stated that the inhabitants of Carmel were numbered among the peoples of the Western districts whom Nabuchodonosor threatened with destruction, should they venture to deny him help in his present conflict with powerful enemies (Judith, i, 8, in Vulgate and in Septuagint). There also we are told that despite his menaces, they all, "with one mind", refused to obey his orders, whereupon the Assyrian king swore to avenge himself of them (Judith, i, 11, 12). In ancient times the sacredness of Carmel seems to have been known to other nations besides Israel. Thus in the list of places conquered by the Egyptian King Thothmes III, there is a probable reference at No. 48 to the "holy headland" of Carmel (see also Nos. 49, 96, in "Records of the Past", new series, V, 47, 50). In the fourth century B. C. the neo-Platonic philosopher Iamblicus, in his life of Pythagoras, speaks of Mt. Carmel as "sacred above all mountains and forbidden of access to the vulgar". The great Roman historian, Tacitus, mentions an altar as erected there without temple or image: "tantum ara et reverentia"; and Suetonius, in his "Lives of the Cæsars", narrates that before making war against the Jews Vespasian went to Carmel and consulted the oracle of its god. After the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (70 A. D.), the Jews did not lose sight of the mountain of Carmel and of its connexion with Elias. In the twelfth century of our era Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela writes as follows in the narrative of his journey to Palestine: "Under the mountain of Carmel are many Jewish sepulchres, and near the summit is the cavern of Elias upon whom be peace. . . . On the summit of the hill, you may still trace the site of the altar which was rebuilt by Elias of blessed memory, in the time of King Achab, and the circumference of which is

about four yards". Rabbis of the thirteenth and following centuries make similar references to Elias in connexion with Mt. Carmel; and it is well known that in the eighteenth century the Jews used to join with the Mohammedans and the Christians to celebrate the feast of that holy prophet on the mountain which bears his name, "Jebel Mâr Elîas". As we have seen, the traditional site of Elias' contest is still held sacred by the Druses. But it is Christianity which, through its pious pilgrims and its Carmelite monks, has chiefly contributed to preserve the sacred memories of Mt. Carmel. The best positions from which to view the extensive prospect are furnished by the flat roof of the Carmelite monastery at the north-western end of the mountain, and by the platform of the chapel recently erected by the Carmelites at its south-eastern extremity.

WRIGHT, *Early Travels in Palestine* (London, 1848); ROBINSON, *Biblical Researches* (Boston, 1841), III; GUÉRIN, *Description de la Palestine*, etc. (Paris, 1876), II; CONDER, *Tent Work in Palestine* (London, 1889); THOMSON, *The Land and the Book* (New York, 1882), II; SMITH, *Hist. Geogr. of the Holy Land* (New York, 1897); BAEDEKER, *Palestine and Syria* (4th ed., New York, 1906).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Carmelite Order, THE, one of the mendicant orders.—*Origin.*—The date of the foundation of the Order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel has been under discussion from the fourteenth century to the present day, the order claiming for its founders the prophets Elias and Eliseus, whereas modern historians, beginning with Baronius, deny its existence previous to the second half of the twelfth century. As early as the times of the Prophet Samuel there existed in the Holy Land a body of men called Sons of the Prophets, who in many respects resembled religious institutes of later times. They led a kind of community life, and, though not belonging to the Tribe of Levi, dedicated themselves to the service of God; above all they owed obedience to certain superiors, the most famous of whom were Elias and his successor Eliseus, both connected with Carmel, the former by his encounter with the prophets of Baal, the latter by prolonged residence on the holy mountain. With the downfall of the Kingdom of Israel the Sons of the Prophets disappear from history. In the third or fourth century of the Christian Era Carmel was a place of pilgrimage, as is proved by numerous Greek inscriptions on the walls of the School of the Prophets: "Remember Julianus, remember Germanicius", etc. Several of the Fathers, notably John Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Jerome, represent Elias and Eliseus as the models of religious perfection and the patrons of hermits and monks. These undeniable facts have opened the way to certain conjectures. As St. John the Baptist spent nearly the whole of his life in the desert, where he gathered around him a number of disciples, and as Christ said he was endowed with the spirit and virtue of Elias, some authors think that he revived the institute of the Sons of the Prophets.

The glowing descriptions given by Pliny, Flavius Josephus, and Philo, of the manner of life of the Essenes and Therapeutes convinced others that these sects belonged to the same corporation; unfortunately their orthodoxy is open to serious doubts. Tacitus mentions a sanctuary on Carmel, consisting "neither of a temple, nor an idol, but merely an altar for Divine worship"; whatever its origin may have been, it certainly was at the time of Vespasian in the hands of a pagan priest, Basilides. Pythagoras (500 B. C.) is represented by Jamblichus (A. D. 300) as having spent some time in silent prayer in a similar sanctuary on Carmel, a testimony of greater force for the time of Jamblichus himself than for that of Pythagoras. Nicephorus Callistus (A. D. 1300) relates that the Empress Helena built a church in honour of St. Elias on the slopes of a certain mountain. This evidence is, however, inadmissible, inasmuch as Eusebius is witness to the fact that she built only two churches in the Holy Land, at Bethlehem and at Jerusalem, not twenty, as Nicephorus says; moreover the words of this author show clearly that he had in view the Greek monastery of Mar Elias, overhanging the Jordan valley, and not Carmel as some authors think; Mar Elias, however, belongs to the sixth century. These and other misunderstood quotations have enfeebled rather than strengthened the tradition of the order, which holds that from the days of the great Prophets there has been, if not an uninterrupted, at least a moral succession of hermits on Carmel, first under the Old Dispensation, afterwards in the full light of Christianity, until at the time of the Crusades these hermits became organized after the fashion of the Western orders. This tradition is officially laid down in the constitutions of the order, is mentioned in many papal Bulls, as well as in the Liturgy of the Church, and is still held by many members of the order.

The silence of Palestine pilgrims previous to A. D. 1150, of chroniclers, of early documents, in one word the negative evidence of history has induced modern historians to disregard the claims of the order, and to place its foundation in or about the year 1155 when it is first spoken of in documents of undoubted authenticity. Even the evidence of the order itself was not always very explicit. A notice written between 1247 and 1274 (Mon. Hist. Carmelit., 1, 20, 267) states in general terms that "from the days of Elias and Eliseus the holy fathers of the Old and the New Dispensation dwelt on Mount Carmel, and that their successors after the Incarnation built there a chapel in honour of Our Lady, for which reason they were called in papal Bulls "Friars of Blessed Mary of Mount Carmel". The General Chapter of 1287 (unedited) speaks of the order as of a plantation of recent growth (*plantatio novella*). More definite are some writings of about the same time. A letter "On the progress of his Order" ascribed to St. Cyril of Constantinople, but written by a Latin (probably French) author about the year 1230, and the book "On the Institution of the First Monks" connect the order with the Prophets of the Old Law. This latter work, mentioned for the first time in 1342, was published in 1370 and became known in England half a century later. It purports to be written by John, the forty-fourth (more accurately the forty-second) Bishop of Jerusalem (A. D. 400). However, as Gennadius and other ancient bibliographers do not mention it among the writings of John, and as the author was clearly a Latin, since his entire argument is based upon certain texts of the Vulgate differing widely from the corresponding passages of the Septuagint, and as he in many ways proves his entire ignorance of the Greek language, and, moreover, quotes or alludes to writers of the twelfth century, he cannot have lived earlier than the middle of the thirteenth. A third author is sometimes mentioned, Joseph, a Deacon of Antioch, whom Possevin assigns to about A. D. 130. His work is lost but its very title, "Speculum perfectæ militiæ primitivæ ecclesiæ", proves that he cannot have belonged to the Apostolic Fathers, as indeed he is entirely unknown to patristic literature. His name is not mentioned before the fourteenth century and in all probability he did not live much earlier.

The tradition of the order, while admitted by many of the medieval Schoolmen, was contested by not a few authors. Hence the Carmelite historians neglected almost completely the history of their own times, spending all their energy on controversial writings, as is evident in the works of John Baconthorpe, John of Chimineto, John of Hildesheim, Bernard Olerius, and many others. In 1374 a disputation was held before the University of Cambridge between the Dominican John Stokes and the Carmelite John of Hornehy; the latter, whose arguments were chiefly

taken from canon law, not from history, was declared victorious and the members of the university were forbidden to question the antiquity of the Carmelite Order. Towards the end of the fifteenth century this was again ably defended by Trithemius (or whoever wrote under his name), Bostius, Palæonydorus, and many others who with a great display of learning strove to strengthen their thesis, filling in the gaps in the history of the order by claiming for it numerous ancient saints. Sts. Eliseus and Cyril of Alexandria (1399), Basil (1411), Hilarion (1490), and Elias (in some places c. 1480, in the whole order from 1551) had already been placed on the Carmelite calendar; the chapter of 1564 added many more, some of whom were dropped out twenty years later on the occasion of a revision of the Liturgy, but were reintroduced in 1609 when Cardinal Bellarmine acted as reviser of Carmelite legends. He, too, approved with certain reservations the legend of the feast of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, 16 July, which had been instituted between 1376 and 1386 in commemoration of the approbation of the rule by Honorius III; it now (1609) became the "Scapular feast", was declared the principal feast of the order, and was extended to the whole Church in 1726. The tendency of claiming for the order saints and other renowned persons of Christian and even classical antiquity came to a climax in the "Paradisus Carmelitici decoris" by M. A. Alegre de Casanate, published in 1639, condemned by the Sorbonne in 1642, and placed on the Roman Index in 1649. Much that is uncritical may also be found in the annals of the order by J.-B. de Lezana (1645-56) and in "Decor Carmeli" by Philip of the Blessed Trinity (1665). On the publication, in 1668, of the third volume of March of the Bollandists, in which Daniel Papebroch asserted that the Carmelite Order was founded in 1155 by St. Berthold, there arose a literary war of thirty years' duration and almost unequalled violence. The Holy See, appealed to by both sides, declined to place the Bollandists on the Roman Index, although they had been put on the Spanish Index, but imposed silence on both parties (1698). On the other hand it permitted the erection of a statue of St. Elias in the Vatican Basilica among the founders of orders (1725), towards the cost of which (4064 scudi or $3942) each section of the order contributed one fourth part. At the present time the question of the antiquity of the Carmelite Order has hardly more than academical interest.

Foundations in Palestine.—The Greek monk John Phocas who visited the Holy Land in 1185 relates that he met on Carmel a Calabrian (i. e. Western) monk who some time previously, on the strength of an apparition of the Prophet Elias, had gathered around him about ten hermits with whom he led a religious life in a small monastery near the grotto of the prophet. Rabbi Benjamin de Tudela had already in 1163 reported that the Christians had built there a chapel in honour of Elias. Jacques de Vitry and several other writers of the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries give similar accounts. The exact date of the foundation of the hermitage may be gathered from the life of Aymeric, Patriarch of Antioch, a relative of the "Calabrian" monk, Berthold; on the occasion of a journey to Jerusalem in 1154 or the following year he appears to have visited the latter and assisted him in the establishment of the small community; it is further reported that on his return to Antioch (c. 1160) he took with him some of the hermits, who founded a convent in that town and another on a neighbouring mountain; both were destroyed in 1268. Under Berthold's successor, Brocard, some doubts arose as to the proper form of life of the Carmelite hermits. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, Albert de Vercelli, then residing at Tyre, settled the difficulty by writing a short rule, part of which is literally taken from that of St. Augustine (c. 1210). The hermits were to elect a prior to whom they should promise obedience; they were to live in cells apart from one another, where they had to recite the Divine Office according to the Rite of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, or, if unable to read, certain other prayers, and to spend their time in pious meditation varied by manual labour. Every morning they met in chapel for Mass, and on Sundays also for chapter. They were to have no personal property; their meals were to be served in their cells; but they were to abstain from flesh meat except in cases of great necessity, and they had to fast from the middle of September until Easter. Silence was not to be broken between Vespers and Terce of the following day, while from Terce till Vespers they were to guard against useless talk. The prior was to set a good example by humility, and the brothers were to honour him as the representative of Christ.

Migration to Europe.—As will be seen from this short abstract no provision was made for any further organization beyond the community on Carmel itself, whence it must be inferred that until 1210 no other foundation had been made except those at and near Antioch, which were probably subject to the patriarch of that city. After that date new communities sprang up at Saint Jean d'Acre, Tyre, Tripoli, Jerusalem, in the Quarantena, somewhere in Galilee (*monasterium Valini*), and in some other localities which are not known, making in all about fifteen. Most of these were destroyed almost as soon as they were built, and at least in two of them some of the brothers were put to death by the Saracens. Several times the hermits were driven from Carmel, but they always found means to return; they even built a new monastery in 1263 (in conformity with the revised rule) and a comparatively large church, which was still visible towards the end of the fifteenth century. However, the position of Christians had become so precarious as to render emigration necessary. Accordingly colonies of hermits were sent out to Cyprus, Sicily, Marseilles, and Valenciennes (c. 1238). Some brothers of English nationality accompanied the Barons de Vescy and Grey on their return journey from the expedition of Richard, Earl of Cornwall (1241), and made foundations at Hulne near Alnwick in Northumberland, Bradmer (Norfolk), Aylesford, and Newenden (Kent). St. Louis, King of France, visited Mount Carmel in 1254 and brought six French hermits to Charenton near Paris where he gave them a convent. Mount Carmel was taken by the Saracens in 1291, the brothers, while singing the Salve Regina, were put to the sword, and the convent was burnt.

Character and Name.—With the migration of the Carmelites to Europe begins a new period in the history of the order. Little more than the bare names of the superiors of the first period has come down to us: St. Berthold, St. Brocard, St. Cyril, Berthold (or Bartholomew), and Alan (1155–1247). At the first chapter held at Aylesford, St. Simon Stock was elected general (1247–65). As the oldest biographical notice concerning him dates back only to 1430 and is not very reliable, we must judge the man from his works. He found himself in a difficult position. Although the rule had been granted about 1210 and had received papal approbation in 1226, many prelates refused to acknowledge the order, believing it to be founded in contravention of the Lateran Council (1215) which forbade the institution of new orders. In fact the Carmelite Order as such was only approved by the Second Council of Lyons (1274), but St. Simon obtained from Innocent IV an interim approbation, as well as certain modifications of the rule (1247). Henceforth foundations were no longer restricted to deserts but might be made in cities and the suburbs of towns; the solitary life was abandoned for community life; meals were to be taken in common; the abstinence, though not dispensed with, was

rendered less stringent; the silence was restricted to the time between Compline and Prime of the following day; donkeys and mules might be kept for travelling and the transport of goods, and fowls for the needs of the kitchen. Thus the order ceased to be eremitical and became one of the mendicant orders. Its first title, *Fratres eremitæ de Monte Carmeli*, and, after the building of a chapel on Carmel in honour of Our Lady (c. 1220), *Eremitæ Sanctæ Mariæ de Monte Carmeli*, was now changed into *Fratres Ordinis Beatissimæ Virginis Mariæ de Monte Carmeli*. By an ordinance of the Apostolic Chancery of 1477 it was further amplified, *Fratres Ordinis Beatissimæ Dei Genitricis semperque Virginis Mariæ de Monte Carmeli*, which title was rendered obligatory by the General Chapter of 1680.

Having obtained the mitigation of the rule, St. Simon Stock, who was altogether in favour of the active life, opened houses at Cambridge (1249), Oxford (1253), London (about the same time), York (1255), Paris (1259), Bologna (1260), Naples (date uncertain), etc. He strove especially to implant the order at the universities, partly to secure for the religious the advantages of a higher education, partly to increase the number of vocations among the undergraduates. Although the zenith of the mendicant orders had already passed he was successful in both respects. The rapid increase of convents and novices, however, proved dangerous; the rule being far stricter than those of St. Francis and St. Dominic, discouragement and discontent seized many of the brothers, while the bishops and the parochial clergy continued to offer resistance to the development of the order. He died a centenarian before peace was fully restored. With the election of Nicholas Gallicus (1265–71) a reaction set in; the new general, being much opposed to the exercise of the sacred ministry, favoured exclusively the contemplative life. To this end he wrote a lengthy letter entitled "Ignea sagitta" (unedited) in which he condemned in greatly exaggerated terms what he called the dangerous occupations of preaching and hearing confessions. His words remaining unheeded, he resigned his office, as did also his successor, Radulphus Alemannus (1271–74), who belonged to the same school of thought.

Habit.—The approbation of the order by the Second Council of Lyons secured its permanent position among the mendicant orders, sanctioned the exercise of the active life, and removed every obstacle to its development, which thenceforth went on by leaps and bounds. Under Peter de Millaud (1274–94) a change was made in the habit. Hitherto it had consisted of a tunic, girdle, scapular, and hood of either black, brown or grey colour (the colour became subject to numberless changes according to the different subdivisions and reforms of the order), and of a mantle composed of four white and three black vertical stripes or rays, whence the friars were popularly called *Fratres barrati*, or *virgulati*, or *de pica* (magpie). In 1287 this variegated mantle was exchanged for one of pure white wool which caused them to be called Whitefriars.

The Thirteenth Century.—Besides the generals already mentioned, the thirteenth century saw two saints of the order, Angelus and Albert of Sicily. Very little is known of the former, his biography, purporting to be written by his brother Enoch, Patriarch of Jerusalem, being a work of the fifteenth century; in those portions in which it can be controlled by contemporary evidence it is proved to be unreliable, e. g. when it establishes a whole Greek hierarchy at Jerusalem during the period of the Crusades; or when it gives the acts of an apocryphal Council of Alexandria together with the names of seventy bishops supposed to have taken part in it. These and some other particulars being altogether unhistorical, it is difficult to say how much credence it deserves in other matters for which there is no independent evidence. It is, however, worthy of notice that the Breviary lessons from 1458, when the feast of St. Angelus first appears, until 1579 represent him simply as a Sicilian by birth and say nothing of his Jewish descent, his birth and conversion at Jerusalem, etc. Nor is there any positive evidence as to the time when he lived or the year and the cause of his martyrdom. According to some sources he was put to death by heretics (probably Manichæans), but, according to later authors, by a man whom he had publicly reproved for grave scandal. Again, the oldest legends of St. Francis and St. Dominic say nothing of a meeting of the three saints in Rome or their mutual prophecies concerning the stigmata, the rosary, and the martyrdom. The life of St. Albert, too, was written a long time after his death by one who had no personal recollection of him and was more anxious to edify the reader by an account of numerous miracles (frequently in exaggerated terms), than to state sober facts. All that can be said with certainty is that St. Albert was born in Sicily, entered the order very young, in consequence of a vow made by his parents, that for some time he occupied the position of provincial, and that he died in the odour of sanctity on 7 August, 1306. Though he was never formally canonized, his feast was introduced in 1411.

Foundations in the British Isles.—The English province, to which the Irish and Scotch houses belonged until 1305, made rapid progress until about the middle of the fourteenth century, after which date foundations became less numerous, while from time to time some of the smaller houses were given up. The Carmelites enjoyed the favour of the Crown, which contributed generously towards several foundations, particularly that of Oxford, where the royal residence was handed over to the order. The site is now occupied by the Beaufort Hotel, but there may still be seen Friars' Walk, and the little church of St. Mary Magdalen which for a time was served by the Carmelites. Other royal foundations were Hitchin, Marlborough, etc. John of Gaunt was a great benefactor of the order and chose his confessors from amongst its members; the House of Lancaster likewise almost always had Carmelites as royal confessors, a post which corresponded to some extent to that of royal almoner or minister of public worship. These confessors were as a rule promoted to small bishoprics in Ireland or Wales. The order became very popular among the people. The life was one of deep poverty, as is proved by various inventories of goods and other documents still extant. During the Wycliffite troubles the order took the leadership of the Catholic party, the first opponent of Wyclif being the Provincial of the Carmelites, John Cunningham. Thomas Walden was entrusted by Henry V with important missions abroad, and accompanied Henry VI to France. During the wars with France several French convents were attached to the English province, so that the number of English Carmelites rose to fifteen hundred. But ultimately there remained only the house at Calais, which was suppressed by Henry VIII. At the end of the fifteenth century the province had dwindled down to about six hundred religious.

None of the various reforms seems to have been introduced into England, although Eugene IV and the general, John Soreth, took steps in this direction. The peculiar constitutions in vigour in England, and the excellent organization of the province rendered the spread of abuses less to be feared than elsewhere. At the beginning of the Reformation a number of the junior religious, affected by the new learning, left the order; the remainder were compelled to sign the Act of Supremacy, which they apparently did without hesitation, a fact not much to be wondered at if it be borne in mind that Cardinal Wolsey had already obtained power from the Holy See to visit and reform

the Carmelite convents, a measure which left no alternative but blind submission to the royal will or suppression. Separated from the rest of the order, the Carmelites were for a time subjected to the rule of George Brown, general of all the mendicants, but gained a comparative independence under John Byrd, first provincial and then general of the English section of the order. At the time of the final suppression there were thirty-nine houses, including that of Calais. The suppression papers are very far from complete, exhibiting the names of only about 140 religious, and containing the inventories of less than a dozen houses. These were in a state of abject poverty. At Oxford the friars had been obliged to sell the benches of the church and the trees in the road, and the commissioner stated that soon they would have to sell the tiles off the roof, to buy a few loaves of bread. Yet one of the novices, Anthony Foxton, nothing daunted by this trying situation, fled to Northallerton to continue his novitiate, whence a few weeks later he was expelled for the second time. The property of the order was squandered with the same recklessness as other ecclesiastical goods. The library of the London house, considered one of the finest in England (this applies in all probability to the building, not to its contents, which bear no comparison with other monastic libraries of that period), came into the possession of Dr. Butt. The other buildings were sold in parcels. Only two Carmelites are known to have suffered death, Lawrence Cook and Reginald Pecock; others seem to have recanted in prison. But as practically nothing is known of the fate of a large number of convents, especially those of the North, it is more than probable that during the different risings some were burnt and their inmates hanged. Among the few remains of the English Carmelite convents must be mentioned the first two foundations, Hulne, now a ruin, and Aylesford, in a fairly good state of preservation, and also the beautiful cloister in what is now the workhouse for male paupers at Coventry. An attempt to revive the English province during the reign of Queen Mary was unsuccessful.

The history of the Irish and Scotch provinces has never been exhaustively studied, owing chiefly to the loss of many documents. The total number of Irish convents is variously given as twenty-five or twenty-eight, but in all probability some of these had but a short-lived existence. The fact that the general chapters repeatedly appointed Englishmen as provincials for Ireland seems to indicate that the province was frequently troubled by disunion and strife. At an early epoch the Dublin house was designated a *studium generale*, but as it is never mentioned as such in the official lists it probably served only for the Irish students, foreign provinces not being required to send their contingent. For the pursuit of higher studies special facilities were given to the Irish and Scotch in London and at the English universities. The Irish convents fell without exception under the iron hand of Henry VIII.

The Scotch province numbered at the utmost twelve convents, of which that of South Queensferry at the foot of the Forth Bridge is still extant. Here again we have to content ourselves with stray notices, from which, however, it is manifest that the order was in high favour with the Crown. Some Scotch Carmelites played an important part at the University of Paris, while others were among the chief promoters of the Reform of Albi. At the suppression of the English convents many religious betook themselves to Scotland where convents were allowed to exist as best they could until 1564.

Constitutions.—The oldest constitutions that have come down to us are dated 1324, but there is evidence of a former collection begun about 1256 to supplement the rule, which lays down only certain leading principles. In 1324 the order was divided into fifteen provinces corresponding to the countries in which it was established. At the head of the order was the general, elected in open *scrutinium* (ballot) by the general chapter; at each successive chapter he had to render an account of his administration and if no serious complaints were made he was confirmed in his office until he was removed by the nomination to a bishopric, or by death, or until he resigned of his own accord. He chose his own residence which from 1472 was usually Rome. He was given two companions (generally of his own choice) to accompany him on his journeys and to assist him with advice. The whole order contributed annually a fixed amount towards the maintenance of the general and the costs of the administration. In theory, at least, the power of the general was almost unlimited but in practice he could not afford to disregard the wishes of the provinces and provincials. The general chapter assembled fairly regularly every third year from 1247 to the end of the fourteenth century; but from that period onward the intervals became much longer, six, ten, even sixteen years. The chapters had become a heavy burden, not only for the order but also for the towns which accorded them hospitality. Each province (their number was constantly increasing) was represented by the provincial and two companions. In addition to these there was a gathering of masters in divinity and promising students who held theological disputations, while the definitors discussed the affairs of the order; as the Holy See usually granted indulgences on the occasion of chapters, the pulpits of the cathedral and parochial and conventual churches were occupied several times a day by eloquent preachers; travelling being performed on horseback, each province sent a number of lay brothers to care for the horses.

Thus the general chapters were always attended by large numbers of friars, from five hundred to a thousand and more. To defray the costs each provincial was bound to ask his sovereign for a subsidy, the English Crown contributing as a rule ten pounds, while board and lodging for the members of the chapter were found in other religious houses and among the townspeople. In return the order used to grant the town letters of fraternity and to place its patron saints on the Carmelite calendar. For the election of the general all the provincials and their companions assembled, but the remaining business was entrusted to the definitors, one for each province; these were chosen at the provincial chapter in such a way that no one could act in this capacity in two successive chapters. The duty of the definitors was to receive reports on the administration of the provinces; to confirm provincials or to depose them, and elect others in their stead; to audit the accounts and fix the annual taxation; to nominate those who were to lecture on Scripture and the Sentences at the universities, especially Paris; to grant permission for the reception of academical honours at the expense of the whole order; to revise and interpret existing laws and add new ones; and finally, to grant privileges to deserving members, deal with those guilty of serious offences by meting out adequate punishment, or, if cause were shown for leniency, by relaxing or condoning previous sentences. This done, the whole chapter was again called together, the decisions of the definitors were published and handed in writing to each provincial. Of the records of the earlier chapters only fragments are now to be found, but from 1318 the acts are complete and have partly been printed.

The provincial chapters were held as a rule once a year, but there were complaints that some provincials held only two in three years. Each convent was represented by the prior or vicar and by one companion elected by the conventual chapter to take complaints against the prior. Out of the whole

number of capitulars four definitors were chosen who together with the provincial performed much the same duties on behalf of the province as did the definitory of the general chapter on behalf of the whole order. Among other things they had full authority to depose priors and to elect new ones; they also selected students to be sent to the various *studia generalia* and *particularia*, and to the universities, and made adequate provision for their expenses. They decided—subject to the approval of the general and the Holy See—on the foundation of new convents. They dealt with delinquents. Attempts were made from time to time to limit the duration of the office of provincials, but so long as the general legislation of the Church tolerated an indefinite tenure of office these endeavours were practically unavailing.

The superior of a convent was the prior, or in his absence and during a vacancy the vicar. The prior was controlled in his administration by three guardians who held the keys of the common chest and countersigned bills and contracts. Complaints against the prior were sent to the provincial or to the provincial chapter. There was no limit to the tenure of office of the prior; he might be confirmed year after year for twenty or more years. In the case of convents in university towns, especially Paris and the Roman Curia (Avignon, afterwards Rome) the nomination belonged to the general or the general chapter; and there appears to have been an unwritten law that at Cambridge, Louvain, and other universities the priorship should be filled by the bachelor who in the course of the year was to take his degree as Master in Divinity. From about the middle of the fourteenth century it became customary to fill the offices of general, provincial, and prior (at least in the larger convents) exclusively with those who had taken degrees. Almost the only systematic exception to this rule is to be found in the province of Upper Germany.

Sources of Membership.—When St. Simon Stock established convents in university towns he obviously counted upon the undergraduates as the future recruits of the order; nor was he deceived in his expectation. True, the time had passed when in one day sixty or more students with their professors flocked to the Dominican convent at Paris to receive the habit from the hands of Blessed Jordan. But there were still many applicants, notwithstanding the severe by-laws of the universities regulating the reception of students in mendicant convents. It was perhaps chiefly the poor scholars who by joining one of these orders secured for themselves the necessaries of life as well as the means of education. Not only in the time of St. Simon but even much later a good deal of trouble was caused by these young men, who had recently exchanged the free and easy life of the scholar for the discipline of the cloister. In many convents we find numerous instances of members of the families of the founders and chief benefactors becoming conventuals; in some cases the relationship of uncle and nephew may be traced through several centuries; just as the prebends of cathedrals and collegiate churches were often in the gift of the founder and his family and were handed down from generation to generation, the more humble cells of a Carmelite convent remained frequently in the hands of one and the same family who considered it their duty as well as their right to be ever represented by at least one member. Again, it frequently happened that a father desirous of settling his son in life bought or endowed a cell for him in a convent. It was probably due to the ardent piety of former times and the careful preservation from dangerous society that such casual calls ripened into solid vocations. In places where the Carmelites had public or semi-public schools they found little difficulty in choosing suitable boys. But there remained a good many convents in small places, where the recruiting was evidently not so easy and where with a decreasing number of inmates a dangerous relaxation of religious observance went hand in hand. For, throughout the Middle Ages a friar belonged to the convent in which he had taken the habit, although through force of circumstances he might be absent from it for the greater part of his life. Hence, the general chapters repeatedly commanded the priors to receive every year one or two promising young men even if they brought no endowment, so as to gradually increase the number of religious. In other cases where provinces were numerous enough but lacked the means of subsistence the reception of novices might be stopped for several years.

Probation and Formation of Members.—The clothing of novices was preceded by certain inquiries into their antecedents and the respectability of their families. The year of probation was spent in the convent which they entered, the "native convent" as it was called, and a father was commissioned to take personal care of a novice, teaching him the customs of the order and the ceremonies of the choir. According to the oldest constitutions, each novice might have a special master, but in practice one master, assisted, if necessary, by a substitute, was appointed for all. The novices were not allowed to mingle with the rest of the community or with the boys of the convent school; no office that in any way could interfere with their chief duty, viz. learning the Divine Office, was given them. On the other hand the prior was not to allow anyone to reprehend the novices or find fault with them, except the novice-master himself, whose business it was to teach, correct, guide, and encourage them. Towards the end of the novitiate the probationer was voted on; if he had given satisfaction he was allowed to make his profession, otherwise he was dismissed. One of the conditions for profession was that the novice should be able to read fluently and write correctly. Those who might smile at such elementary requirements should remember that reading and writing implied a complete mastery of the Latin grammar and a practical knowledge of the system of abbreviations and contractions, a knowledge of palæography which is not now required either of schoolboys or advanced scholars.

After profession the provincial decided what was to be done with the young religious. He might stand in need of further training in grammar and rhetoric, or he might begin at once the study of physics and logic. If his own convent offered no facility for these pursuits, which was probably seldom the case, he would be sent to another. Once a week or a fortnight the teacher would hold a repetition with his scholars in presence of the community so that it might become known who had studied and who had been negligent. Special convents were assigned for the study of philosophy and theology; in England the former was taught at Winchester, the latter at Coventry. The higher studies were, however, pursued at the *studia generalia* of which in 1324 there were eight: Paris, Toulouse, Bologna, Florence, Montpellier, Cologne, London, and Avignon. Their number was gradually increased until each province had its own, but in earlier times every province was bound to send a certain number of students to each of these *studia*, and to provide for their maintenance; they were even free to send a larger number than prescribed, but they had to pay for the full number even if they sent less. In addition to the students sent to the *studia* at the expense of their provinces, others might be sent at the expense of their parents and friends, provided the superiors had given their consent. Thus the number of students at the Carmelite convent at Paris averaged three hundred, in London over a hundred. The majority of students were sent *pro simplici formâ*, that is just to complete their course, after which they returned to their provinces. Only the most promising were allowed to study for degrees, because this

involved a prolonged residence at the universities, ten, twelve or more years, and a corresponding outlay. (For the course of studies and the various steps leading to the degree of Master in Divinity see UNIVERSITIES.) The provincial and general chapters regulated the succession of lecturers on Scripture and the Sentences; particularly at Paris, the foremost university, provision was often made for ten years in advance, so as to ensure a steady supply of able readers and to distribute as far as possible the honours among all the provinces. For the universities would allow only one friar of each of the mendicant orders to take degrees in the course of a year, and each order was naturally anxious to put its most capable men in the foreground. It was therefore not an idle boast when it was said, as we read sometimes, of one or other of the Carmelites, that he was the best lecturer of his term at Paris. As Paris was the most celebrated university, so the doctors of Paris had precedence over those of the other universities. During the schism Paris took sides with the Clementist party whose most powerful support it was. The Urbanist party in the Carmelite Order transferred the prerogatives of the graduates of Paris to those of Bologna, a poor makeshift. There exists a fairly complete list of the Masters of Paris, but only fragmentary information concerning other universities. Unfortunately the register of the English province was destroyed during the Reformation, while the greater part of the archives of Oxford and Cambridge were lost during the Civil War, so that the priceless notices collected by John Bale are the chief sources for our knowledge of Carmelite activity at the English universities. This is the more regrettable as the position of Carmelite friars was regulated by special statutes often alluded to, but nowhere preserved. On their return from the universities the religious were usually appointed to some readership, care being taken that in every convent there should be a daily lecture on Scripture and theology.

Penalties Established by Rule.—The constitutions deal very fully with the faults committed by religious and their punishment. A few words will not be out of place with regard to more serious breaches of discipline, especially the violation of the religious vows. Faults against chastity were punished with six months', or, if notorious, with a year's, imprisonment, and the loss of voice and place in chapter for from three to five years. If special circumstances required it this punishment was increased, and in the case of a grave scandal the culprit was sent to the galleys for hard labour for a number of years or even for the remainder of his life. If serious suspicion existed against anyone which it was impossible either to prove or to disprove, the accused was allowed the benefit of canonical purgation, i. e. having himself denied the charge on oath, he produced six other religious of good name and high standing to affirm on oath that they considered the charge unfounded and the accused innocent. If unable to find such witnesses, he was punished as though he had been convicted. Other faults that recur frequently were open disobedience and rebellion against the commands of the superiors, the undue exercise of proprietorship, theft, apostasy (by which was understood any absence from the convent without proper permission, even if there was no intention of quitting the order permanently). Thus, if a religious, being sent from one place to another, tarried on the road without proper cause, or went out of his way without necessity, he was punished as an apostate; again, a lecturer at the universities leaving town before the end of the course was judged guilty of the same crime, his action being prejudicial to the honour of the order. In all these matters it must be borne in mind that the penal system of the Middle Ages was far less humane than the modern one, and that many faults were ascribed to perversity of will where we should make allowance for weakness of character or even mental derangement. The more serious faults were judged and punished by the provincial and general chapters, to whom also was reserved the absolution of the culprits and their reinstatement. The general chapters frequently granted free pardon to all prisoners except those recently condemned and there were occasional complaints that some of the superiors showed undue leniency; but the material before us proves that on the whole discipline was well maintained. With an average of twenty thousand friars or more during the fifteenth century, the "Chronique scandaleuse" is singularly unimportant, a fact that tells in favour of the order, all the more as a large percentage of this number consisted of students at the great universities exposed to many temptations.

Constitutional Revisions.—These constitutions underwent numerous changes. Almost every chapter made additions which were frequently cancelled or qualified by subsequent chapters. John Balistarius (1358-74) published a revised edition in 1369 (inedited) and the mitigation of the rule by Eugene IV necessitated a further revision under John Soreth (1462, printed in 1499). Nevertheless it must be admitted that the legislation of the order moved too slowly, and that many measures were out of date almost as soon as they were passed. Moreover, laws that may have been excellent for Norway or England were hardly applicable in Sicily or at Seville. These simple facts account for many complaints about relaxation or want of discipline.

From the approbation of the order by the Council of Lyons until the outbreak of the great Western Schism (1274-1378) there was a steady increase in provinces and convents, interrupted only temporarily by the Black Death. At the time of the schism it was not left to the provinces, much less to individuals, to choose their own party; they necessarily followed the politics of the country to which they belonged. A census taken in 1390 shows the following provinces on the Urbanist side: Cyprus (number of convents not stated); Sicily, with 18 convents; England with 35; Rome with 5; Lower Germany with 12; Lombardy with 12 or 13; Tuscany with 7; Bologna with 12; Ireland with 8; and Gascony with 6. The Clementist party with the Scotch, French, Spanish, and the greater number of the German houses, was rather more powerful. The general, Bernard Olerius (1375-83) being a native of Catalonia, adhered to Clement VII, and was succeeded first by Raymond Vaquerius and next by John Grossi (1389-1430), one of the most active generals, who during the schism made numerous foundations and maintained excellent discipline among the religious belonging to his party, so that at the union in 1411 he was unanimously elected general of the whole order. The Urbanists had been less fortunate. Michael de Anguanis who succeeded Olerius (1379-86) having become suspect, was deposed after a long trial; the financial administration was far from satisfactory, and the loss of Paris proved a serious blow to that section of the order. Soon after the re-establishment of the union a radical change of the rule became necessary. This, as has been seen, was originally composed for a handful of hermits living in a singularly mild climate. Notwithstanding the few changes made by Innocent IV, the rule had proved too severe for those who spent one half of their life in the intellectual turmoil of the university and the other half in the exercise of the sacred ministry at home. Accordingly Eugenius IV granted in 1432 a mitigation allowing the use of flesh meat on three or four days a week, and dispensing with the law of silence and retirement. But even so the chief abuses that had crept in during the fourteenth century were by no means abolished.

Abuses, Irregularities.—It is indispensable to have a

clear idea of these abuses in order to understand the reforms called into life to counteract them. (1) The permanency of superiors. Even an excellent superior is liable to lose his first energy after a number of years while an indifferent superior seldom improves. This is one of the most difficult problems in the history of monasticism, but the experience of fifteen hundred years has turned the scales in favour of a limited tenure of office. (2) The right of private property. Notwithstanding the vow of poverty many religious were allowed the use of certain revenues from hereditary property, or the disposal of moneys acquired by their work, teaching, preaching, the copying of books, etc. All this was fully regulated by the constitutions and required special permission from the superiors. It was, therefore, quite reconcilable with a good conscience, but it necessarily caused inequality between rich and poor friars. (3) The acceptance of posts of honour outside the order. From the middle of the fourteenth century the popes became more and more lavish in granting the privileges of papal chaplaincies, etc., to those who paid a small fee to the Apostolic chancery. These privileges practically withdrew religious from the rule of their superiors. Again, after the Black Death (1348) thousands of benefices fell vacant, which were too small to provide a living for an incumbent; these were eagerly sought after by religious, among others by Carmelites, who, for an insignificant service, such as the occasional celebration of Mass in a chantry, obtained a small but acceptable income. The papal dispensation *ab incompatibilibus* and the necessary permission of the superiors were easily obtained. Others again were empowered to serve high ecclesiastics or lay people "in all things becoming a religious" or to act as chaplains on board ship, or to fill the post of organist in parish churches. All such exceptions, of which many instances could be quoted, tended to loosen the bonds of religious observance; they filled with pride those who had obtained them and with envy those who were less fortunate. (4) A further source of disorder was found in the small convents with only a few religious, who, naturally, could not be expected to keep up the full observance and sometimes appear to have kept hardly any.

Reforms.—These and other abuses were by no means peculiar to the Carmelites; they occurred, to say the least, in an equal degree in all the mendicant orders, and awakened everywhere loud cries for reform. In point of fact, long before the end of the Western Schism nearly every order had inaugurated that long series of partial and local reforms which constitutes one of the most refreshing elements in the history of the fifteenth century; but though it seems to have remained unknown to the strenuous reformers, no lasting improvement was possible so long as the root of the evil was not removed. This was not in the power of individual reformers, even of saints, but required the concerted action of the whole Church. It required a Council of Trent to raise the whole conception of religious life to a higher level. The first step towards reform in the Carmelite Order dates from 1413, when three convents, Le Selve near Florence, Gerona, and Mantua, agreed to adopt certain principles, among which were the limitation of the tenure of office to two years, with an enforced vacation of four years between each two terms of office, the abolition of all private property, and the resignation of all posts necessitating the residence of religious outside their convents. After considerable difficulty, the congregation of Mantua, as it was called, obtained in 1442 quasi-autonomy under a vicar-general. It gradually brought under its authority several other houses in Italy, but it was only after the death of the general, John Soreth, himself an ardent reformer but an enemy of all separatist tendencies, that it began to spread with rapidity. In 1602 it counted fifty-two houses. The most celebrated member of this reform was Blessed Baptista Mantuanus (Spagnoli) (q. v.) who filled the office of vicar-general six times and became general of the whole order. The statutes of this congregation were printed in 1540 and again in 1602. After the French Revolution it was amalgamated with the remains of the old stock of the order in Italy.

Blessed John Soreth (1451–71) throughout his long generalship carried out a similar reform, but on the basis of the constitutions. His own life and work are a proof that under certain circumstances a protracted tenure of office can be most profitable. While officially visiting numerous provinces he established in each of them several reformed houses whither the most fervent religious flocked. For these he obtained many privileges; no superior could refuse permission to one desirous of joining such a convent; the very fact of entering a reformed house dispensed a religious from penalties previously incurred, which, however, would revive should he return to a non-reformed convent. No superior could withdraw a member of a reformed community except for the purpose of reforming other houses through his instrumentality. If Soreth was, on the whole, successful in his enterprise he also encountered a certain amount of systematic opposition on the part of graduates who were loth to give up their privileges of not attending choir, of taking their meals privately, and of having lay brothers and "fags" for their personal attendance, and who preferred to withdraw to distant convents rather than submit to the rules of the general. The latter obtained leave from the Holy See to fill up the gaps by bestowing the title of doctor on those who were not qualified by a proper course at the universities, a most dangerous proceeding, which before long led to fresh and serious abuses. It has often been asserted that Soreth died of poison, but there is no foundation for such a calumny. Even after his death the movement so happily inaugurated did not lose all vigour, but neither of his two immediate successors understood the art of appealing to the higher nature of his subjects, whereby Soreth had gained his marvellous influence. Christopher Martignon (1472–81) was considered an intruder, his election being ascribed to the pressure exercised by Sixtus IV, his personal friend, and Pontius Raynaud (1482–1502) had the reputation of being a martinet. Peter Terasse (1503–13) visited most of the provinces and has left in his register (unedited) a vivid picture of the condition of the order immediately before the Reformation. Many convents, he is able to state, were thoroughly reformed, while others were far from perfect. He himself, however, was too generous in granting licenses and privileges, and, though strict in punishing, he contributed not a little to the very abuses he intended to abolish. His successor, Blessed Baptista Mantuanus (1513–16), was too old and worn out to exercise any lasting influence. He obtained, however, the recognition and approbation of the congregation of Albi.

This congregation had been established in 1499 by Bishop Louis d'Amboise, who, there being no reformed convent in the province of France, obtained from Mantuanus two religious, one of whom died on the road; the survivor found in the Collège Montaigu in Paris some twenty students willing to embrace the religious life. They were placed in the convent of Albi, while the legitimate inmates were dispersed. Soon other convents, Meaux, Rouen, Toulouse, joined the movement, at the head of which was Louis de Lyra. It is related, though hardly credible, that the general died of grief when he heard of this new rift in the unity of the order. The General Chapter of 1503 excommunicated Louis de Lyra on the ground that the right of reforming belonged to the general and not to self-constituted reformers. But the congregation was already strong enough to offer resistance and

had even found an entrance into the most important convent of the order, that of Paris. The next year Terasse spent five months there trying to win back the dissidents. At last, by a strange error of judgment, he ordered the lecturers to leave Paris at the conclusion of the term and the students to return to their native convents within three days. The natural result was that many of them formally joined the congregation of Albi which now obtained complete control at Paris. A compromise was then reached whereby the vacancies were alternately filled by the order and by the congregation of Albi. Baptista Mantuanus obtained for the latter papal approbation and an extension of the privileges of his own congregation. Notwithstanding this victory the new congregation became a prey to disunion and was unable to make much headway. The evils brought about by the Reformation and the civil and religious wars weighed heavily upon it until, in 1584, it was dissolved by the Holy See.

A further reform of somewhat different nature was that of the convent of Mount Olivet near Genoa, 1514; it consisted in a return to the purely contemplative life and the ancient austerity of the order. The general, Giovanni Battista Rubeo, has left a record that during his visit there in 1568, which lasted only three days, he abstained from flesh meat. This reform continued well into the seventeenth century. A later reform modelled upon that of St. Teresa was inaugurated at Rennes in 1604 by Philip Thibault (1572–1638) and nine companions. With the assistance of the Discalced Carmelites he was able to give it a solid basis, so that before long it embraced the whole province of Touraine. Unlike the other reforms it remained in organic union with the bulk of the order, and enjoyed the favour of the French Court. Among its greatest ornaments were Leo of St. John, one of the first superiors, and the blind lay brother, John of St. Sampson, author of various works on the contemplative life.

Affiliations, Carmelite Sisters.—About the middle of the fifteenth century several communities of Beguines at Gueldre, Dinant, etc., approached John Soreth with the request that they be affiliated to the order (1452). He gave them the rule and constitutions of the friars, to which he added some special regulations which unfortunately do not appear to be preserved. The prestige of the Carmelite Sisters grew rapidly when the Duchess of Brittany, Blessed Frances d'Amboise (1427–85), joined one of the convents, which she herself had founded. Before the end of the century there were convents in France, Italy (Blessed Jane Scopelli, 1491), and Spain. Especially in the latter country the manner of life of the nuns was greatly admired, and several convents became so crowded that the slender means available hardly sufficed for their maintenance.

St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross.—The convent of the Incarnation at Avila was destined to fashion the brightest ornament of the Carmelite Order, St. Teresa of Jesus. Born in 1515 she entered the convent in 1535 and made her profession in the following year. Shortly afterwards she fell ill and, unable to fulfil the usual duties of a religious, gave herself to the practice of mental prayer. Frightened by her directors, who believed her trances to be diabolical illusions, she passed through a period of interior trials which awakened in her the desire for a more perfect life. Learning that the primitive rule aimed at the contemplative life and prescribed several austerities which had since been dispensed with, she resolved upon the foundation of a convent for thirteen nuns in her native town, which after many difficulties was established on 24 August, 1562. The general, Rubeo (1564–78), who at that time visited Spain, approved of what St. Teresa had done and encouraged her to make further foundations. In a letter written from Barcelona (unedited) he enlarged on the blessings of the contemplative life and granted permission for the establishment of two convents for reformed friars within the province of Castile. But warned by what had happened in the case of the congregation of Albi he made some very stringent regulations so as to suppress from the outset any separatist tendencies. In the course of fifteen years St. Teresa founded sixteen more convents of nuns, often in the teeth of the most obstinate opposition.

Among the friars she found two willing helpmates, the prior Anton de Heredia who had already filled important posts in the order, e. g. that of auditor of civil causes at the General Chapter of 1564, and St. John of the Cross, who had just completed his studies. They entered with supernatural courage upon a life of untold hardships and were joined not only by a number of postulants, but also by many of their former brethren in religion. The province of Castile being numerically weak, it stands to reason that the provincial resented the departure of so many of his subjects, among whom were the most reliable and promising. The papal nuncio, Hormaneto, was favourably disposed towards the reform. As Apostolic visitor of the religious orders he wielded papal powers and considered himself entitled to overrule the restrictions of the general. He granted leave for the foundation of other convents of friars, besides the two stipulated by the general, and for the extension of the reform to the province of Andalusia. By an almost incomprehensible error of judgment he appointed visitor of the Calced Carmelites of this last named province Jerome of the Mother of God (Jerome Gratian, 1545–1615) who had just made his profession among the Reformed or Discalced Carmelites, and who, however zealous and prudent, could lay no claim to much experience of the religious life. The Calced Carmelites appealed to Rome, and the result was that the general took a great dislike to the new reform. He himself was a reformer, and had favoured the foundation of a convent of reformed nuns at Alcalá de Henares by Mary of Jesus (1563), and of a reformed convent of friars at Onde in Aragon under James Montanes (1565), and in his visitations he frequently resorted to drastic measures to bring about improvements; moreover he was a strict disciplinarian, punishing faults with a severity which to us seems inconceivable. When he found that the dangers he had striven to avert, viz. a repetition of the disorders caused by the congregation of Albi, had actually occurred, he resolved to root out the new reform. The General Chapter of 1575 decided to abolish the Discalced Carmelites, threatened to send Mariano del Terdo, formerly a hermit, and Baldassare Nieto, an ex-Minim, to their former abodes, ordered the three Andalusian convents of Granada, Seville, and Peñuela, to be closed, and the friars to return to their proper convents within three days. The acts of the chapter (unedited) are silent as to the nuns, but it is known from the correspondence of St. Teresa that she received orders to choose one of her convents there to remain, and to abstain from further foundations.

The Discalced friars, however, relying upon the powers they had received from the nuncio, resisted these commands and went so far as to hold a provincial chapter at Almodóvar (1576). The general sent a visitor with ample powers, Girolamo Tostado, who for some years had been his official companion and was fully acquainted with his intentions. At this juncture the nuncio died and was succeeded by Sega, who at first remained impartial but soon began to proceed vigorously against the reform. A second chapter having been held at the same place (1578), the nuncio excommunicated all the capitulars; St. John of the Cross was seized in the convent of the Incarnation at Avila where he was confessor and hurried to

Toledo, where he was thrown into a dungeon and cruelly treated; others were imprisoned elsewhere. The persecution lasted for nearly a year until at length Philip II intervened. The reform having thus proved too strong, it was resolved to give it a legal standing by establishing a special province for the Discalced friars and nuns, but under obedience to the general (1580). The first provincial was Jerome Gratian who throughout had been the chief support of St. Teresa. To her it was given to see the triumph of her work, but dying on 4 October, 1582, she was spared the pain which the disunion among the friars of her own reform must have caused her. When founding her first convent she had a definite object in view. Not only was she anxious to reintroduce the contemplative life, but knowing how many souls were daily being lost through heresy and unbelief she wished the nuns to pray and offer up their mortifications for the conversion of infidels and heretics, while the friars were also to engage in active work. She was delighted when St. John of the Cross and his brethren went from village to village instructing the ignorant in Christian doctrine, and her joy knew no bounds when, in 1582, missioners of the order were sent out to the Congo. This first missionary expedition, as well as a second, came to an abrupt end through misadventures at sea, but a third was successful, at least so long as it received support from home.

Jerome Gratian, the provincial, was heart and soul in these undertakings. When his tenure of office expired he was replaced by a man of a very different stamp, Nicolò Doria, known in religion as Nicholas of Jesus (1539–94), a Genoese who had come to Spain as the representative of a large banking house, in which capacity he was able to render important services to the king. Aspiring after a higher life, he distributed his immense fortune among the poor, took Holy orders and joined the reformed friars at Seville (1577). He rapidly rose from dignity to dignity, and while engaged in the foundation of a convent in his native town, was elected provincial of the Discalced Carmelites. Endowed with an iron will and indomitable energy, he at once began to fashion his subjects after his own ideas. Having known only the old stock of the order during the troublous times preceding the separation of his province, he was not attached to the order as such. He widened rather than lessened the breach by laying aside, on a mere pretext and against the wishes of the friars, the venerable Carmelite Liturgy in favour of the new Roman Office books, and by soliciting useless privileges from Rome; he withdrew the missioners from the Congo, renounced once for all every idea of spreading the order beyond the frontiers of Spain, restricted the active work to a minimum, increased the austerities, and without consulting the chapter introduced a new form of government which, as it was said at the time, was more fit for the policing of an unruly Italian republic than for the direction of a religious order. He relegated St. John of the Cross to an out-of-the-way convent and on the flimsiest pretext expelled Jerome Gratian. Finally at the General Chapter of 1593 he proposed "for the sake of peace and tranquillity and for many other reasons", the total separation of the Discalced Carmelites from the rest of the order, which was granted by a Bull of 20 December, of the same year. Doria now became the first general of the Discalced Carmelites. He died a few months later. It would be unjust to belittle his merits and talents, but it must be acknowledged that in many respects his spirit was diametrically opposed to the lofty conceptions of St. Teresa and the generous dispositions of St. John of the Cross, while the unwarranted expulsion of Jerome Gratian is a blot on his reputation. It was, he said on his death-bed, the only thing that troubled him. The Spanish Carmelites having practically renounced all exterior work and interest, the further history of that branch of the order reduces itself to notices on the foundations of convents, and the truly edifying life of numerous friars and nuns. At the end of the eighteenth century Spain possessed eight provinces with about 130 convents of friars and 93 of nuns. The greater number of these convents were suppressed in 1836, but many have been restored since 1875, when the old Spanish congregation was united with the Italian congregation. They now constitute the Order of the Discalced Carmelites, without subdivision. The Portuguese province was separated from the Spanish congregation in 1773 for political reasons; it possessed twenty-one convents of friars and nine of nuns, nearly all of which were secularized in 1834.

Missionary Work.—As has been said, the first two missionary undertakings came to a premature end, one on account of shipwreck, the members of the other being captured by privateers. When set free the missioners, instead of resuming their journey to the west coast of Africa, proceeded to Mexico, where they laid the foundation of a province which in the course of time embraced twenty convents of friars and ten of nuns, but was finally suppressed by the Government. As early at 1563 Rubeo had granted leave to the Calced friar, Francisco Ruiz, to make foundations in Peru, Florida, and elsewhere, nominating him at the same time vicar-general. By 1573 there were convents at Sante Fè (New Mexico), New Granada, and other places, and provision was made for further increase. The Chapter of 1666 took the matter seriously in hand and after certain reforms had been carried out the provinces of Bahia, Pernambuco, and Rio de Janeiro were erected in 1720. There were also convents in Guadeloupe and San Domingo, and there is evidence that foundations were contemplated, if not actually made, in the Philippine Islands as far back as 1705. The Discalced Carmelite nuns of the Spanish congregation found their way to the states of South America as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century; several of their convents are still in existence, and others have lately been erected in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru.

The congregation of St. Elias of Discalced Carmelites, otherwise called the Italian congregation was erected at the instigation of Clement VIII. By a strange irony of fate Nicolò Doria, who afterwards resisted the spreading of the order beyond the Peninsula and the Spanish colonies, had been commissioned in 1584 to establish a convent at Genoa. This was followed by one in Rome, Santa Maria della Scala, destined to become the nursery of a new congregation and the living example of perfect observance, and another at Naples. Several of the most prominent members of the Spanish congregation had been sent to these foundations, among them Ven. Peter of the Mother of God (1565-1608), and Ferdinand of St. Mary (1538-1631), who became the first superiors; Ven. John of Jesus Mary (1564-1615), whose instructions for novices have become authoritative, and whose incorrupt body is still preserved in the convent of St. Sylvester near Monte Compatri; Ven. Dominic of Jesus Mary (1559-1630), the great wonder-worker of his time, and Thomas of Jesus (1568-1627) to whose genius for organization not only the order but the Catholic Church is deeply indebted. With men such as these at its head the congregation spread rapidly, not alone in Italy but through the length and breadth of Europe, and attracted men of high social position. The Archduke Albert of Austria and his consort, the Infanta Isabel Clara Eugenia of Spain having applied in Rome for a colony of Discalced Carmelites, the pope nominated Thomas of Jesus founder of the Belgian province. So successful was he that in the course of twelve years he erected ten convents of friars and six of nuns. The establishment in France was more difficult; systematic opposition from various quarters

rendered each foundation a hard task, yet from 1611 till the end of the century almost every year saw the foundation of one or two new convents. Germany, Austria, Poland, even distant Lithuania, were opened to the disciples of St. Teresa. The spread of the congregation may perhaps best be illustrated by statistics. In 1632 the reform counted 763 priests, 471 clerics and novices, and 289 lay brothers, total 1523. In 1674 there were 1814 priests, 593 clerics and 747 lay brothers, total 3154. In 1731 the total had risen to 4193 members. No later statistics are available, but it may be taken that the increase continued for another twenty years until the spirit of Voltaire began to make itself felt. Comparatively little has been published about the foundations, the annals of the order reaching only as far as 1612, and much manuscript material having been lost, but a great deal is still waiting for the hand of the chronicler.

Although the exercise of the contemplative life was given prominence even by the Italian congregation, the active life received far wider scope than in the Spanish fraction of the order. Almost from the beginning it was decided on principle and in full harmony with the known intentions of St. Teresa, that missionary undertakings were quite reconcilable with the spirit of the congregation. The pope himself suggested Persia as the first field of labour for Carmelite missioners. Such was the zeal of the fathers assembled in chapter that each of them declared himself ready to lay down his office and go forth for the conversion of unbelievers as soon as his superiors should give him permission to do so. This promise is made to the present day by every member of the order. It was not until 1604 that the first expedition led by Paul Simon of Jesus Mary was actually sent out to Persia. Three fathers, a lay brother, and a tertiary, proceeded through Germany, Poland, and Russia, following the course of the Volga, sailing across the Caspian Sea, until after more than three years of great hardship they reached Ispahan on 2 December, 1607. They met with surprising success, and being speedily reinforced were soon able to extend their activity to Bagdad, Bassora, and other towns, penetrating into India where they founded flourishing missions at Bombay, Goa, Quilon, Verapoly, and elsewhere, even at Peking. Some of these missions are still in the hands of the order, although the political events of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries proved fatal to others. Another field of labour was the Near Orient, Constantinople and Turkey, Armenia and Syria. To these was added in 1720 "a new mission in America in the district called Mississippi or Lusitania, which was offered by Captain Poyer in the name of the French company, but under certain conditions". If indeed this mission was accepted, it does not seem to have been long prosperous.

One of the happy results of the establishment of missions in the Levant was the recovery of Mount Carmel, which had been lost to the order in 1291. Prosper of the Holy Ghost on his journeys to and from India had repeatedly visited the holy mountain and convinced himself that with prudence and tact it might be recovered. For a time the superiors were by no means favourably disposed towards the project, but at last they furnished him with the necessary powers, and a contract to the said effect was signed at Caiffa, 29 November, 1631. Onuphrius of St. James, a Belgian, and two companions were commissioned to re-establish religious life on the spot where the Carmelite order had had its origin. They reached Alexandrette on 5 November, 1633, and at the beginning of the following year took possession of Mount Carmel. For cells, oratory, refectory, and kitchen they used caverns cut in the living rock, and their life in point of austerity and solitude was worthy of the prophets who had dwelt on Carmel. At length it became necessary to construct a proper convent, in which they were installed 14 December, 1720, only to be plundered a few days later by the Turks, who bound the fathers hand and foot. This convent served as a hospital during Napoleon's campaign; the religious were driven out, and on their return, 1821, it was blown up by the Turks. An Italian lay brother, John Baptist of the Blessed Sacrament (1777-1849), having received orders to rebuild it, and having collected alms in France, Italy, and other countries, laid the foundation stone of the new fabric in 1827. But as it became necessary to do the work on a larger scale than formerly, it was completed only by his successor, Brother Charles, in 1853. It forms a large square block, strong enough to afford protection against hostile attempts; the church is in the centre with no direct entrance from outside; it is erected over a crypt sacred to the Prophet Elias, and has been elevated by the pope to the rank of minor basilica. There are few travellers of any creed who in the course of their journeys in the Holy Land do not seek hospitality on Mount Carmel.

It must not be supposed that the Carmelites were spared the perils to which the missionary life is exposed. John of Christ Crucified, one of the first band of missioners sent out to Persia met with a hostile reception in the neighbourhood of Moscow, and was thrown into a dungeon where he remained for three years. At last he was released and, nothing daunted, continued his journey to Ispahan. Another lay brother Charisius a Sanctâ Mariâ, suffered martyrdom in 1621 on the Island of Ormuz; he was tied to a tree and cut open alive. Blessed Dionysius of the Nativity (Pierre Bertholet), and Redemptus a Cruce, a Portuguese lay brother, suffered for the Faith in Sumatra on 28 November, 1638. The former had been pilot and cartographer to the Portuguese viceroy, but gave up his position and became a Carmelite novice at Goa. Soon after his profession the viceroy once more demanded his services for an expedition to Sumatra; Dionysius was ordained priest so that he might at the same time act as chaplain and as pilot, and Redemptus was given him as companion. No sooner had the ship cast anchor at Achin than the ambassador with his suite was treacherously apprehended, and Dionysius, Redemptus, and a number of others were put to death with exquisite cruelty. The two Carmelites were beatified in 1900. Other members of the order suffered martyrdom at Patras in Achaia in 1716.

In order to ensure the steady supply of missioners the order established some missionary colleges. The original idea had been to found a special congregation under the title of St. Paul, which should entirely devote itself to missionary work. The Holy See granted permission and placed the church of St. Paul in Rome (now Santa Maria della Vittoria) at the disposition of the congregation; but on second thought the project was allowed to drop, and the missionary career was opened to all members of the Italian congregation. Those who manifested a talent in this direction, after having completed their ordinary studies were sent to the college of S. Pancrazio in Rome (1662) or to that of St. Albert at Louvain (1621) to study controversy, practical theology, languages, and natural sciences. After a year they were allowed to take the missionary oath, and after a second year they returned to their provinces until a vacancy in one of the missions necessitated the appointment of a new labourer; by these means the order was prepared to send out efficient subjects at very short notice. The seminary of the Missions étrangères in Paris was founded by a Carmelite, Bernard of St. Joseph, Bishop of Babylon (1597–1663).

An attempt in this direction had been made soon after the Council of Trent, but was not followed up. The pope, struck with the missionary zeal of the Carmelites, consulted Thomas of Jesus as to the best

means of bringing about the conversion of infidels. This religious, in his works "Stimulus missionum" (Rome, 1610) and especially "De procurandâ salute omnium gentium" (Antwerp, 1613), laid down the principles upon which the Holy See actually instituted and organized the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda; other fathers, particularly Ven. Dominic of Jesus Mary, contributed towards its success by collecting funds; the Bull of institution by Gregory XV pays a just tribute to the zeal of the Carmelites. In establishing missions the order had in view not only the conversion of infidels but also that of Protestants. St. Teresa herself had been deeply afflicted by the spread of Lutheranism; hence the foundation of the Dutch, English, and Irish missions. The history of the first of these is only partly known; of the three it was the least beset with difficulties, and although obstacles were never wanting, it did not pass through the dangers which were a matter of almost daily occurrence in England and Ireland. The most prominent members were Peter of the Mother of God (Bertius, d. 1683) and his brother Cæsar of St. Bonaventure (d. 1662), the sons of Peter Bertius, rector of the University of Leyden, a famous convert to the Catholic Faith.

Missions in the British Isles.—The establishment of a mission in England dates back to the year 1615. Thomas Doughty of Plombley, Lincolnshire (1574–1652), probably himself a convert, entered the Carmelite novitiate of La Scala in 1610 after having spent some years at the English College where he had taken Holy orders. After a few months he was obliged by ill-health to return to England, but remained in correspondence with the order and sent some postulants to Belgium. Finally he resumed the religious life and after profession proceeded to London, where he had charge of important negotiations. Having become acquainted with the Spanish ambassador and having secured a chaplaincy for himself and his successors, he was introduced at Court and gained the confidence of Queen Anne of Denmark. Nevertheless he was never secure from priest-hunters and had many hairbreadth escapes. Other missioners having joined him, he withdrew to a country place near Canterbury where he died after a long illness. He was the author of several controversial and spiritual books much appreciated in his time. For years he loudly advocated the establishment of an English novitiate on the Continent, for which he collected the necessary funds, but unfortunately the superiors did not see their way to take up the idea and when at last it was carried out it came too late to be of much practical use.

The next missioner, Eliseus of St. Michael (William Pendryck, 1583–1650), a Scotchman and a convert, who had received his religious training at Paris and Genoa, arrived in London with letters patent constituting him vicar-provincial and superior of the mission. He led for the most part a very retiring life but did not escape persecution; towards the end of his activity he became involved in one of the innumerable disputes as to the extent of the pope's powers; compelled to justify his attitude before the nuncio in Belgium, he returned to England crushed with disappointment. Among the prominent missioners must be mentioned Bede of the Blessed Sacrament (John Hiccocks, 1588–1647), a converted Puritan, who had been the first superior of the missionary college at Louvain. Soon after his arrival in London he was offered a mission on the estates of Lord Baltimore in Newfoundland, which he appears to have been inclined to accept, but when the faculties from Rome arrived, he was in prison, having been surprised by the priest-hunters while writing to his superiors. For several months his fate as well as that of a brother religious and fellow-prisoner was uncertain, but being at last set free through the intervention of the French ambassador he returned to Belgium. He underwent imprisonment for a second time in Holland, but after a long interval came back to London where he resumed his missionary work. Francis of the Saints (Christopher Leigh, 1600–41) died of the plague contracted in prison. John Baptist of Mount Carmel (John Rudgeley, 1587–1669) spent a considerable portion of his life in prison. Joseph of St. Mary (Nicholas Rider, 1600–82), after many years of fruitful activity, devoted his old age to the training of aspirants to the order; these were sent abroad for their novitiate and studies and on their return were appointed to one or other of the missionary stations belonging to the order.

The most remarkable men in a long series of missioners were Bede of St. Simon Stock (Walter Joseph Travers, 1619–96) and his half brother, Lucian of St. Teresa (George Travers, 1642–91). The son of a Devonshire clergyman, Walter Travers was articled to a London solicitor. An elder brother having become a Catholic and a Jesuit, Walter, desirous of guarding himself against a like fate, began to study controversial works with the result that he became convinced of the truth of the Catholic Church which he went to Rome to join. He became a student at the English College and afterwards entered the Carmelite Order in which he filled various offices. He was active in London during the whole period of the Restoration and has left a record of his manifold experiences. At the outbreak of the Oates' Plot he was obliged to return to Italy, but after some years resumed his work in London, until old age and grief over his brother's death compelled him to retire to Paris where he died in the odour of sanctity. He had had the consolation of solemnly inaugurating a chapel in Bucklersbury in London, as well as those at Hereford and Worcester, but the Orange Revolution undid the work begun by him. George Travers, after a dissolute life, accidentally met his brother in London, was rescued by him, instructed, and received into the Church. He made his studies under Joseph of St. Mary, and entered the novitiate at Namur. At the outbreak of the plot he was sent to London, where he passed through many thrilling adventures. Some time after the Orange Revolution he was betrayed by a false friend, and thrown into prison, whither his accuser, on a different charge, followed him. This man was suffering from a contagious disease which Lucian, while nursing him, contracted, and of which he died, 26 June, 1691.

Much less is known of the missioners of the eighteenth century than of those of the seventeenth. Their lives, though still exposed to dangers, were as a rule quiet; moreover, the art of memoir writing seems to have been lost under the House of Orange. One of the more prominent missioners of this period was Francis Blyth (q. v.). In 1773 the English mission acquired the college of the Society of Jesus, recently suppressed, at Tongres, where a number of missioners were prepared for their work before the French Revolution swept over Belgium. The disappearance of this short-lived establishment dealt the death-blow to the Carmelite mission in England. A few missioners remained stationed in various places, but they received no fresh help and little encouragement; the property of the mission as well as its library and archives were lost through the iniquitous laws which rendered the last will of a Catholic illegal. On the occasion of the Catholic Emancipation, Francis Willoughby Brewster was obliged to fill up a parliamentary paper with the laconic remark: "No superior, no inferior, being the last man". He died at Market Rasen in Lincolnshire 11 January, 1849. Cardinal Wiseman, anxious to introduce the Discalced Carmelites into his archdiocese, obtained in 1862 an order authorizing him to select some suitable subjects. His choice fell upon Hermann Cohen (Au-

gustine Mary of the Blessed Sacrament, 1820–71), a converted Jew of Hamburg, originally a brilliant musician, whose conversion and entrance into a strict order had caused considerable stir in France. He opened a small chapel in Kensington Square, London, 6 August, 1862, where the new community struggled against many difficulties, not the least of which was their deep poverty. Before long a convenient site was found for a spacious church, designed by Pugin and inaugurated by Cardinal Manning in 1866, and a convent, completed in 1888. A second house having been founded in a remote country district in Somerset, the English semi-province was canonically established in 1885. Father Hermann did not see the completion of his work; having been called to Spandau to minister to the French prisoners of war, he died of smallpox and was buried in Berlin.

Soon after the English mission a similar undertaking was begun in Ireland by Edward of the Kings (Sherlock, 1579–1629) and Paul of St. Ubaldus, both of whom had made their novitiate in Belgium and had in all probability studied at the missionary college at Louvain. Although the persecution in Ireland was, if possible, more brutal than that in England, Catholic missioners had the support of the poorer classes, who clung tenaciously to their Faith, and from among whom they were recruited. Besides a convent at Dublin they founded residences in the ruins of several former Carmelite abbeys (as they were called), viz. at Athboy, Drogheda, Ardee, Kilkenny, Loughrea, Youghal, and other places. Many of these were but of ephemeral existence. About the same time the Calced Carmelites returned to Ireland, and there arose a dispute as to the ownership of these convents. At the separation of the orders it had been stipulated that the Discalced Carmelites were not to take away any of the convents of their Calced brethren. The Holy See decided in 1640 that the former should retain possession of the four ancient convents they then inhabited, as there still remained twenty-eight houses for the Calced Carmelites to revive. No sooner had this decision reached Ireland than the Cromwell persecution put a stop to any further increase and necessitated the dissolution of the communities that had been erected. Several friars earned the crown of martyrdom, viz. Thomas Aquinas of St. Teresa, who was put to death at Ardee in 1642; Angelus of St. Joseph, cleric (George Halley), an Englishman who was shot 15 August, 1642; and Peter of the Mother of God, lay brother, who was hanged at Dublin, 25 March, 1643. There is reason to believe that others met with a similar fate, but no particulars have been preserved; many, however, suffered imprisonment. Such events told on the life of the province. Canonically erected in 1638, it was dissolved in 1653 but re-established during the comparatively quiet time of the Restoration. In 1785 a chapel and convent were built near the ruins of the Abbey of Loughrea, founded in 1300, and from 1640 in the hands of the Teresian friars, who, nevertheless, were several times obliged to abandon it. Further building operations were carried out in 1829 and again towards the end of the century. The year 1793 witnessed the laying of the foundation stone of St. Teresa's church, Clarendon Street, Dublin. This church, which also underwent frequent alterations and enlargements, served as a meeting room during Daniel O'Connell's campaign, which ended in the Catholic Emancipation Act. It was felt that in this case the interests of the Church were identical with those of the country. A third convent was built at Donnybrook near Dublin in 1884.

The Calced Carmelites appear to have attempted a mission in England at the beginning of the seventeenth century when George Rainer was put to death (c. 1613). No particulars are known about his life and the missionary project seems to have died with him. In Ireland, however, they carried on a flourishing mission from the early part of the same century, and they have at present six convents and a college which is well attended. Their church in Whitefriars Street, Dublin, is well known to Catholics and is an architectural curiosity.

Steps were taken about 1635 to make a foundation in America, and a petition was presented to the pope for approbation of the mission founded there, but for some reason or other it does not seem to have had a lasting result. The Dutch province, however, founded houses at Leavenworth (1864) and Scipio, Anderson Co., Kansas (1865); Englewood, Bergen Co., New Jersey (1869); New Baltimore, Somerset Co., Pennsylvania (1870); Pittsburg, Pennsylvania (1875); Niagara Falls, Canada (1875); and St. Cyril's College, Illinois (1899); while the Irish Calced Carmelites settled in 1888 in New York City and at Tarrytown, New York, and the Bavarian Discalced Carmelites at Holy Hill and Fond du Lac, Wisconsin (1906).

Daily Life.—The life of a Carmelite is somewhat different according to the branch of the order to which he belongs, and the house in which he lives. The life in a novitiate, for instance, is different even for those who have taken their vows, from that in a college, or in a convent intended for the care of souls. It is also stricter among the Discalced Carmelites, who keep perpetual abstinence (except in case of weakness or illness) and who rise in the night for the recitation of the Divine Office, than among the Calced Carmelites, who have adapted their rule to the needs of the times. Formerly the whole Office was sung every day, but when in the sixteenth century the exercise of mental prayer became more and more universal, particularly through the influence of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, the singing was abandoned for a recitation in monotone except on certain feasts. The Calced Carmelites still adhere to the liturgy of the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, a Gallo-Roman Rite, practically identical with that of Paris in the middle of the twelfth century. It underwent certain changes during the Middle Ages and was completely and satisfactorily revised in 1584. The Discalced Carmelites, for reasons already stated, adopted the new Roman Liturgy in 1586. In all convents a certain time is given to mental prayer, both in the morning and the afternoon. It is generally made in common, in the choir or oratory, and is intended to impress the soul with the presence of God and the everlasting truths. Other religious exercises and private devotions supplement those already mentioned. The rule of fasting, somewhat less severe among the Calced Carmelites, is preserved everywhere, although the Church has in many respects mitigated her legislation in this matter. The Discalced Carmelites (Teresians) are generally barefooted; otherwise the only distinction in the habit of the two branches consists in the fashioning of the various garments. The habit of the lay brothers is like that of the choir religious, except that among the Discalced Carmelites they wear a brown mantle and no hood; but in the Spanish congregation they use the hood, and, since 1744, a white mantle. The correct colour of the habit has often been made the subject of somewhat animated discussions among the different branches of the order.

Desert Convents.—A peculiar institution is that of "deserts". The recollection of Mount Carmel and the purely contemplative life, as well as the wording of the rule, which prescribes that the brothers should dwell in their cells or near them, meditating day and night on the Law of the Lord, except when other necessary occupations call them away, had awakened in many a desire for an exclusively spiritual life. It has been noticed that some of the first generals resigned their offices in order to dedicate the remainder of their

life to contemplation, and in the constitutions and other documents exceptions are sometimes made in favour of convents "situated in forests", far away from human habitations. Among such convents were, to mention only two, Hulne in England and Liedekerke in the Netherlands. One of the first Discalced Carmelites in Spain, Thomas of Jesus, who has already been mentioned in connexion with the missions, conceived the idea of founding a "desert" where the religious should find the opportunity for devoting their whole time and energy to the cultivation of a spirit of contemplation. With the exception of four or five who were to remain there permanently, each friar was to spend but a year in the "desert", and afterwards return to the convent whence he had come, so that, the whole community being composed of strong and healthy members, no relaxation however slight should become necessary. After some hesitation the superiors took up the idea, and a suitable site having been found, the first "desert" was inaugurated 28 June, 1592, at Bolarque, on the banks of the Tagus in New Castile. The result was so encouraging that it was decided to found such a house in every province, so that there have been altogether twenty-two "deserts", many of which, however, have been swept away during periods of political agitation. They were constructed after the manner of a charterhouse, but on a smaller scale. A number of cells, each forming a little house of four rooms with a garden attached, were built in the shape of a quadrangle, one wing of which contained the chapel, sacristy, library, etc. In the older "deserts" the chapel was placed in the centre of the quadrangle. The refectory, kitchen, robery and other dependencies were connected with the principal cloister; all the buildings were plain, imposing on account of their austerity rather than their ornamental character. The manner of life, too, resembles that of the Carthusians, but is far more severe. The chant of the Divine Office is more solemn than in other convents; more time is devoted to mental prayer; the fast is extremely strict, the silence all but uninterrupted; only once a fortnight the hermits after the manner of the ancient anchorites, assemble for a conference on some spiritual subject; many volumes of such conferences are still preserved and some have been printed. An hour's social intercourse follows the conference. The time not devoted to prayer and reading is spent in manual labour, the religious finding occupation in the cultivation of their gardens. Study, strictly speaking, is not allowed, lest the strain upon the mind should become too severe.

Each "desert" possessed extensive grounds which were laid out as forests with numerous rivulets and ponds. At equal distances from the convent and from each other there were small hermitages consisting of a cell and chapel, whither the friars retired at certain periods of the year, as Advent and Lent, in order to live in a solitude still more profound than that of the convent. There they followed all the exercises of the community, reciting their Offices at the same time and with the same solemnity as the brothers in choir, and ringing their bell in response to the church bells. Early in the morning two neighbouring hermits served each other's Mass. On Sundays and feasts they went to the convent for Mass, chapter, and Vespers, and returned in the evening to their hermitages,' with provisions for the ensuing week. While in the hermitage they fared on bread, fruit, herbs, and water, but when in the convent their meals were less frugal, although even then the fast almost equalled that of the early monks. Notwithstanding this rigorous observance the "deserts" were never used as places of punishment for those guilty of any fault, but on the contrary as a refuge for those aspiring after a higher life. No one was sent to the "desert" except upon his own urgent request and even then only if his superiors judged that the applicant had the physical strength and ardent zeal to bear and to profit by the austerity of the hermit life. Among the more celebrated "deserts" should be mentioned those of San Juan Bautista, founded in 1606 at Santa Fé, New Mexico; Bussaco (1628), near Coimbra, Portugal, now a horticultural establishment and recreation ground; Massa (1682), near Sorrento, Italy, well known to visitors to Naples on account of the marvellous view of the gulfs of Naples and Salerno to be obtained from the terrace of the convent; and Tarasteix (1859), near Lourdes, France, founded by Father Hermann Cohen.

The Calced Carmelites tried to introduce a similar institute but were less successful. André Blanchard obtained in 1641 the papal approbation for the foundation of a convent at La Graville near Bernos, in France, where the original rule of St. Albert, without the mitigations of Innocent IV should be kept, and the life led by the hermits on Mount Carmel copied; all went well until the arrival, in 1649, of a pseudo-mystic, Jean Labadie, formerly a Jesuit, who in an incredibly short time succeeded in so influencing the majority of the religious, that at length the bishop had to interfere and dissolve the community. Another "desert" was founded by the Calced Carmelites in 1741 at Neti near Syracuse in honour of the Madonna della Scala. A suggestion made in the course of the seventeenth century to the Discalced Carmelites of the Italian congregation to introduce perpetual mental prayer after the manner in which in some convents the perpetual chant of the Divine Office, or Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament is practised, namely by relays of religious, was decided against by the chapter as being altogether unsuitable.

Exterior Occupations.—Apart from the purely contemplative life led in the "deserts", and the specific religious exercises practised in all convents (though in different measure), the chief occupation of the order consists now in the care of souls and missionary work. So long as the Carmelites occupied a well-defined position at the universities and took part in the academic work, a large number cultivated almost exclusively the higher studies. During the Middle Ages the subjects of Carmelite writings were almost invariable, including the explanation of a certain number of Biblical writings, lectures on the various books of Aristotle, the Sentences, and canon law, and sermons *De tempore* and *De sanctis*. In the long list of Carmelite writings preserved by Trithemius, Bale, and others, these subjects occur over and over again. Several friars are known to have cultivated the study of astronomy, as John Belini (1370) and Nicholas de Linne (1386); others concerned themselves with the occult sciences, e. g. William Sedacinensis, whose great work on alchemy enjoyed considerable vogue during the Middle Ages; Oliver Golos was expelled the order on account of his too great knowledge of astrology (1500). There were poets, too, within the order, but while many were justly praised for purity and elegance of style, as Lawrence Burelli (c. 1480), only one secured lasting renown, Blessed Baptista Mantuanus. The other fine arts were also represented, painting chiefly by Filippo Lippi of Florence, whose life, unfortunately, caused him to be dismissed with dishonour. Although many friars cultivated music, no really prominent name can be mentioned. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries allusion is frequently made to Carmelite organists serving various churches outside the order while one obtained leave from the general to repair organs wherever his services might be required.

In the University.—When the Carmelites first appeared at the universities, the two great schools of the Dominicans and Franciscans were already formed, and there remained no room for a third. Some attempts to elevate the teaching of John Baconthorpe

to the rank of a theological school came to naught. The majority of lecturers and writers belonged to the Thomistic school, especially after the great controversies on grace had compelled various orders to choose sides. This tendency became so intense that the Carmelite *Salmanticenses* made it their duty to follow the teaching of the Angelical Doctor even in the minutest details. Controversy was inaugurated by Guy de Perpignan, general from 1318–20, author of "Summa de hæresibus"; the subject was taken up anew at the time of the Wycliffite troubles and ultimately led to the important works of Thomas Netter de Walden, the "Doctrinale" and "De Sacramentis et Sacramentalibus", which proved a gold-mine for controversialists for several centuries. No epoch-making work was done at the time of the Reformation, and the order lost all its northern and the greater part of its German provinces. Although few Carmelite controversialists are to be found on the Catholic side (the best known being Evrard Billick), there were hardly any prominent members among those who lost their faith.

Mystical Theology.—Although Scholastic philosophy and theology, as well as moral theology, have found some of their chief exponents among the Carmelites (e. g. the *Salmanticenses*), other branches of science being less generally cultivated, the field on which absolutely fresh ground was opened by them is mystical theology. During the Middle Ages this subject had been treated only in so far as the ordinary course of studies required, and those of the friars who wrote on it were few and far between, nor do they seem to have exercised much influence. All this was changed with the establishment of the Teresian Reform. As has already been said, St. Teresa was led, unknown to herself, to the highest planes of the mystical life. With her marvellous gift of introspection and analysis, and her constant fear of swerving, be it ever so little, from the teaching of the Church, she subjected her own personal experiences to severe scrutiny, and ever sought the advice and direction of learned priests, chiefly of the Dominican Order. When St. John of the Cross joined the reform, he, fresh from the lecture-rooms at Salamanca and trained in the philosophy and theology of St. Thomas, was able to give her light on the phenomena of psychology and Divine grace. Both of these saints have left writings on mystical theology, Teresa recording and explaining in simple but telling words her own experiences, John taking up the matter more in the abstract sense; still some of his writings, particularly the "Ascent of Mount Carmel", might almost be considered a commentary on the life and the "Interior Castle" of St. Teresa. There is no evidence that he had derived his knowledge from study; he was unacquainted with the works of St. Bernard, Hugh of St. Victor, Gerson, and the Low German mystics, and knew nothing of the mystical school of the German Dominicans; he appears to have known St. Augustine and the other fathers only in so far as the Breviary and theological textbooks contained extracts from their writings. He was therefore in no way influenced by the views of earlier mystics, and had no difficulty in keeping aloof from the beaten track, but he evolved his system from his own and St. Teresa's personal experience as seen in the light of Scholastic theology, and with constant reference to the words of Holy Scripture. For the analogies and allegories of previous mystics he had no taste, and nothing was farther from him than the wish to penetrate the secrets of Heaven and gaze behind Divine revelation.

An order which gives such prominence to the contemplative life could not but take up the subject and study it under all its aspects. The experimental part, which of course does not depend on the will of the individual, but which, nevertheless, is assisted by a certain predisposition and preparation, found at all times a home not only in the "deserts" and the convents of Carmelite nuns, but in other houses as well; the annals of the order are full of biographies of profound mystics. Considering the danger of self-deception and diabolical illusion which necessarily besets the path of the mystic, it is surprising how free the Carmelite Order has remained from such blots. Rare instances are on record of friars or nuns who left the safe ground for the crooked ways of a false mysticism. Much of this indemnity from error must be ascribed to the training directors of souls receive, which enables them to discern almost from the outset what is safe from what is dangerous. The symptoms of the influence of good and evil spirits have been explained so clearly by St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, and a prudent reserve in all that does not tend directly to the advancement of virtue has been so urgently counselled, that error can creep in only where there is a want of openness and simplicity on the part of the subject. Hence, among the great number of mystics there have been but very few whose mysticism is open to question. Several great theologians endeavoured to reduce mystical theology to a science. Among these must be reckoned Jerome Gratian, the confessor and faithful companion of St. Teresa; Thomas of Jesus, who represented both sides of the Carmelite life, the active part as organizer of the missions of the Universal Church as well as of his order, and the contemplative part as founder of the "deserts". His great works on mystical theology were collected and printed at the bidding of Urban VIII; Philip of the Blessed Trinity (1603–71), whose "Summa theologiæ mysticæ" may be taken as the authoritative utterance of the order on this subject; Anthony of the Holy Ghost, Bishop of Angola (d. 1677), author of a handbook for the use of directors of souls, entitled "Directorium mysticum"; Anthony of the Annunciation (d. 1714), and, finally, Joseph of the Holy Ghost (d. 1739), who wrote a large work on mystical theology in three folio volumes; all these and many more strictly adhered to the principles of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross and to the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas. The ascetic part was not less cultivated. For elevation of principles and lucidity of exposition it would be difficult to surpass Ven. John of Jesus-Mary. The difficult art of obeying and the more difficult one of commanding have been dealt with in a masterly manner by Modestus a S. Amabili (d. 1684). The Calced Carmelites, too, have furnished excellent works on different branches of mystical theology.

Foundations of Women.—The Carmelite nuns established by St. Teresa spread with marvellous rapidity. Such was the veneration in which the foundress was held in Spain during her life-time that she received more requests for foundations than she could satisfy. Although very careful in the selection of superiors for new convents she had not always the most capable persons at her disposal and complained in several instances of the lack of prudence or the overruling spirit of some prioresses; she even found that some went so far as to tamper with the constitutions. Such incidents may be unavoidable during the first stage of a new order, but Teresa strove to counteract them by detailed instructions on the canonical visitation of her convents. She desired one of her favourite subjects, Ven. Anne of Jesus (Lobera, b. 1545; d. 4 March, 1621), prioress of Granada to succeed her in the position of "foundress" of the order. Hence, when Nicolò Doria changed the manner of government of the Discalced Carmelites, Anne of Jesus submitted the Constitutions of St. Teresa (already revised by the General Chapter of 1581) to the Holy See for approbation. Certain modifications having been introduced by successive popes, Doria refused to have anything further to do with the nuns. His successors, however, reinstated them, but main-

tained the prohibition in vigour for the friars against making foundations outside Spain and the Spanish colonies. A convent, however, had already been inaugurated at Genoa and another was in contemplation in Rome, where some ladies, struck with the writings of St. Teresa, formed a community on the Pincian Hill under the direction of the Oratorians, one of the members being a niece of Cardinal Baronius. On the arrival of the Discalced friars in the Holy City it was found that the nuns had much to learn and more to unlearn. Other convents followed in rapid succession in various parts of Italy, the beatification and canonization of St. Teresa (1614 and 1622) acting as a stimulus. Not all convents were under the government of the order, many having been from the first subject to the jurisdiction of the local bishop; since the French Revolution this arrangement has become the prevailing one. In 1662 the number of nuns under the government of the Fathers of the Italian Congregation was 840; in 1665 it had risen to 906, but these figures, the only ones available, embrace only a very small fraction of the order.

About the beginning of the seventeenth century Mme Acarie (Blessed Marie of the Incarnation, 1565-1618) was admonished in an apparition by St. Teresa to introduce her order into France. Several attempts were made to obtain some nuns trained by the holy foundress herself, but the Spanish superiors declared themselves unable to send subjects beyond the Pyrenees. M. (afterwards Cardinal) de Bérulle, acting on behalf of Mme Acarie and her friends, received a Brief from Rome empowering him to proceed with the foundation; but as it contained some clauses distasteful to him, e. g. that the new foundations should be under the government of the friars as soon as these should be established in France, and as it did not contain some others he had counted upon, he obtained through the French ambassador an order from the king commanding the general to send certain nuns to Paris. Among these were Anne of Jesus, and Ven. Anne of St. Bartholomew (1549 to 7 June, 1626), then a lay sister, who had been St. Teresa's attendant during the latter years of her life. Altogether seven sisters left Spain for Paris, where they arrived in July, 1604, being received by Princesse de Longueville and other ladies of the Court. As it soon became manifest that M. de Bérulle had his own ideas about the government of the order, which he was anxious to associate with the French Oratory founded by him, pending the establishment of an "Order of Jesus and Mary" he had in contemplation, six of the foundresses left France within a few years, while the seventh remained only under protest.

The French Carmelite nuns were placed (with few exceptions) under the government of the Oratorians, the Jesuits, and secular priests, without any official connexion either with the Spanish or the Italian congregation of Discalced Carmelites, forming a congregation apart from the rest of the order. They spread very rapidly, being held in high esteem by the episcopate, the Court, and the people. Unfortunately the mother-house in Paris (Couvent de l'Incarnation, Rue d'Enfer) became for some years one of the centres of the Jansenists, but otherwise the French Carmelites have reflected glory on the Church. Among the most celebrated French Carmelite nuns may be mentioned Louise de la Miséricorde (1644-1710), who as Duchesse de la Vallière had taken an unfortunate part in the court scandals under Louis XIV, which she expiated by many years of humble penance; Ven. Thérèse de Saint Augustin (Mme Louise de France, 1737-87) daughter of Louis XV, notwithstanding her exalted birth, chose for herself one of the poorest convents, Saint-Denis near Paris, where she distinguished herself by the exercise of heroic virtue. During the Revolution all the communities were dissolved; one of them, that of Compiègne, endeavoured to keep up, as far as circumstances allowed, the observances prescribed by the rule, until the sixteen nuns were all apprehended, cast into prison, dragged to Paris, tried, condemned to death, and consigned to the guillotine, 17 July, 1794; they were beatified in 1906. Another Carmelite nun, Mother Camille de l'Enfant Jésus (Mme de Soyecourt) underwent with her community long imprisonment, but being at last liberated she became instrumental in re-establishing not only her own but many other convents. When at the beginning of the twentieth century the law on religious associations was passed, there were over a hundred Carmelite convents in France with several offshoots in distant parts of the world, even Australia and Cochin China. In consequence of the French legislation many communities took refuge in other countries, but some are still in their old convents.

Quitting Paris for Brussels, Ven. Anne of Jesus became the foundress of the Belgian Carmel. At her instigation the Infanta Isabel Clara Eugenia called the friars from Rome, with the result that foundations increased rapidly. One of these, at Antwerp, was due to Ven. Anne of St. Bartholomew, who, while in France, had been promoted from lay sister to prioress, having learned to write by a miracle; she was instrumental in delivering Antwerp from a siege. The Belgian Carmel sent out colonies to other countries, Germany and Poland, where Mother Teresa of Jesus (Marchocka, 1603–52) became celebrated. Another convent was founded at Antwerp for English ladies (1619), who were reinforced by Dutch sisters; in 1623 it was detached from the order and placed under the bishop, and in its turn made foundations at Lierre in 1648, and Hoogstraeten in 1678, all of which became the abode of many noble English ladies during the times of penal laws. At the outbreak of the French Revolution the nuns had to flee the country. After a short stay in the neighbourhood of London the community of Antwerp divided into two sections, one proceeding to America, the other settling ultimately at Lanherne in Cornwall, whence they sent out an offshoot which finally settled at Wells in Somerset (1870); the community of Lierre found a home at Darlington, Co. Durham (1830), and that of Hoogstraeten, after much wandering, settled at last at Chichester, Co. Sussex, in 1870. Not counting the French refugees, there are at present seven convents of Carmelite nuns in England. An earlier project for a convent in London, with Mary Frances of the Holy Ghost (Princess Elénore d'Este, 1643–1722, aunt of the Queen of James II) as prioress, came to naught owing to the Orange Revolution, but it appears that about the same time a community was established at Loughrea in Ireland. At times the nuns found it difficult to comply with all the requirements of the rule; thus they were often compelled to lay aside the habit and assume secular dress. Several convents were established in Ireland in the eighteenth century, but in some cases it became necessary for the nuns to accommodate themselves so far to circumstances as to open schools for poor children. There are at present twelve convents in Ireland, mostly under episcopal jurisdiction.

The second section of the English community at Antwerp, consisting of Mother Bernardine Matthews as prioress and three sisters, arrived at New York, 2 July, 1790, accompanied by their confessor, Rev. Charles Neale, and Rev. Robert Plunkett. On the feast of St. Teresa, 15 October of the same year, the first convent, dedicated to the Sacred Heart, was inaugurated on the property of Mr. Baker Brooke, about four miles from Port Tobacco, Charles Co., Maryland. Want of support compelled the sisters to seek a more convenient site, and on 29 September, 1830, the foundation-stone was laid for a convent in Aisquith Street, Baltimore, whither the community

migrated the following year, Mother Angela of St. Teresa (Mary Mudd) being then prioress. In 1872, during the priorship of Mother Ignatius (Amelia Bandy), the present (1908) convent, corner of Caroline and Biddle Streets was inaugurated. This community made a foundation at St. Louis, 2 October, 1863, first established at Calvary Farm, and since 1878 within the city. The foundation at New Orleans dates back to 1877, when Mother Teresa of Jesus (Rowan) and three nuns took a house in Ursuline Street, pending the construction of a convent in Barrack Street, which was completed on 24 November, 1878. The convent at Boston was founded 28 August, 1890, and in its turn established that of Philadelphia, 26 July, 1902, Mother Gertrude of the Sacred Heart being the first prioress. In May, 1875, some nuns from Reims arrived at Quebec and found a convenient place at Hochelaga near Montreal, where they established the convent of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart. Another Canadian foundation attempted from Baltimore in the same year was unsuccessful, and had to be given up after a few years.

Life of the Nuns.—The life of a Carmelite nun is somewhat different from that of a friar, as there is an essential difference between the vocation of a priest and that of a lay person. Active work, such as nursing the sick and teaching, are out of the question in a cloistered convent. The Carmelite sister leads a contemplative life, a considerable portion of her time being devoted to Divine service, meditation and other pious exercises, the rest occupied with household work and other occupations. The life is necessarily strict, the fasting severe, and there are many opportunities for exercising virtue.

Various Carmelite Institutions.—Several religious institutions have gathered round Carmel. In the Middle Ages we find attached to many convents and churches anchorages, that is, hermitages for recluses who at their own request were walled up by the bishop and who exercised a great influence over the populace by reason of their example, their austerities, and their exhortations. Among the more celebrated Carmelite recluses may be mentioned Thomas Scrope of Bradley, at Norwich, afterwards titular Bishop of Dromore in Ireland and Apostolic legate in Rhodes; and Blessed Jane of Toulouse (beginning of the fifteenth century) whose cultus was approved by Leo XIII.

Probably ever since the coming of the friars to Europe, founders of convents and benefactors were admitted to the order under the title of *Confratres*, which gave them a right to participation in the prayers and good works of a section or of the entire order, and to suffrages after their death. Neither the constitutions nor the ceremonial of admission of such Confratres, nor even the text of confraternity letters, contain any mention of obligations incumbent on them. The letters were at first granted only after mature consideration, but from the end of the fifteenth century it was less difficult to obtain them; in many cases the general handed numerous blank forms to provincials and priors to be distributed by them at their own discretion. Out of this confraternity, which stood in no organic connexion with the order, arose in the sixteenth century, according to all probability, the Confraternity of the Scapular.

Another confraternity was a guild established in 1280 at Bologna, and perhaps elsewhere, which held its meetings in the Carmelite church and from time to time made an offering at a certain altar, but otherwise was entirely independent of the order. As has been seen, some communities of Beguines in the Netherlands asked, in 1452, for affiliation to the order, and thus gave rise to the first convents of Carmelite nuns. At a later period Herman of St. Norbert (d. 1686), preaching in 1663 at Termonde, determined five Beguines, among them Anne Puttemans (d. 1674), to sell their property and found the congregation of Maricoles or Maroles, which was aggregated to the order 26 March, 1672; they occupy themselves with the education of poor girls and with the care of the sick in their own homes, and have still many convents in the Dioceses of Mechlin, Ghent, and especially Bruges. A community of thirty-seven hermits living in various hermitages in Bavaria and the Tyrol having asked for aggregation, the General Chapter of the Discalced Carmelites of 1689 granted their wish under certain conditions, among others that not more than four or five should live in each hermitage, but the decree was rescinded in 1692, for what reason is not known, and all connexion between these hermits and the order was severed.

Carmelite Tertiaries.—Tertiaries or members of the Third or Secular Order may be divided into two classes, those living in their own homes and those living in community. The former class is first met with in the middle of the fifteenth century, when the Holy See granted permission to the Carmelites to institute a Third Order of secular persons, after the model of similar institutions attached to other mendicant orders. The oldest printed Missals and Breviaries contain the rite of admission of such persons; these were then known by the term of *bizzoche*, which has since acquired a somewhat unpleasant meaning. They were bound to recite certain prayers (in the Teresian Reform also to practise meditation), to keep certain fasts and abstinences, refrain from worldly amusements, and to live under obedience to the superiors of the order; they might wear a distinctive habit resembling that of the friars or nuns. Tertiaries living in community observe a rule similar to, but less austere than, that of the friars; there are two communities of Tertiary brothers in Ireland, one at Clondalkin, where they have a boarding-school established previous to 1813, and another, in charge of an asylum for the blind, at Drumcondra near Dublin. There are also Tertiary fathers (natives) in the Archdiocese of Verapoly in India, established in 1855, who serve a number of missions.

Tertiary sisters have a convent in Rome founded by Livia Vipereschi for the education of girls; they were approved by Clement IX in 1668. The Austrian congregation has had, since 1863, ten houses partly for educational purposes, partly for the care of servants. In India, too, there are native Tertiary sisters in Verapoly and Quilon with thirteen houses, boarding schools, and orphanages. A Tertiary convent was founded in Luxemburg in 1886. Finally, mention must be made of the Carmelite Tertiaries of the Sacred Heart lately established in Berlin, with orphanages and kindergartens in various parts of Germany, Holland, England, Bohemia, and Italy.

Statistics.—At the present time there are about 80 convents of Calced Carmelite friars, with about 800 members and 20 convents of nuns; 130 convents of Discalced Carmelite friars, with about 1900 members; the number of convents of nuns, including the French previous to the passing of the Association law, was 360.

A considerable portion of this article being based on unpublished material, the following notices are necessarily incomplete, and to a large extent antiquated.

General Sources:—Migne, *Dict. des ordres religieux*, I, 635 sqq.; *Bullarium Carmelitanum*, vols. I and II, ed. Monsignanus (Rome, 1715, 1718), vols. III and IV (Rome, 1768), ed. Ximenes (Rome, 1768); Riboti, *Speculum Carmelitarum*, ed. Cathaneis (Venice, 1507), ed. Daniel a Virgine Maria (2 vols. in fol., Antwerp, 1680), containing the *Corpus* of medieval Carmelite historians together with numerous dissertations and polemical writings, and practically superseding such authors as: Falcone, *Chronicon Carmelitarum* (Piacenza, 1545); Brussela, *Compendio historico Carmelitano* (Florence, 1595); Bolarquez, *Chronicas dell' Orden del Monte Carmelo* (Cordova, 1597); Leoindelicato da Sciacca, *Giardino Carmeliano* (Palermo, 1600); Aubertus Miræus, *Carmelit. Ordinis origo* (Antwerp, 1610); J. de Carthagena, *De antiquitate Ordin. B. M. V. de Monte Carm.* (Antwerp, 1620). Dominicus a Jesu, *Spicilegium episcoporum, Ordin. Carmel.* (Paris, 1638); Daniel a Virg. Maria, *Vinea Carmeli* (Antwerp, 1662), with a synchronological table embracing the events during the lifetime of St. Simon Stock (1165–1265) by Segherus Pauli,

which the student will do well to handle critically. The first three vols. of LEZANA, *Annales sacri prophetici et Eliani Ord.* (4 vols., Rome, 1645, 1650, 1653, and 1656), contain the life of the Prophet Elias, the history of the order during the Old Law, at the coming of Christ, and during the Middle Ages as far as 1140; the fourth vol., which might have permanent value as it embraces the period from 1140 till 1515, is in many respects unsatisfactory and superficial. PHILIPPUS A SS. TRINITATE, *Compendium historiæ Carmelitarum* (Lyons, 1656); IDEM, *Theologia Carmelitana* (Rome, 1665); IDEM, *Decor Carmeli* (Lyons, 1665); HAITZE D' ACHE wrote against this work *Les moines empruntés*, to which JEAN DE VAUX replied by *Réponse pour les Religieux Carmes au livre intitulé: Les moines empr.* (Cologne, 1697). LOUIS DE STE THÉRÈSE, *La succession du S. prophète Elie* (Paris, 1662); JOHANNES-NEPOMUCENUS A S. FAMILIA, *vere* PETRUS RENERUS, *Histoire de l'Ordre de N. D. du Mont Carmel sous ses neuf premiers généraux* (Maastricht, 1798), published anonymously; this author frankly adopts the thesis of the Bollandists. ALEXIS-LOUIS DE S. JOSEPH, *Histoire sommaire de l'Ordre de N. D. du Mont Carmel* (Carcassonne, 1855); FERDINAND DE STE THÉRÈSE, *Ménologe du Carmel* (3 vols., Lille, 1879), not always reliable; CAILLAUD, *Origine de l'Ordre du Carmel* (Limoges, 1894); ZIMMERMAN, *Monumenta historica Carmelitana* (Lérins, 1907), so far only one vol., containing the oldest constitutions, acts of general chapters, biographical and critical notes on the first generals, lists of the Masters of Paris, and various collections of letters. No critical history, however compendious, has as yet been attempted, although there is no lack of material in public archives as well as in those of the various branches of the order.

ORIGINS.—The bibliography of the controversy about the antiquity of the order is extremely lengthy, but of no general interest; the principal works are: (1) in favour of the traditional view: DANIEL A VIRGINE MARIA, *op. cit.*; SEBASTIANUS A S. PAULO, *Exhibitio errorum* (Cologne, 1693); (2) against the tradition: *Acta SS.*, April, I, 764–99, May, II, *Commentar. apologet.*, 709–846; PAPEBROCH, *Responsio ad Exhib. error.* (3 vols., Antwerp, 1696); IDEM, *Elucidatio.*; REUSCH, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Bonn, 1885), II, 267 sqq.

GENERAL HISTORY OF THE ORDER:—GULIELMUS DE SANVICO (1291), TRITHEMIUS: *De ortu et progressu; de viris illustribus;* PALÆONYDORUS, *Fasciculus trimerestus* (Mainz, 1497; Venice, 1570), reprinted in DANIEL A VIRGINE MARIA, *op. cit.*; LUCIUS, *Bibliotheca Carmel.* (Florence, 1593); COSME DE VILLIERS DE S. ETIENNE, *Bibliotheca Carmelitana* (2 vols., Orléans, 1752), which should be compared with the MSS. corrections and additions of NORBERTUS A S. JULIANA in the Royal Library at Brussels. DE SMEDT, *Introductio general. ad histor. eccles.* (Ghent, 1876); HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1893); CHEVALIER, *Rép. topo-bibliogr.*, s. v.; KOCH, *Die Karmeliten-klöster der niederdeutschen Provinz* (Freiburg im Br., 1889); ZIMMERMAN, *Die heil. Einsiedeleien im Karmeliten-Orden*, in *Stimmen v. Berge Karmel* (Graz, 1898–1900); IDEM, *Die englischen Karmelitenklöster* (Graz, 1901–1903).

REFORMS:—*Reform of Mantua:* PENSA, *Teatro degli uomini illustri della famiglia di Mantova* (Mantua, 1618); FELLINI, *Sacrum musæum s. Congreg. Mantuanæ* (Bologna, 1691); VAGHI, *Commentarium fratrum et sororum Ordin. B. V. M. de Monte Carm. Congreg. Mantuan.* (Parma, 1725). On the reform of Touraine (Rennes), LEO A S. JOHANNE, *Typus vestis religiosæ* (Paris, 1625), on change of colour of habit; IDEM, *Delineatio observantiæ Rhedonensis* (Paris, 1646). MATHIAS A S. JOHANNE, *L'esprit de la réforme des Carmes en France* (Bordeaux, 1666); SERNIN-MARIE DE S. ANDRÉ, *Vie du Ven. Fr. Jean de S. Samson* (Paris, 1881). Reform of St. Teresa, (1) Spain: Besides her own writings, FRANCISCUS A S. MARIA and others: *Reforma de los Descalços* (6 vols., Madrid, 1644); part of this work, which is partisan, in favour of Doria and against St. John of the Cross and Jerome Gratian, has been translated into Italian (Genoa, 1654) and French (Paris, 1665; Lérins, 1896); GRÉGOIRE DE S. JOSEPH, *Le Père Gratien et ses juges* (Rome, 1904), also tr. It. and Sp.; IDEM., *Peregrinación de Anastasio* (Burgos, 1905), published anonymously. (2) Portugal: MELCHIOR A S. ANNA and others, *Chronica de Carmelitas Descalços* (3 vols., Lisbon, 1657). (3) Italy and other countries: ISIDOR A S. JOSEPH. and PETRUS A S. ANDREA, *Historia generalis fratrum discalceator.* (2 vols., Rome, 1668, 1671); EUSEBIUS AB OMNIBUS SANCTIS, *Enchiridion chronologicum Carmel. Discalceat.* (Rome, 1737); LOUIS DE STE THÉRÈSE, *Annales des Carmes déchaussés de France* (Paris, 1666; Laval, 1891); HENRICUS-MARIA A SS. SACRAMENTO, *Collectio scriptorum Ord. Carmel. Excalceat.* (2 vols., Savona, 1884), superficial. On the missions: JOH. A JESU-MARIA, *Liber seu historia missionum*, in *Opp. omnia* (Florence, 1774), III; PHILIPPUS A SS. TRINITATE, *Itinerarium orientale* (Lyons, 1649; also Fr. and It.); EUSEBIUS AB OMNIB. SANCTIS, *Historia missionum* (1730); PAULINUS A S. BARTHOLOMÆO, *Opera* (Rome, 1790); BERTHOLDE-IGNACE DE S. ANNE, *Hist. de l'établissement de la mission de Perse* (Brussels, 1886); ALBERT-MARIE DU S. SAUVEUR, *Le sanctuaire du Mont Carmel* (Tournai, 1897), the original edition published without acknowledgment, by JULIEN DE STE THÉRÈSE (Marseilles, 1876); HENRICUS A S. FAMILIA, *Leven der gelukzaligen Dionysius en Redemptus* (Ypres, 1900); RUSHE, *Carmel in Ireland* (Dublin, 1897; supplement, 1903); ZIMMERMAN, *Carmel in England* (London, 1899).

CARMELITE NUNS:—HOUSSAYE, *M. de Bérulle et les Carmélites de France* (Paris, 1872); GRAMIDON, *Notices historiques sur les origines* (Paris, 1873); HOUSSAYE, *Les Carmélites de France et les constitutions* (Brussels, 1873); ALBERT-MARIE DU S. SAUVEUR, *Les Carmes déchaussés de France* (3 vols., Paris, 1886) with a supplement on the Jansenist troubles in the convent of the Incarnation at Paris; *Mémoire sur la fondation, le gouvernement et l'observance des Carmélites déchaussées* (2 vols., Reims, 1894), anonymous, by the Carmelite nuns of the Rue d'Enfer, Paris, with a valuable bibliography; *Chroniques de l'ordre des Carmélites* (9 vols., partly at Troyes, 1846; partly at Poitiers, 1887); BERTHOLD-IGNACE DE STE ANNE, *Vie de la Mère Anne de Jésus* (2 vols., Mechlin, 1876, 1882); *La vie et les instructions de la Vén. Anne de S. Barthélémy* (anonymous, by a solitary of the "Desert" of Marlaigne), (new ed., Paris, 1895); SYLVAIN, *Vie du P. Hermann* (Paris, 1881), tr. Germ. and It.; *Carmel in India* (anonymous) (London, 1895); IGNACE DE S. JEAN L'ÉVANGÉLISTE, *Vie et vertus héroiques de la Mère Thérèse de Jésus* (*Marchocka*) (Lillie, 1906); *Vie de la R. Mère Camille de l'Enfant Jésus née de Soyecourt* (anonymous), ed. D'HULST (Paris, 1898); BEDINGFIELD, *Life of Margaret Mostyn* (London, 1884); HUNTER, *An English Carmelite: Life of Catherine Burton* (London, 1876); CURRIER, *Carmel in America* (Baltimore, 1890).

BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN.

Carneiro (CARNERO), MELCHIOR, missionary bishop; b. of a noble family at Coimbra, in Portugal; d. at Macao, 19 August, 1583. He entered the Society of Jesus 25 April, 1543, was appointed in 1551 the first rector of the College of Evora, and shortly after transferred to the rectorship of the College of Lisbon. When, in 1553, Simon Rodriguez, the first provincial of Portugal, was summoned to Rome by St. Ignatius to answer charges made against his administration, the visitor, Nadal, assigned him Carneiro as a companion. In the meantime King John of Portugal, the great friend and patron of the Society, had written both to Pope Julius III and to St. Ignatius, requesting the appointment of a Jesuit as Patriarch of Ethiopia. The pope chose John Nugnez, giving him at the same time two coadjutors with the right of succession, Andrew Oviedo, titular Bishop of Hierapolis, and Melchior Carneiro, of Nicæa. They were consecrated in 1555, and were the first Jesuits to be raised to the episcopal dignity. The pope had given them an order of obedience to accept consecration, and St. Ignatius acquiesced, considering that the dignity carried with it hardship and suffering rather than honour. Unable to enter his missionary field of Ethiopia, Carneiro set out for the Indies and landed at Goa. He laboured there on the Malabar coast until 1567, when he was appointed first Bishop of Japan and China, which office he seems to have renounced soon after, for in 1569 Leonard de Saa succeeded him. He retired to the house of the Society of Jesus at Macao, where he died. Carneiro has written some letters of considerable historical interest, one from Mozambique, one from Goa, and two from Macao. They are printed in various collections.

Mon. Hist. Soc. Jesu (Madrid, 1894–96); *Vita Ignatii Loyolæ*, I–IV, passim; *Literæ Quadrimestres*, I–IV, passim; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II, s. v.

B. GULDNER.

Carnoy, JEAN-BAPTISTE, Belgian biologist, b. at Rumillies, province of Hainaut, near Tournai, 22 Jan., 1836; d. at Schuls, in Switzerland, 6 September, 1899. After the usual course in theology at the seminary of Tournai, he was ordained priest and then devoted some years to the study of natural science, for which he had always shown great talent. His progress was rapid and, after receiving the degree of Doctor of Science, he was awarded a Government travelling fellowship. He went to Germany, where he worked with Hanstein at Bonn and also spent some time in Leipzig, Berlin, and Vienna. He was then sent to Rome by his bishop on business pertaining to the Diocese of Tournai. While there he made the acquaintance of Buoncompagni and Castracane and was associated with the latter in his researches. In 1868 he was recalled to Belgium, his bishop, at the request of Monseigneur Laforêt, having consented to attach him to the University of Louvain to found a course in general biology. Financial difficulties at the university, however, made it impracticable to carry out this plan at the time, and he became, instead, vicar at Celles near Tournai. During his stay here he completed his "Recherches anatomiques et

physiologiques sur les champignons" published in the bulletin of the "Société royale de botanique". In 1870 he was appointed *curé* at Bauffe, where his pastoral duties gave him little leisure for scientific work. In 1876 he was again invited to Louvain on the proposal of Monseigneur Namèche. He began his teaching with a course in practical microscopy, and in 1879 he published his "Manuel de microscopie". This was, however, but preliminary to his work in biology, upon which his fame as a teacher and investigator rests. But instead of taking the whole science for his field he confined himself to that phase of it which seemed to him of greatest interest and importance, viz. the study of the structure and phenomena of the cell. He thus became the founder of the school of cellular biology or cytology at Louvain—the first of its kind—whose laboratories he equipped at his own expense. He gathered about him students whom he inspired with his own enthusiasm, and he spared no pains or labour to advance his school and its work and to secure recognition for it. In 1884 he founded "La Cellule", a journal of cytology, in which much of his own work and that of his collaborators was published. Carnoy did much to advance our knowledge of the cell. He advocated Fromman's theory of the reticulated structure of the cell, and appears to have been the first to explain the true nature of the albuminoid membrane. He devoted considerable study to the nucleus and was able to distinguish three species of nucleoli within the nucleus, differing in structure and function. He also carried on important researches in cell segmentation. Besides the works already mentioned, Carnoy was the author of the "Traité de biologie cellulaire" (1884), an important work, which, however, was never completed.

GILSON, in *La Cellule* (Lierre and Louvain, 1900), XVII, i–xxxiv; HAHN, in *Revue des questions scientifiques*, XLVI, p. 695; Eulogies by HEBBELYNCK and GILSON in *Annuaire de l'Université Catholique de Louvain* (1900).

H. M. BROCK.

Caro, FRANCISCO LOPEZ. See LOPEZ CARO.

Caro, GIUSEPPE. See GIUSEPPE MARIA TOMMASI, BLESSED.

Carochi, HORACIO, b. in Florence, c. 1586; d. in Mexico in 1666. He entered the Society of Jesus and before he had concluded his philosophical studies went to Mexico, where he studied the Indian languages, especially the Nahuatl and the Othomí, which he mastered fully. He was made Secretary of the Province and wrote "Arte de la Lengua mexicana con la declaración de todos sus adverbios", printed at Mexico in 1645; "Vocabulario copioso de la Lengua mexicana"; "Gramática de la Lengua Otomí"; "Vocabulario Otomí"; "Sermones en Lengua mexicana". His letters to the Bishop of Puebla, Juan de Palafox, also deserve mention. Only the first named work has been printed. It is a much esteemed contribution to Mexican linguistics and a rare book.

SOTWELL, *Bibliotheca Jesuitica* (Rome, 1676); BERISTAIN, *Biblioteca hispano-americana;* LUDEWIG, *Literature of Am. Aboriginal Languages* (1858).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Caroline Books (LIBRI CAROLINI), a work in four books (120 or 121 chapters), purporting to be the composition of Charlemagne, and written about 790–92. It is a very severe critique of the Seventh General Council, held at Nicæa in 787, particularly as regards its acts and decrees in the matter of sacred images. In fact, it is a grave theological treatise in which both the Iconoclastic council of 754 and its opponent, the aforesaid Second Nicene of 787, are brought before the bar of Frankish criticism and judged equally erroneous, the former for excluding all images from the churches as sheer idolatry, the latter for advocating an absolute adoration of images. Though launched under the royal name, the theological, philosophical, and philological learning displayed far surpass the known powers of Charlemagne. The author may be Alcuin; possibly one or more of the Spanish or Irish theologians who were then residing at the Frankish court (cf. Samuel Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, Paris, 1895). The work had its origin in a very faulty (see Anastasius Bibliothecarius in Mansi, Coll. Conc. XII, 981) Latin version of the Greek acts of the Seventh General Council (Second Nicene) which the negligence of the Roman copyists disfigured still more; in one crucial text, e. g., the negative particle was omitted, and in another the council was made to assert that the images were to be adored as the Trinity itself, whereas the genuine Greek text is quite orthodox (Hefele gives a parallel list of the numerous errors, History of the Councils, III, 709, German text). This version was severely criticised by an assembly of Frankish theologians at which Charlemagne assisted. Some (85) obnoxious passages were gathered therefrom and brought to Pope Adrian I by Abbot Angilbert for correction. This document is lost, but its content may be gathered from the moderate and prudent reply (794) of Adrian (P. L., 1247–92; cf. Nam absit a nobis ut ipsas imagines, sicut quidam garriunt, deificemus, etc.). Dissatisfied with this defence of the council (not reputed œcumenical by the king's theologians) Charlemagne caused the preparation (790–92) of the large work in question, known since then as "Quattuor Libri Carolini" (Hampe, Hadrians I Verteidigung der zweiten nicänischen Synode in Neues Archiv, 1896, XXI, 85 sqq.; Hergenröther-Kirsch, Kircheng. 4th ed. Freiburg, 1904, II, 133; Knöpfler-Hefele, Kircheng., 1902, 283).

In further explanation of this remarkable step, it has been noted that Charlemagne was at this time much irritated against the Greek Empress Irene, partly for the failure of the marriage projected between her son and his daughter Rotrudis, partly for the protection and help she was affording to Adelchis, the son of the dethroned King of Lombardy, to which may be added a certain jealousy of any authority over his Frankish subjects by a Greek council in which they had taken no part. Some believe that he was even then contemplating the assumption of the imperial title, and was therefore only too willing to discredit Greek authority wherever possible. The work was first printed at Paris in 1549 by the priest Jean du Tillet (Tilius), later Bishop of Saint Brieuc and then of Meaux, but anonymously and without indication of the place where he found the manuscript (Tilius was suspected of a leaning to Calvinism). While the Centuriators of Magdeburg (q. v.) at once made use of it as an evidence of Catholic corruption of the true doctrine concerning images, some Catholic apologists asserted that it was only an heretical work sent by Charlemagne to Rome for condemnation, others that it was a forgery of Carlstad (the manuscript of Tilius was, after all, a very recent one; Floss, De suspecta librorum Carolinorum a Joanne Tilio editorum fide, Bonn, 1860). They overlooked the fact that Augustinus Steuchus (1469–1549) librarian of the Vatican, writing in defence of the Donation of Constantine, had already quoted a passage from the "Libri Carolini" (I, 6) which he declared he had found in a Vatican manuscript written in an ancient Lombard hand; it had disappeared, however, by 1759, according to a letter of Cardinal Passionei to the learned Abbot Frobenius Förster, then meditating a new edition of the work (see preface no. 10 to his edition of the Opera Alcuini). Floss (op. cit.) maintained the thesis of a forgery, but the genuinity of the work can no longer be questioned since the discovery (1866) by Reifferscheid of a tenth century (imperfect) manuscript in the Vatican Archives (Narratio de Vaticano Libror. Carol. codice, Breslau, 1873). Moreover, the work is

evidenced as extant in the latter half of the ninth century by Hincmar of Reims (Adv. Hincmar. Laud., c. 20). Its genuinity was long since admitted by Catholic scholars like Sirmond and Natalis Alexander (Sæc. VIII, Diss. VI, § 6). The work was reprinted by the imperialist editor Michael Goldast (Imperialia decreta de cultu imaginum, Frankfort, 1608, p. 67, sqq., and Collect. Constitut. imper., I, 23) whence it was taken by others, e. g. Migne (P. L., XCVIII, 989–1248), though the latter had at his disposition the better edition of G. A. Heumann, Augusta Concilii Nicæni II Censura, i. e. Caroli M. de impio imaginum cultu libri IV (Hanover, 1731). Some excerpts from it are re-printed in Jaffé, Bibl. Rer. Germanic., VI, 220–42.

The authors of the "Libri Carolini" admit that images may be used as ecclesiastical ornaments, for purposes of instruction, and in memory of past events; it is foolish, however, to burn incense before them and to use lights, though it is quite wrong to cast the images out of the churches and destroy them. The writers are scandalized chiefly by the Latin term *adoratio*, taking it wrongly to mean absolute adoration, whereas the original Greek word, Proskynesis (*προσκύνησις*), means no more than reverence in a prostrate attitude. So they insist that God alone is to be adored (*adorandus et colendus*). The saints are to be venerated, only in a suitable manner (*opportuna veneratio*). Ecclesiastical tradition, they insist, holds all images as far inferior, in point of reverential honour, to the Cross of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, the sacred vessels, and the relics of the saints. They blame the excessive reverence shown by the Greeks to their emperors, criticize unfavourably the elevation of Tarasius (q. v.) to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and find fault (not always unreasonably) with the Scriptural and patristic exegesis of the Greeks. On the other hand, they ignorantly confound the sayings and doings of this orthodox council with those of the Iconoclastic conciliabulum of 754, frequently misrepresent the facts, and in general exhibit a strong anti-Greek bias. In explanation of their attitude the following words of Cardinal Hergenröther (Kircheng., ed. Kirsch, 1904, II, 132) seem appropriate: "Apart from the [unrecognized] errors of the translation, the acts and decrees of the Seventh General Council offended in various ways the customs and opinions of the Teutonic world where heathenism, but lately vanquished, was still potent in folk-life and manners. The rude semi-heathen Teuton might easily misunderstand in an idolatrous sense the honours awarded to images, as yet few in number owing to the uncultivated taste of the people. While, therefore, images were tolerated, they were not yet encouraged and held but a subordinate place. The Greeks had always reverenced highly, not alone the person of the Emperors, but also their portraits and statues, and in this respect incense and prostrations (Gr. Proskynesis, Lat. *adoratio*) were immemorial usages. It seemed to them, therefore, that they could not otherwise pay due reverence to the images of the Saviour and the saints. It was otherwise with the Germans, unaccustomed to prostrate themselves or to bend the knee before their kings. Such acts seemed fitted to express that adoration (latreia) which was due to God alone; when exhibited to others they were frequently a source of scandal. In the Teutonic mind, moreover, the freer ecclesiastical life of the West already shone by contrast with the extravagance of Oriental emperor-worship."

As stated above, Pope Adrian I, in a letter addressed to Charlemagne, answered lengthily the eighty-five *Capitula* submitted to him. He reminded the king that twelve of his bishops had taken part in a Roman Synod (previous to the Second Nicene Council) and had approved the "cultus" of images; he refuted a number of the arguments and objections brought forward, and asserted the identity of his teaching with that of the highly-respected Pope Gregory the Great concerning images. He also defended in a dignified way the Second Nicene Synod, not yet finally acknowledged by him, calling attention at the same time to his own just grievances against the Greeks who still retained the churches and estates that the Iconoclast Leo III (717–41) had violently withdrawn from Roman jurisdiction. This letter of Pope Adrian (d. 795) may not have been known to the bishops and abbots of the synod which met at Frankfort in 794 and on the above-described erroneous supposition rejected (can. 2) the Second Nicene Council. Charlemagne sent the acts of this synod to Rome, with a demand for the condemnation of Irene and Constantine VI, but seems gradually to have yielded to the mild and prudent firmness of Adrian for whom he professed at all times the most sincere admiration and friendship. A last echo of the theological conflict crystallized in the "Libri Carolini" is heard at the Paris Synod of 825, which, no wiser than its predecessor as to the erroneous version of the acts in question, sought in vain to obtain from Pope Eugene II an abandonment of the position taken by Adrian I. Despite the increasing favour of the "cultus" of images among their people, the Frankish bishops continued their opposition to the Second Nicene Council; the latter, however, eventually gained recognition especially after a new and somewhat more accurate version of its acts and decrees was made by Anastasius Bibliothecarius under John VIII (872–82). In the meantime the Frankish writer Walafrid Strabo had summarized and popularized the true ecclesiastical doctrine in his excellent "Liber de exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum", written about 840 (ed. Knöpfler, Munich, 1890). See Iconoclasm; Images; Claudius of Turin; Dungal of St. Denys; Jonas of Orléans.

Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, III, 678, 694–717; Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (4th ed., Freiburg, 1904), II, 132–137; Blanc, *Cours d' hist. ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1896), II, 100–103; Nolte in *Kathol. Literaturzeitung* (1861), 237; Floss, *Leben und Schriften Agobards, Erzbischofs von Lyon* (Gütersloh, 1897); Dümmler, *Uber Leben und Lehre des Bischofs Claudius von Turin* in *Sitzungsberichte der preuss. Akademie* (Berlin, 1895), 427; Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1900), II; Hermes in *Kirchenlexikon*, VII, 189–96; Wagenmann-Hauck in *Real-encyclopädie f. prot. Theologie und Kirche* (Leipzig, 1901), X, 88–97; Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (New York, 1895), IV, 465–70; and the ecclesiastical histories of Rohrbacher, Alzog, Kraus, etc.

Thomas J. Shahan.

Caroline Islands. A group of about 500 small coral islands, east of the Philippines, in the Pacific Ocean. The distance from Manila to Yap, one of the larger islands of the group, is 1200 miles. The Caroline Islands were discovered in the sixteenth century by the Spaniards and were so named in honour of Charles V. The Jesuits, John Anthony Cantova and Victor Walter, attempted missionary work there in 1731; the former was soon murdered, the latter obliged to flee. Two other Jesuits were killed later. In 1767 the Jesuits were suppressed in the Spanish dominions, and during the next 120 years there is no trace of a missionary. The controversy between Germany and Spain concerning the possession of the Carolines having been settled by Pope Leo XIII in favour of Spain, the king directed Spanish Capuchins to the islands, 15 March, 1886, and the Propaganda officially established that mission, 15 May, 1886, dividing it into two sections, named West and East Carolines respectively. Until then the islands had belonged ecclesiastically to the Vicariate Apostolic of Micronesia.

The aborigines, of the Polynesian race, are not cannibals; they live mainly by hunting and fishing, and know nothing of agriculture, though the soil is very fertile. They wear very little clothing and build small huts of branches. Immorality is rife

PRESENTATION OF CHRIST IN THE TEMPLE—CARPACCIO

ACADEMY, VENICE

among them, even the little children being infected with it. The boys make progress in learning, the girls are exceptionally slow. The language spoken in commerce is English, but the aborigines have several dialects of their own. The Spanish Capuchins had a catechism and prayer book printed in the Ponape dialect, and Father Anthony of Valentia wrote a small grammar and dictionary of the Yap dialect in 1890. They believe in a Supreme Being (*Yalafar*) and in a bad spirit (*Can*), yet they have hardly any religious rites. When the Spanish Fathers had laid the foundations of the mission, these islands passed by purchase into the hands of Germany (2 June, 1899). Spain had contributed more than $5000 a year towards the mission; Germany granted no support. Spain had compelled the aborigines to send their children to school; Germany gave full liberty in this regard, and the somewhat lazy people consequently began to neglect school as well as church. The mission thereby suffered greatly, and the Propaganda finally deemed it advisable to replace the Spanish Capuchins with others of German nationality (7 Nov., 1904) and to erect one Apostolic prefecture instead of the two separate missions (18 Dec., 1905). The Very Reverend Father Venantius of Prechthal was appointed first prefect Apostolic. In 1906 twelve fathers and twelve brothers were working in thirteen stations, and several Sisters of St. Francis left Luxemburg to take charge of the ten schools, in which were 262 children. Ninety adult converts were the harvest of that year, and the Catholic population is given as 1900 among 11,600 heathens and a few Protestants. The United States Government sent, 1 July, 1905, a Jesuit from the observatory at Manila to erect a meteorological station on the island of Yap, of which station the Capuchin Father Callistus was appointed director. The origin of the East-Asiatic typhoons had been traced to these regions, and twice a day observations are made, and notice is frequently given to Manila by cable.

STOLBERG, *Die Karolineninsel Yap* (Berlin, 1906); BAUMGARTEN, *Das Wirken der kath. Kirche auf dem Erdenrund* (Munich, 1902); STEIDL, *Die Missionen der Kapuziner in der Gegenwart* (Meran, 1890); *Katholische Missionen*, XXXIII–XXXV; CHRISTIAN, *The Caroline Islands* (London, 1899); *The Statesman's Year-Book* (1907), 1023; *Missiones Cath.* (Rome, 1907), 713–14; STREET, *Atlas des Missions cath.* (Steyl, 1906), 20, and plates 15 and 22.

OTTO JÉRON.

Caroly, GASPARD. See KAROLY, GASPARD (JASPER).

Caron, PIERRE AUGUSTIN. See BEAUMARCHAIS.

Caron, RAYMOND (or REDMOND), Franciscan friar and author, b. at Athlone, Ireland, in 1605; d. at Dublin, 1666. Entering the Franciscan convent in his native town he there made his preliminary studies, after which he studied philosophy at Drogheda. Subsequently he left Ireland and studied theology at Salzburg and at the Franciscan college at Louvain. At the latter place he was, immediately after his ordination, appointed professor of theology, and in that capacity maintained the reputation he had earned as a student. In 1635 he published at Antwerp a work "Roma triumphans Septicollis", in defence of Catholic doctrine, and had he continued at Louvain the quiet life of author and professor it would have been well for his peace of mind. But in 1648 he was sent by the superior of his order in the Netherlands to Ireland as visitator with ample powers to correct and reform. He resided at the Franciscan convent at Kilkenny, and plunged at once into the strife of faction then raging there. Opposing the nuncio and Owen Roe O'Neill, he sought to bring all to the side of Ormond and imprisoned the members of his order at Kilkenny who refused to adopt his views, a proceeding which made him so unpopular that his life was in danger, and he had to be protected by Lord Castlehaven at the head of an armed force. During the rule of the Puritans he remained abroad, but returned to England at the Restoration and lived there for several years. He was throughout the supporter of Ormond and his policy and wrote two works, in defence of Peter Walsh's "Remonstrance": "Loyalty asserted, and the late Remonstrance of the Irish Clergy and Laity confirmed and proved by the authority of Scripture, Fathers, etc." (London, 1662); and "Remonstrantia Hibernorum contra Lovanienses" (London, 1665). This conduct earned for him the character of a loyalist; but it brought on him the condemnation of his own superiors and for a time he was under ecclesiastical censure.

WARE-HARRIS, *Writers of Ireland* (Dublin, 1764); GILBERT, *History of Irish Affairs*, 1641–52 (ibid., 1880); CASTLEHAVEN, *Memoirs* (ibid., 1815); WALSH, *History of the Irish Remonstrance* (1674).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Caron, RENÉ-EDOUARD, a French Canadian statesman and magistrate, b. at Sainte Anne de Beaupré, Canada, 13 October, 1800, of Augustin Caron, a farmer, and Elizabeth Lessard; d. 13 December, 1876. He studied at the Quebec seminary and was admitted to the Bar in 1826. In 1833 he was elected Mayor of Quebec, an office he held for ten years with zeal and devotedness, particularly during the cholera of 1834, and the fire of 1845, which nearly destroyed the whole city. Elected for the Legislative Assembly in 1834, he was called to the Legislative Council, at the Union of the two provinces (1841). He was appointed Speaker of the Upper House successively in 1843, 1848, and 1851, having likewise a seat in the Cabinet on the last two occasions. He shared with Lafontaine and Morin the merit of wresting from an ultra-Tory oligarchy equal rights for Lower Canada. His patriotism and disinterestedness made him twice forgo power and honours to assure to his province the benefits of responsible government. In 1853 he was appointed Judge of the Superior Court, and in 1855 of the Court of the Queen's Bench, an office which he discharged for twenty years with prudence and impartiality, ever guided by conscience and the sense of duty. He took part in the codification of the civil laws (1859). In 1872 his long career of unsought honours was crowned by his appointment to the Lieutenant-Governorship of the Quebec Province, a position which he held till his death.

TURCOTTE, *Le Canada sous l'Union* (Quebec, 1872); FENNINGS-TAYLOR, *Portraits of British Americans* (Montreal, 1865).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Carpaccio, VITTORE, a Venetian painter whose real name was Scarpazza, b. at Venice about 1455; d. in the same city between 1523 and 1526. He was one of those Venetian masters who formed a link between the earlier artists, such as Jacobello del Fiore and the classic painters like Giorgione and Titian. Lazzaro Bastiani was his teacher, not, as Vasari has maintained, his pupil. Being an artist who worked for the middle classes of Venetian society, Carpaccio enjoyed neither the official position nor the aristocratic patronage that fell to the lot of the Bellinis. It was only in 1501 that he received orders for the Doge's Palace, where he painted the "Lion of St. Mark", still to be seen there, and the "Battle of Ancona", destroyed in the fire of 1577. In 1508 he was one of the commission appointed to set a valuation upon Giorgione's frescoes at the Fondaco dei Tedeschi.

Nearly all of Carpaccio's lifetime was spent in painting for the *scuole* (schools) or religious confraternities either of artisans or foreigners. It was for one of these that he executed the most celebrated and extensive of his works "The Life of St. Ursula", now preserved in the Academy of Venice. His other paintings were produced, doubtless, under similar circumstances. They usually depicted the lives of

the saints, and they included such subjects as: "The Life of the Virgin", "The Life of St. Stephen", "The Life of St. Jerome", and "The Life of St. George". The first two are found in museums of Europe, but about 1560 the others were placed, with the "Miracle of St. Tryphonius" and the "Call of St. Matthew", in the little Venetian church of San Giorgio de' Schiavoni, the best place in the world in which to make Carpaccio's acquaintance. The eight unframed panels found in the church of Saint Alviso, signed "Carpathius" and dealing with the histories of Joseph, the Queen of Sheba, Job, and Rebecca, are attributed, although without positive proof, to the youthful period of the master.

Carpaccio's style, like that of all the Venetian painters of the time, bore the imprint of Mantegna's influence. Architecturally he was inspired by Lombardi, but his peculiar charm lay in knowing better than any other artist how to reproduce the incomparable grace of Venice. Long before the time of Guardi and the Canalettis, Carpaccio was the historian and the poet of its *calle* and *canali*, and his work, together with Marin Sanudo's Journal, provides the best picture extant of the golden age of the republic. Carpaccio was the most truly Venetian of all the artists of Venice, and, of course, it is there that he can be best understood and appreciated. Moreover, he was the most Oriental, and his work abounds in the costumes and views of the East. In 1511 he had completed a panorama of Jerusalem that he offered in a letter to the Marquis of Mantua. It might naturally be supposed that Carpaccio had accompanied Gentile Bellini to Constantinople, but it has been ascertained that he limited himself to copying Reuwich's pictures in Breydenbach's "Itinerary", published at Mainz in 1486.

His genius is of a most realistic turn. He has nothing of Giovanni Bellini's deep, religious lyricism; besides, his expression lacks vigour. His "Martyrdom of the Ten Thousand" in the Academy of Venice is among his feeblest efforts, being merely a happy, tranquil, although quite pleasing, conception, luminous and life-like, and characterized by exquisite dignity and an indescribable air of cheerful heroism. His great equestrian picture of St. Vitalis at Venice was the most beautiful piece of decorative painting prior to the time of Paul Veronese. When pathetic, Carpaccio is charming. Nothing is more instructive than to compare his "Life of St. Ursula" with Memling's famous shrine in Bruges. With the Venetian everything merges into splendid spectacles and ceremonies. However, his "Saint's Vision" is one of the most beautiful paintings of virginal sleep ever made. His "St. Jerome in his Cell" yields nothing in point of nobility to Dürer's fine print, and his last pictures, such as "The Holy Family" at Caen and the eloquent "Pietà" at Berlin, reveal a soulful intensity of which his earlier productions gave no promise.

VASARI, *Le Vite* (1557); RIDOLFI, *Meraviglie dell' arte* (Venice, 1648, in 4to); RUSKIN, *St. Mark's Rest* (London); LUDWIG AND MOLMENTI, *Vittore Carpaccio, la vita e le opere* (Milan, 1906, in 4to); ROSENTHAL, *Carpaccio* (Paris, 1907); DE WYZEWA, *Les maîtres italiens d'autrefois* (Paris, 1907).

LOUIS GILLET.

Carpasia, a titular see of Cyprus. Carpasia, Karpasia, also Karpasion (sometimes mistaken for Karpathos) is said to have been founded by King Pygmalion near Cape Sarpedon, now Cape St. Andrea, at the extreme end of a peninsula on the north-east shore of Cyprus, a short distance north of the modern Rhizokarpaso. Its first-known bishop, St. Philo, was ordained by St. Epiphanius in the fourth century; he has left a commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, a letter, and some fragments. Hermolaus was present at Chalcedon in 451. The chroniclers mention three other names, and a fourth occurs on a seal, all without dates. Another is quoted in the "Constitutio Cypria" of Alexander IV (1260). The see was suppressed in 1222 by the papal legate, Cardinal Pelagius, but it figures in later episcopal lists. During the Latin domination the Greek Archbishop of Arsinoë (Famagusta) was obliged to reside at Rhizokarpaso.

P. G., XL, 9–154; KERAMEUS, *Analecta*, I, 393–399; FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. græca*, ed. HARLES, IV, 751, X, 479; MAS-LATRIE, *Histoire de Chypre*, passim; IDEM, *L'île de Chypre*, 46; HACKETT, *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus* (1901), 318, 320.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Carpi, DIOCESE OF (CARPENSIS).—The city of Carpi is situated in the province of Modena, Central Italy. It belonged originally to the famous Countess Matilda, from whom it passed to the Holy See (1115–1215). From 1215 to 1319 it was subject to Modena, and from the latter date until 1525 was ruled by the Pio, vassals of the Holy See. In 1530 Charles V, who had occupied Carpi since 1525, made it over to Alfonso (I) d'Este, Duke of Ferrara. Carpi was created a see only in 1779, by Pius VI, the first bishop being Francesco Benincasa. Under Julius II it became immediately dependent on the Holy See, having previously been under the jurisdiction of Modena. The cathedral, built by King Aistulf in 756, was entirely rebuilt and richly embellished by Duke Alberto Pio. In 1855 Carpi became a suffragan of Modena. The diocese contains a population of 70,000, with 31 parishes, 50 churches and chapels, 84 secular and 4 regular priests, and 4 religious houses for women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XV, 401; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 369.

U. BENIGNI.

Carpini, GIOVANNI DI. See PIANO CARPINI, GIOVANNI DI.

Carr, THOMAS. See PINKNEY, MILES.

Carracci, AGOSTINO, an Italian painter, engraver, and etcher, b. at Bologna, 16 August, 1557; d. at Parma, 22 March, 1602. The son of Antonio Carracci, a tailor, he was nephew of Lodovico and brother of Annibale. He began his art life as a goldsmith; but, urged by his uncle, the youth abandoned plastic for graphic art, and studied painting, first with Fontana, who had been Lodovico's master, and later with Passerotti. The fame of Correggio's masterpieces drew Agostino to Parma, and afterwards, accompanied by Annibale, he made a long sojourn in Venice, where he became a distinguished engraver under the celebrated Cort. In 1589 he and his brother returned to Bologna and with Lodovico started the "School of the Carracci" (see below, LODOVICO), in which he taught while working devotedly at painting. In his native town is his masterpiece, "The Last Communion of St. Jerome", a beautiful work, showing Correggio's influence. Agostino helped in the decoration of nearly every great palace in Bologna, and his poetic imagination was of great avail when with the matter-of-fact Annibale he assisted in the decoration of the Farnese Palace in Rome. He was a poet, and an interesting sonnet of his tells the students of the "Academy" what parts to choose from each school of painting and from the masters of the past in order to attain perfection. In 1600 Annibale and Agostino had a disagreement, and the latter left for Parma, where for the rest of his life he painted for the duke. Agostino was a master of engraving; he introduced what is called "the large style", and the lines of his plates were broadly and boldly laid. His influence in the art of engraving was felt far beyond the bounds of Italy, and his technic with the graver was widely imitated. His plates were freely and beautifully executed, there is an admirable expression on all his faces, and the execution of the hands and feet is

marvellous. In addition to his masterpiece, mention may be made of: "St. Francis receiving the Stigmata" (Vienna); "Triumph of Galatea" (London). Among his numerous plates the best and most celebrated are: "Antonio Carracci" (his father); "Tiziano Vecelli"; "The Repose in Egypt".

ANNIBALE, painter, etcher, and engraver, brother of Agostino, b. at Bologna, 3 November, 1560; d. in Rome, 15 July, 1609. The boy's father, after much persuasion by Lodovico an uncle, was induced to let Annibale study painting instead of learning the trade of tailor, and Lodovico became his first teacher. After a visit to Parma and a study of the masters in that city, Annibale accompanied his brother Agostino to Venice and worked with him there. He returned to Bologna in 1589, and with his uncle and brother opened the Academy of the *Incamminati* or *Desiderosi*, called later the "School of the Eclectics" and the "School of the Carracci", whose object was to "revive" art. In 1600 Annibale went to Rome, whither Cardinal Odoardo Farnese had invited him, to decorate the splendid Farnese Palace. This was his greatest achievement, and up to and through Sir Joshua Reynolds's time Annibale was ranked with Raphael. Poussin says of the Farnese decorations, "in them he surpassed every artist who preceded him". Agostino assisted him in this work but left before a year was over, either from Annibale's jealousy, as some assert, or because of the latter's quarrelsome disposition. In any event, Annibale stands as the most distinguished of the five Carracci, and in perfection of drawing, delicacy of colour, and grace in modelling closely approaches the old masters. "The Three Maries" is his finest easel picture, and both in feeling and handling is beautiful and impressive. Although a founder of the *Desiderosi*, his landscapes possess great charm even as backgrounds, and, what was unusual then, he painted landscapes where figures were but accessories, and also worked in genre. His etchings and engravings, however, are much inferior to his paintings, and, compared with Agostino's work with the graver, conventional and amateurish. When Annibale died, his nephew Antonio, to whom he was benefactor, teacher, and friend, gave him a splendid burial in the Pantheon. Among his principal paintings are: "The Three Maries" (Castle Howard, England); "Holy Family" (Berlin); "Portrait of Himself" (Florence); "La Vierge aux Cerises" (Paris); "Pietà" (St. Petersburg). Of his engraved and etched plates the best is: "The Dead Christ in the Lap of the Virgin", called the "Caprarola Christ".

ANTONIO MARZIALE, an Italian painter, the natural son of Agostino Carracci, b. in Venice, 1583; d. in Rome, 1618. He began his art studies early and proved an apt scholar. He was taught first by his father, and later and chiefly by his uncle Annibale for whom he developed a deep affection. With Annibale he went to Rome where most of his work was done. Cardinal Tonti employed the talented youth to decorate his chapel, and on its completion he was commissioned to paint the chapel of St. Charles Borromeo, and a frieze in one of the rooms of the pope's palace at Monte Cavallo. His easel pictures were few, and are to-day exceedingly rare. In 1609, when his uncle and teacher, Annibale, died, he showed his devotion by burying him with great solemnity near the tomb of Raphael. His was an uneventful career. Chief among his works are: "The Flood" (Louvre); "Christ healing a blind man" (Modena); "Lute Player" (Modena).



ANTONIO CARRACCI ANNIBALE CARRACCI LODOVICO CARRACCI

PORTRAITS BY THEMSELVES (Uffizi Gallery, Florence)

FRANCESCO, painter and engraver, son of Giovanni Antonio Carracci, b. in Bologna, 1595; d. in Rome, 1622. The father was a brother of Agostino and Annibale. Francesco was a youth of great talent and promise. He was taught by Lodovico in the Academy of the *Incamminati*, but left the school to start one in opposition to his teacher, calling it the "True School of the Carracci". Like the other members of the Carracci family he taught, engraved, and painted. His "Adoration" in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, Bologna, is not only his masterpiece but an excellent piece of vigorous painting. The "True School" was not a success, and, his students leaving him, Francesco went to Rome and made another attempt to found an academy, only to fail again. He died in abject poverty. He left a few engravings after the works of Lodovico and Annibale.

LODOVICO, painter, etcher, engraver, and founder of the "Eclectic School" of painting, b. at Bologna, 21 April, 1555; d. there, 13 November, 1619. He was of humble origin, and his brother Antonio was a tailor by trade. Slow, plodding, but determined, the young Lodovico was advised by his masters, Fontana and Tintoretto, to abandon his chosen career of art, and his fellow-students jeered him, calling him "the ox" on account of his physical and mental characteristics. But neither teachers nor pupils could turn him from the path he had marked out for himself. He travelled throughout Italy to

prosecute his studies, and was chiefly influenced by the works of Andrea del Sarto, Titian, and Correggio. He returned to Bologna in 1589 and with Agostino and Annibale, his nephews, opened the Academy *degli Desiderosi*, "the school of those who regret the past, despise the present, and aspire to a better future". For eleven years these three worked together, and then, the younger men going to Rome, Lodovico remained the sole head of the Academy until his death. The object of the "Eclectics" was to combine in their art Michelangelo's line, Titian's colour, Correggio's chiaroscuro, and Raphael's symmetry and grace. Midway, however, in their successful career, the three Carracci were forced to modify their eclecticism and rely more and more on nature. The fame of the Carracci Academy was great, its influence spread over all Italy, and Lodovico's was a great name—great more on account of the painters he developed than from his own work with the brush. Albani, Guido Reni, Domenichino, Lanfranco, Spada, Tiarini, and Bonzi (*Il Gobbo*) were among those who attended the school. Lodovico's paintings are pleasing in colour, and exhibit much intelligence and technical skill, but lack spontaneity, originality, and individuality. He was a teacher rather than an artist. His engravings, much more interesting than his other work, are very beautiful; evidently he began his plates by freely and simply etching them and then finished with an elaborate use of the graver. Chief among his works are: "Ecce Homo" (Rome); "Miracle of the Loaves and Fishes" (Berlin); "Virgin and Child" (Paris). Among his etched and engraved plates are the "Holy Family" and "Samson overcoming the Lion".

CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *History of Painting in Italy* (London, 1864); LÜBKE, *Gesch. der italienischen Malerei* (Stuttgart, 1878); MICHAUD, *Biog. Univ.*; LANDON, *Vies et Œuvres des peintres les plus célèbres de toutes les écoles* (Paris, 1803–25); VASARI, *Vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori e architetti* (Florence, 1849).

LEIGH HUNT.

Carranza, BARTOLOMÉ (also called DE MIRANDA, from his native town), Archbishop of Toledo; b. at Miranda de Arga, Spain, 1503; d. at Rome, 2 May, 1576. Carranza belonged to a noble family which had its estates at Miranda de Arga in Spanish Navarre. He received his early education at Alcalá and in 1520 entered the Dominican convent of Benalaque near Guadalajara. He continued his philosophical and theological studies at Salamanca; in 1528 he was made master of the liberal arts, and in 1534 lector of theology, at the College of St. Gregory, Valladolid. On account of some doctrinal opinions he was said to hold, an accusation was about this time brought against him, but nothing further came of it. Carranza's reputation as a learned theologian increased rapidly, and he was appointed censor by the Inquisition and was commissioned to prepare opinions and sermons. He was also sent by his order on various important missions. Thus in 1539 he represented his province at the general chapter of the Dominicans at Rome. After his return, in 1540, the Emperor Charles V offered him the See of Cuzco in Peru, but Carranza declined the appointment and continued performing his duties as lector of theology at Valladolid. In 1545, when the Council of Trent was opened, Charles V sent Carranza and another Dominican, Dominicus de Soto, as imperial theologians, to the council, and by June, 1545, Carranza was in Trent. During the first period of the council (1545–47) he took an active part in the discussions of the theologians in the congregations, expressed opinions concerning the various matters appointed for discussion, the sacraments in general, Baptism, the Eucharist, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and preached at Divine service, 14 March, before the assembled council (Le Plat, "Monum. Trident.", I, 52–62, gives the text of the sermon). He also showed great zeal in the conferences concerning the reform of church discipline. In the warm discussions as to the duty of episcopal residence, Carranza, like all the Spaniards, was strongly of the opinion that the duty of residence was a Divine law (*juris divini*), and therefore could not be delegated to a vicar. On this question Carranza wrote and issued a treatise, "Controversia de necessariâ residentiâ personali episcoporum et aliorum inferiorum ecclesiæ pastorum Tridenti explicata" (Venice, 1547), which may be found in Le Plat, "Monum. Trident.", III, 522–584. Carranza also had a share in drawing up the eleven articles proposed by the Spaniards, which treated the duty of episcopal residence and other questions of discipline relating to the office of a bishop. When the council was transferred to Bologna he did not go to that city, but remained in Trent. In 1548 Charles asked him to accompany Prince Philip to Flanders as confessor, but Carranza declined the position; in 1549 he refused the appointment of Bishop of the Canary Islands.

After his return to Spain, in 1549, he was made prior of the monastery at Palencia, and in 1550 provincial. In 1551, when Pope Julius III reopened the Council at Trent, Carranza went once more to that city to take part in the deliberations. The council was again interrupted in 1552, and Carranza went back to Spain, where, besides his duties in his order he also took part in the labours of the Inquisition. As almoner of Prince Philip, Carranza came in contact with the prince, and often preached before him and his court. When, in 1554, Philip was betrothed to Queen Mary of England, and was preparing to go to that country for the marriage, he sent Carranza and other members of Spanish orders ahead of him, in order to give support to the queen in her efforts to bring back the country to the Catholic Faith. Carranza remained until 1557 in England, where he was actively engaged, in connexion with Cardinal Pole, as visitator and preacher. He sought to prevent the sale of Protestant books, preached frequently against the false doctrines, and made an inspection of the University of Oxford, from which, by his efforts, a number of professors were expelled. After Charles V had abdicated the throne and was succeeded, in Spain, by Philip, Carranza returned, in 1557, to the Continent, and went to Flanders, where the new king had his principal residence at that time. In Flanders the zealous Dominican also busied himself with efforts to check the introduction and spread of Protestant writings and to maintain the Catholic Faith.

The See of Toledo falling vacant by the death of the Cardinal Archbishop Siliceo, 31 May, 1557, the king decided upon Carranza as successor to the position. In vain did Carranza exert himself to win the favour of the king for another candidate. Philip II persisted in his choice, so that at last Carranza yielded and was preconized by Pope Paul IV, 16 December, 1557, as Archbishop of Toledo and, therefore, Primate of Spain. Carranza received episcopal consecration at Brussels, in 1558, from Cardinal Granvella, then Bishop of Arras. Equipped with important political instructions the new archbishop left Flanders in June and reached the court at Valladolid in August. Soon after this he went to Yuste to visit Charles V, who was dying; he remained with the emperor until the latter's death. A report arose in time that Carranza had led Charles into heretical views, so that the emperor had not died in the true Catholic Faith. This rumour was pure invention, but it gave a new ground for the process before the Inquisition which had already begun against him. It was only for about a year that Carranza was able to devote himself to his diocese, where he bestowed especial attention upon the care of the poor. In 1558 his "Commentary on the Christian Catechism" (Commentarios del revmo. Señ. Fray Bartolomé Carranza de Miranda sobre el cate-

chismo cristiano) had appeared at Antwerp. A number of views suspected of heresy were found in the book, and the Grand Inquisitor Valdés brought an action against the author. Besides this work on the catechism, Carranza's manuscripts, expressions he had employed in sermons, and letters found in his possession, among them one from Juan de Valdés, the heretic, were taken as evidence against him. Melchior Cano, the famous theologian, and Dominicus de Soto, both members of the same order as the archbishop, drew numerous propositions from the commentary which were open to ecclesiastical censure. A Brief of Paul IV, dated 7 January, 1559, had granted the Grand Inquisitor of Spain the power, for the space of two years, to investigate the conduct of all Spanish bishops; this measure was intended to counteract the threatening danger of the spread of Protestant doctrine. With the permission, therefore, of King Philip II (26 June, 1558) the grand inquisitor had the archbishop arrested at Torrelaguna, 22 August, 1558, and brought a prisoner to Valladolid. Pope Pius IV made repeated requests to Philip II in the matter, and the Holy Father was urged several times, in the years 1562 and 1563, by the members of the Council of Trent, to bring the case of the Archbishop of Toledo before his court. The Congregation of the Index also gave at the council a favourable testimony for Carranza in regard to his commentary.

Nevertheless the Spanish process pursued its tedious course. In 1564, when the Inquisition had closed its investigation, the king expressed the wish to Pius IV that the matter be decided in Spain by judges appointed by the pope. The pope agreed to this and named (13 July, 1565) four judges who were to pronounce judgment in Spain. These judges were: Cardinal Ugo Buoncompagni, Ippolito Aldobrandini, Fel. Peretti, O. S. F., and J. B. Castagna, Archbishop of Rossano; all four became popes later. However, after their arrival in Spain in November, 1565, they were not permitted to proceed independently of the officials of the Inquisition, and the process, therefore, reached no final settlement. At last, in 1567, owing to the peremptory order of Pius V, the suit was brought before the Curia, the official documents were sent to Rome, and Carranza, who had been in prison eight years, was taken to Rome, where he arrived 28 May, 1567. The papal chambers in the Castle of Sant' Angelo were appointed to be his residence during the trial. Once more the case lasted a long time, being nine years before the Curia. It was not until the reign of Gregory XIII that a final decision was reached, 14 April, 1576. Carranza was not found guilty of actual heresy, but he was condemned to abjure sixteen Lutheran propositions of which he had made himself suspected, was forbidden to enter on the government of his diocese for another five years, and was ordered during this period to live in the monastery of his order near the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, and there to perform certain religious exercises as penance. Carranza died, however, in the same year, and was buried in the choir of the church just mentioned. Before this he had, on 23 April, visited the seven great churches and had celebrated Mass on the following day in the basilica of the Lateran. Previous to receiving the last sacraments he touchingly declared that he had been all his life a true adherent of the Catholic Faith, that he had never voluntarily understood and held the condemned propositions in a heretical sense, and that he submitted entirely to the judgment pronounced upon him. He had borne the imprisonment of nearly seventeen years with patience and resignation, and was universally venerated at Rome. Pope Gregory XIII gave permission for the placing over his grave of a monument bearing an inscription in his honour.

Carranza's sorrowful fate was brought about, largely, by the intense desire to keep all Protestant influences out of Spain. At the same time it cannot be denied that expressions which he used and propositions which he occasionally set forth would of themselves give rise to the suspicion of heretical opinions. At a later date the Congregation of the Index also condemned his commentary. This work, a stout folio, treated the doctrines of Christian faith and morals under four heads: faith, commandments, sacraments, and good works. Besides the commentary, Carranza published a "Summa Conciliorum et Pontificum a Petro usque Paulum III" (Venice, 1546), often republished and enlarged by later editors. The "Summa" was prefaced by four dissertations: "Controversiæ quattuor, (1) Quanta sit auctoritas traditionum in ecclesiâ; (2) Quanta Sacræ Scripturæ; (3) Quanta Romani Pontificis et Sedis apostolicæ; (4) Quanta Conciliorum"; further, by the controversial treatise concerning episcopal residence mentioned above, and by an "Introduction to the Hearing of the Mass" (Instruccion para oir messa). An edition was issued at Antwerp in 1555.

NAVARRETE, *Coleccion de documentos inéditos para la historia de España* (Madrid, 1844), V; GACHARD, *Retraite et mort de Charles-Quint au monastère de Yuste* (Brussels, 1854–55), II; *Concilium Tridentinum*, ed. *Societas Gœresiana*, I; DIARIA, ed. MERKLE (Freiburg im Br., 1901); QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Scriptores ord. Prædicatorum* (Paris, 1721), II; TOURON, *Histoire des hommes illustres de l'ordre de S. Dominique* (Paris, 1747), IV; LLORENTE, *Histoire critique de l'inquisition d'Espagne* (Paris, 1818), III; RODRIGO, *Historia verdadera de la Inquisicion* (Madrid, 1877), III; SCHÄFER, *Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus* (Gütersloh, 1902), I and III; REUSCH, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Bonn, 1883 sqq.), III; LAUGWITZ, *Barth. Carranza, Erzbischof von Toledo* (Kempten, 1870); CABALLERO, *Vida de Melchior Cano* (Madrid, 1871); EHRLE in *Der Katholik* (1885, I, 86, sqq.).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Carranza, DIEGO, b. at Mexico, 1559; d. at Tehuantepec. He entered the Dominican Order 12 May, 1577, and was sent to Nejapa in Oaxaca after being ordained a priest. He was assigned to the mission among the Chontal Indians, who roamed through the forests almost in a savage condition, although, by their language, they belong to the same linguistic stock as the sedentary Nahuatl. Undergoing great privations, Carranza clung to these forest tribes, and succeeded in partly settling them in hamlets and erecting hermitages where they might worship. For twelve years he led this life of exposure and contracted leprosy. He must have died quite young, but the exact date is unknown. Before his death he erected a church for his wards in the village of Santa Maria Tequiztlan. Details concerning this devoted missionary are very meagre. We know however, that he composed, in the Chontal idiom, a "Doctrina cristiana", "Exercicios espirituales", and "Sermones", which remained in manuscript, but they are now lost. They would be of the greatest value, since hardly anything has been published on this idiom.

DÁVILA-PADILLA, *Historia de la Fundación &ca* (Mexico, 1596); BURGOA, *Geográfica Descripción* (Mexico, 1674); ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca hispana nova* (Madrid, 1733–1738); SQUIER, *Monograph of Authors* (New York, 1861); BRINTON, *The American Race* (New York, 1891); OROZCO Y BERRA, *Lenguas indíjenas y Carta etnográfica de México* (Mexico, 1864); PIMENTEL, *Cuadro descriptivo y comparativo de las Lenguas indíjenas de México* (Mexico, 1862).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Carranza, MIGUEL ALFONSO. See MIRANDA.

Carreño de Miranda, JUAN, Spanish painter, b. at Avilés in Asturia, 1614; d. at Madrid, 1685. He was a pupil of Pedro de Las Cuevas and Bartolomé Roman, but at the age of twenty knew more than his masters could teach him, and left them to set up a studio for himself. Velazquez is said to have interested himself to gain permission for the young artist to study the frescoes of the royal palaces; Carreño then obtained a commission to decorate the mirrors in the palace of Alcázar, and his talents so recommended him to the Court that in 1660 he was appointed by

the king as court painter (*pintor de cámara*), a position he retained under the next king, Charles II. He was a man of particularly happy, peaceable disposition, full of generosity, and an immense favourite with his pupils and friends. His work is tender, suave, and of pure, fresh colouring, and in his particular method he is only surpassed by Murillo. Unfortunately, he was too much given to imitating the work of Velazquez, and, although his portraits are powerful and truthful likenesses, their resemblance in general pose to those of the master force them to challenge the incomparable works of Velazquez, to the obvious detriment of Carreño. His strongest portrait is that of Prince Pedro Ivanovitz Potemkin, Ambassador from the Emperor of Russia to the Court of Spain, a full length figure in red, and he painted three portraits of Charles II, life-like representations of the child-king. He executed several etchings. His best paintings are to be seen at Madrid, St. Petersburg, Pamplona, Valenciennes, and Vienna. Palomino gives a long account of his pictures in Alcalá, Segovia, and Pamplona, but very little about the artist himself. He was responsible, with Francisco Ricci, for the decoration of the celebrated cupola of San Antonio de los Portugueses, and the same two artists collaborated in painting the "Magdalen in the Desert" for the Convent of Las Recogidas.

Ceán Bermúdez, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las Bellas Artes en España* (Madrid, 1800); Baldinucci, *Notizie de' Professori del disegno* (Florence, 1688); Conca, *Descrizione odeporica della Spagna* (Parma, 1793); Cossio, *La Pintura española* (Madrid, 1886); Madrazo, *Catálogo descriptivo é histórico de los cuadros del Museo del Prado* (Madrid, 1872); Orlandi, *Abecedario pittorico* (Naples, 1733); Pacheco, *Arte de la Pintura* (Seville, 1649); Palomino de Castro y Velasco, *Museo Pictórico y Escala Optica* (Madrid, 1715); Id., *El Parnaso español pintoresco laureado* (Madrid, 1724); Stirling, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (London, 1848); Smith, *Painting, Spanish and French* (London, 1884); Hartley, *Spanish Painting* (London, 1904); Zarco del Valle, *Documentos inéditos para la Historia de las Bellas Artes en España* (Madrid, 1870).

George Charles Williamson.

Carrera, Rafael, b. at Guatemala, Central America, 24 October, 1814; d. there 14 April, 1865, one of the most remarkable men that Central America has produced. A mestizo, he had no opportunity to secure an education, and learned to sign his name only after he had already risen to power. The judgment usually passed upon him is most unfavourable. He is described as a cruel, bloodthirsty upstart from the lowest walks of life, opposed to liberty and progress and even to order. The last is certainly not true, since it was Carrera who, in the end, brought order into the bloody chaos in which political factions had plunged Guatemala for decades. Two factions were then opposing each other in Central America: the Centralists, who clung to Spanish colonial traditions, and the Federalists, who dreamt of a federation of the Central American States in imitation of the United States of North America. Strife had been bitter and bloody, at least since 1824, and on both sides terrible excesses were committed. The Federalists or Liberals had forcibly abolished the convents and monastic orders, driven away the clergy in general, levying contributions right and left on the Church, making forced loans to gratify the rapacity of unscrupulous and profligate office-holders under pretext of supporting the Government. To this kind of "liberty" Carrera was opposed. His opposition was intuitive, not from principle or reasoning. Like the Indians, he clung to the Church from tradition and habit. In 1829 he was an obscure drummer-boy in one of the bands that fought and pillaged for the Centralist party. General Morazan was the leader of the Liberals and captured the city of Guatemala in the same year, putting the Federalist faction in power again. Carrera abandoned the military career for the time and became a humble swineherd. But when, in 1837, the cholera made its appearance in Guatemala, the Indians, attributing its ravages to the poisoning of the water by the Federalist authorities, rose in arms against them.

The uprising was put down by force, called forth by the usual cruelties perpetrated by Indians on such occasions. Carrera's wife was outraged by Liberals. He vowed revenge and kept his vow. On a later occasion his aged mother was also ill-treated, which still further increased his wrath. He gathered a band of followers and began a merciless warfare. Extermination of the Liberal faction was thereafter his aim. No pity had been shown to those he most loved, and he felt no compassion for those under whose orders they had been wronged. Against the trained soldiers of Morazan he could not for a long time prevail, but his incessant harassing told upon the enemy in the end and, after Morazan had recaptured the city of Guatemala in 1839, that leader found himself entrapped. In 1840 Carrera was absolute master of Guatemala. Until then he had been concerned only with war; now he faced the task of reorganization, for which he was little or not at all prepared. He re-established the clergy, the convents, and recalled the Jesuits, thus laying the foundation of a new life. He proved himself wiser than the Centralists, who opposed all progress, more practical than the Liberals, who refused to take into account the historical development of the people and their actual condition, striving by force to impose changes for which the people were not prepared and which they could not understand.

In 1847 Carrera was, by a kind of election, made President of Guatemala, and seven years later he became dictator, that is, president for life with the right to designate his successor. In 1862 he attacked San Salvador and took its capital. Towards the end of his life he had to repress attempts at insurrection. But no outbreak could succeed; he was too firmly master of the situation, and his influence over the Indians (who form three-fourths of the population) was too powerful.

Stephens, *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas, and Yucatan* (London, 1842); Bancroft, *History of the Pacific States* (San Francisco, 1882); Frobel, *Seven Years' Travel in Central America* (London, 1859); Squier, *The States of Central America* (New York, 1858).

Ad. F. Bandelier.

Carrhæ, a titular see of Mesopotamia. Carrhæ is the Haran of the Bible. It is frequently mentioned in Assyrian monuments under the name Harrânu, which means "Road". It was the centre of the worship of the goddess Sin (the Moon), and was inhabited by Sabeans. Abraham came thither from Ur, in Chaldea (Gen., xi, 31), with his family, which remained there (xxvii, 43) while he went on to Canaan (xii, 1). Rebecca was born there (xxiv, 4), and Jacob lived there during fourteen years with his uncle Laban (xxviii, 2; xxxi, 3). Under King Hezekiah it was taken by the Assyrians (IV K., xix, 12; Is., xxxvii, 12). Ezechiel (xxvii, 23) says it had commercial relations with Tyrus. In the neighbouring plain Crassus was defeated and killed by the Parthians (53 B. C.); Emperor Galerius was defeated on the same site (A. D. 296).

Christianity did not make rapid progress at Carrhæ. Julian the Apostate, before his expedition against the Persians, resided there in preference to Edessa, a Christian city; under Justinian most of its inhabitants were yet heathen (Procop. De bel. Pers., II, 13). In time, however, it became a suffragan of Edessa in Osrhoene. Lequien (II, 973) mentions from the fourth to the sixth century eleven bishops; among them are: Vitus, the friend of St. Basil, St. Protogenes, and St. Abrahamius. The latter died at Constantinople. Emperor Theodosius II was so impressed by his saintly life that he chose to wear his poor tunic. From the sixth century the Jacobites

had at Carrhæ a very flourishing Church; Patriarch Michael the Syrian enumerates seventeen bishops from the eighth to the twelfth century (Revue de l'Orient chrétien, 1901, p. 197). One Latin bishop is known, but not with certainty (Eubel, I, 282). Carrhæ was the residence of Merwan, the last of the Ommiad caliphs, and became the centre of a famous Mussulman school, where, in the tenth century, many Greek works were translated into Arabic. Harran, to-day a village in a wide, barren plain, destitute of trees, is not far from the river Belikh (Bilichus), and about 25 miles from Orfa (Edessa) in the vilayet of Aleppo. Its houses are shaped like sugar loaves and inhabited chiefly by bedouins. There are ruins of a Roman camp, of many churches, and of a fortress dating from the Crusades. Near the village is still to be found the well whence Rebecca was drawing water when Eliezer found her.

AINSWORTH, *Researches in Assyria, Babylonia, and Chaldæa*, 153; CHESNEY, *The Expedition for the Survey of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris*, I, 48, 106–15; II, 401, 426–33, 460; CHWOLSON, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, I, 301–471; STANLEY, *The Jewish Church*, I, 414–418; AINSWORTH, *Haran* in *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology* (1901), XIII, 385–390; BADGER, *The Nestorians*, 341; SACHAU, *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien*, 217–224; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography* (London, 1878), I, 526.

S. VAILHÉ.

Carrière, JOSEPH, moral theologian, thirteenth superior of the seminary and Society of Saint-Sulpice, b. 19 February, 1795, at La Panouze-de-Cernon, near Rodez, France; d. at Lyons, 23 April, 1864. He entered the seminary of Saint-Sulpice in 1812, and five years later, at the age of twenty-two, became a member of the society and was ordained priest. The following year he was called to Saint-Sulpice to teach the postgraduate course of moral theology, and, despite his extreme youth, distinguished himself as a brilliant and sound teacher. In 1829 he came to America in the capacity of official visitor to the Sulpician houses; invited to take part in the First Provincial Council of Baltimore, held in that year, he gained admiration there by his learning as well as by his charming and simple character. The works which have given him a place in the history of theology were chiefly published between 1829 and 1850, when he was chosen superior of the society, a position he retained till his death.

Carrière's published writings are: "Dissertation sur la réhabilitation des marriages nuls" (1828–34); "Juris cultor theologus circa obligationes restitutionis", by I. Vogler, S. J., enlarged and adapted to the French Law (1833), and incorporated in Migne's "Theologiæ Cursus Completus"; "Prælectiones theologicæ: De Matrimonio" (2 vols., Paris, 1837; Louvain, 1838); a compendium of this work (1837), which has had eight editions; "Prælectiones theologicæ: De justitiâ et jure" (3 vols., Paris, 1839; Louvain, 1845), and a compendium (1840) which also reached its eighth edition; "Prælectiones theologicæ: De Contractibus (3 vols., Paris, 1844–47; Louvain, 1846–48), of which the compendium (1848) has had four editions. Carrière was the first writer of note to treat theology in its relations to the Napoleonic Code; his expositions of the French Law were so lucid, full, and accurate that they were used as authorities by jurists, and, it is said, are even to-day so regarded. These qualities characterize his whole work; the opinions he rejects are treated as fairly and almost as fully as those he adopts; his works abound in erudition, but are clear, orderly, precise—*admodum eruditæ, solidæ, accuratæ*, says Father Hurter, S. J. He was inclined to the opinion, generally held in France in his day, that the State had the power to create diriment impediments to marriage among Catholics; but he abandoned it as soon as it was disapproved at Rome. Conservative in temperament and by education, he was one of the first to combat the ideas of de Lamennais. His position at Saint-Sulpice afforded a wide scope to the influence of his learning and solid judgment, and of his simple and upright nature as well, and made him one of the foremost figures of the French Church in his day.

O'MAHONY, *Joseph Carrière* (Dublin, 1865); BERTRAND, *Histoire littéraire de la c. de Saint-Sulpice* (Paris, 1900), II, 272 sq.; LEVESQUE in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1905).

JOHN F. FENLON.

Carrières, LOUIS DE, b. in the château de la Plesse in Avrillé, Angers, France, 1 September, 1662; d. at Paris, 11 June, 1717. He entered the French Oratory at a time when such masters as Le Cointe, Thomassin, Malebranche, Richard Simon, and Bern. Lamy were flourishing, and made the Holy Scriptures the favourite subject of his studies. In his solicitude to promote Biblical science he founded a scholarship, the first beneficiary of which was the well-known C. F. Houbigant. He held various offices in his community, and earned the reputation of a priest as modest as he was learned.

His work, "La Sainte Bible en français, avec un commentaire littéral inséré dans la traduction", has won for his name a widespread and long-lived celebrity among the readers of the Holy Scriptures in French. It differs entirely from anything published by former commentators. Taking Le Maistre de Sacy's translation as a framework, a few words of paraphrase are here and there used to explain difficulties or clear up obscure places. These simple and short additions, inspired for the most part by Vatable, Tirinus, Menochius, Bonfrère, and Jansenius, and printed in italics, are at first glance discernible from the text itself, with which at the same time they are so amalgamated as to form but one continuous narrative. There are no notes to interrupt the text; no tiresome enumerations of the various interpretations brought forward in the course of ages; hence no necessity for the reader to compare and choose among them. A few blemishes, however, mar these real qualities; besides occasional mistranslations, some groundless hypotheses and opinions now antiquated, the reader may think that better judgment could at times have been shown in the choice of authorities and interpretations.

The first volumes published at Paris and Reims in the beginning of the eighteenth century were heartily welcomed and highly recommended by Bossuet, who encouraged the writer to pursue his work and augured well for its success. The commentary, forming twenty-four volumes, duodecimo, was completed in 1716. New editions rapidly followed one another: the second edition with preface, summaries, and dissertations compiled by the Abbé de Vence, twenty-two volumes, duodecimo (Nancy, 1738–1741); third edition, five volumes, octavo (Paris, 1740); fourth edition, ten volumes, octavo (1747); fifth edition, with maps and illustrations, six volumes, quarto (1750), etc. Carrières' paraphrase, slightly corrected, together with an abridged revision of Calmet's commentaries and a few dissertations from the Abbé de Vence, made up Rondet's "Bible d'Avignon" (1748–1750), widely known later as "Bible de Vence". During the nineteenth century Carrières' version has been frequently reprinted, often with the commentaries of Menochius, sometimes also with the notes of modern interpreters, like Sionnet (1840) and Drioux (1884).

INGOLD, *Essai de bibliographie oratorienne* (Paris, 1880); PERRAUD, *L'Oratoire de France au XVII^e^ et au XIX^e^ siècle* (Paris, 1865); PORT, *Dictionnaire historique de Maine-et-Loire* (Paris, 1878); RONDET, *Sainte Bible en latin et en français* (Avignon, 1748), *Avertissement;* GLAIRE, *La Sainte Bible en latin et en français* (Paris, 1834), Preface.

CHAS. L. SOUVAY.

Carroll, CHARLES, OF CARROLLTON.—American statesman, b. at Annapolis, Maryland, 19 September, 1737, d. at Doughoregan Manor near Baltimore, Maryland, 14 November, 1832. His grandfather, Charles Carroll, emigrated from England to Maryland

because of the persecution of Catholics, 1 October, 1688. He obtained considerable grants of land and was made attorney-general under the third Lord Baltimore. The year he arrived in America, Lord Baltimore was deprived of his rights, and Maryland was made a royal province. As Carroll was in favour with the Baltimores, he enjoyed important political positions in the colony before and after the restoration of their rights in 1715. Charles Carroll of Annapolis, the father of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, was born in 1703, and died in 1783. He was a wealthy landowner and bitterly opposed the political disabilities under which the Catholics of Maryland suffered. The mother of Charles Carroll of Carrollton was Elizabeth Brooke, the daughter of Clement Brooke and Jane Sewall, and was a near relation of her husband. Charles Carroll's biographer, Rowland, divides his life into three periods of about thirty years each; the first was a period of preparation, the second a period of public service, and the third a period of retirement, with scholarly observation of public events. At ten years of age Charles Carroll was sent to school to the Jesuits at Bohemia, on Harmon's Manor in Maryland, where one of his fellow-students was his cousin, John Carroll, afterwards Archbishop of Baltimore. The following year, 1748, they both crossed the ocean to the Jesuit college at St-Omer in French Flanders, where Charles remained six years. After a year at the college of the Jesuits at Reims he entered the Collège Louis le Grand at Paris. In 1753 Carroll went to Bourges to study civil law. He remained there for a year, and then returned to Paris until 1757. In this year he took apartments in the Temple, London, where he studied law for several years. In later days he spoke in highest praise of the training he received at St-Omer and the Collège Louis le Grand. To the former he owed his deep conviction of religious truth, and to the latter his critical ability, his literary style, and the basis for the breadth of knowledge which made him an invaluable citizen.



CHARLES CARROLL (PAINTING BY HARDING)

Upon his return to America, in 1765, the estate of Carrollton in Frederick County, Maryland, was given him and later he became known as Charles Carroll of Carrollton, to distinguish him from his father Charles Carroll, of Annapolis. In the difficulties with the mother country, Carroll aggressively defended the position taken by the colonies. In 1770, by a proclamation Governor Eden imposed certain fees upon the colonists. As fees were treated as taxes this was vigorously opposed as violating the right of the people to tax themselves. The jurist Daniel Dulaney defended the position of the Government in a series of articles in the "Maryland Gazette" under the signature Antillon. Carroll took up the debate as a champion of popular rights, maintaining the thesis that fees were taxes and that taxes should not be levied upon the people except by the consent of their representatives. He wrote four articles and the popular sentiment was decidedly with him. This controversy established Carroll's reputation as a debater and a scholar.

In 1774 Carroll was elected with six others by the citizens of Anne Arundel County and of Annapolis, with full power to represent them in the provincial convention. Catholics had been disfranchised and declared ineligible to a seat in the Assembly, but by this act the prejudice against them was swept away. Carroll was from this time for a period of twenty-seven years called to important public service in behalf of the colony and for the general government. In December of this year he was appointed a member of a Provincial Committee of Correspondence. He was a member of the Maryland Convention of 1775 which adopted the "Association of the Freemen of Maryland" which became the charter of the colony until the adoption of the Maryland Constitution in 1776. The Association was pledged to an armed resistance to Great Britain. He was appointed by the convention one of a committee of nine to "consider the ways and means to put this province in the best state of defense". On 12 September, 1775, the citizens of Anne Arundel County and the city of Annapolis appointed a Committee of Observation for the town and county of which Carroll was a member. At this meeting he was elected one of the deputies to represent the county in the State Convention for one year, and he was selected with six others to license suits in the county for the same period. The Colonial Convention on the 13th of October appointed Charles Carroll chairman of a committee of five "to devise ways and means to promote the manufacture of saltpetre". On the 11th of January, 1776, the Maryland Convention instructed the Maryland delegates to the Continental Congress, "to disavow in the most solemn manner, all design in the colonies for independence". This position was strenuously opposed by Carroll, who at this time advocated independence. In February, 1776, the Continental Congress appointed Carroll one of a committee of three to visit Canada to secure the alliance of the Canadians in the struggle for independence. Franklin and Samuel Chase were the other members of the committee, and Father John, afterwards Archbishop, Carroll accompanied them. The committee was clothed with almost absolute power over military affairs in that country, and their failure to accomplish their object was not due either to their want of zeal or lack of ability. On the 28th of June, 1776, the Maryland Convention withdrew the instructions given on previous occasions to its delegates to Congress, and authorized them "to vote in declaring the United States free and independent states". Principally responsible for this change of attitude by Maryland was Charles Carroll, who was afterwards rewarded in being elected a delegate to the Continental Congress on the 4th of July. He took his seat on the 18th of July and signed the Declaration of Independence on the 2nd of August, when the copy engrossed on parchment was presented for signature. Of all the signers he risked most. He was the wealthiest man in the colonies at the beginning of the Revolution, his wealth being estimated at $2,000,000. On the 19th of July Carroll was appointed on the Board of War, a very important appointment, as this board had charge of all the executive duties of the military department, subject to the direction of Congress. In the fall of 1777 the Board of War was enlarged and some of Washington's enemies were made members. Out of this new membership the Conway Cabal developed, the objects of which were defeated by Carroll, Morris, and Duer.

Charles Carroll was appointed one of two delegates from Annapolis to the Colonial Convention which was to adopt a constitution for Maryland. It met 14 August. Carroll was selected as one of the seven to draw up a constitution. He was responsible for the distinctive part of the constitution, the method of choosing senators. The senate was to be composed

of fifteen members, who were to be selected by a body of forty electors, two from each county, and one each from Baltimore and Annapolis. In the fall of 1778, Carroll resigned his seat in Congress and returned to Maryland to become a member of its senate. He was placed on all its important committees. He was re-elected to Congress in 1780, but promptly resigned his seat. He was elected president of the Maryland Senate, 23 May, 1783, and a second time on 23 December. Carroll was in the Maryland Senate from 1787 to 1789, when the constitution was adopted, and became a leader of the Federalists. He was elected to the U. S. Senate from Maryland and took his seat in 1789. On the 19th of May, Carroll was appointed one of a committee of three to revise the journal of the Senate for publication. As a Federalist Carroll favoured the tariff, Hamilton's funding measures, and the strengthening of the national government. He and Lee of Virginia were the chief advocates of placing the capital at Philadelphia for ten years, thence to be removed to the Potomac. As a democrat he opposed all distinctions and titles. Although favouring a centralized government he preferred to serve his state, for when Congress at its session in 1792 passed a law making it ineligible for a person to hold office in Congress and in a State legislature, Carroll resigned his seat in the U. S. Senate to retain his place in the Maryland Senate. In this capacity he served the State of Maryland till 1801. In 1799 he served on the committee to settle the boundary disputes between Maryland and Virginia.

After the election of Jefferson to the presidency in 1800, Carroll viewed public events with anxiety and fear. He was out of sympathy with the prosecution of a second war with Great Britain. In later years he became more hopeful of his nation's future. His last public act was the laying of the corner-stone of the Baltimore and Ohio railroad on the 4th of July, 1828. After the death of Adams and Jefferson on the 4th of July, 1826, he was the only surviving Signer of the Declaration of Independence.

On the 5th of June, 1768, Charles Carroll married his cousin Mary Darnall, who died in 1782. They had seven children, four of whom died in youth. One of his daughters married Richard Caton, an Englishman, and another married the distinguished statesman from South Carolina, Robert Goodloe Harper. He outlived by several years his only son, Charles Carroll, Jr.

ROWLAND, *Life and Correspondence of Charles Carroll of Carrollton* (New York, 1898); LATROBE, *Sketch of Charles Carroll of Carrollton* in *Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence* (New York, 1827), VII; NILES, *Register* (1827), XXXVIII, 79; *Appleton's Journal* (New York, 1874), XII, nos. 286, 287; *Catholic World* (New York, 1876), XXIII, 537; SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1889–92); GRIFFIN, *Catholics in the Am. Revolution* (Ridley Park, Pennsylvania, 1907). A very full list of publications relating to Charles Carroll is printed in *Hist. Records and Studies* (U. S. Cath. Hist. Soc., New York, Jan., 1903), III, pt. I.

J. E. HAGERTY.

Carroll, DANIEL, brother of Archbishop Carroll, b. at Upper Marlboro, Maryland, U. S. A., 1733; d. at Washington, 1829. Politically he was, in his time, one of the most influential men of his native State, but the wider fame of his illustrious brother has somewhat overshadowed his repute. His early training was like that of the archbishop. "My father", he wrote, 20 Dec., 1762, to his kinsman, James Carroll, in Ireland, "died in 1750 and left six children, myself, Ann, John, Ellen, Mary and Betsey. My eldest sister Ann is married to Mr. Robert Brent in Virginia. They have one child a son. My brother John was sent abroad for his education on my return. Ellen, my second sister, is married well, to Mr. Wm. Brent in Virginia near my eldest sister. She has three boys and one girl. My sisters Mary and Betsy are unmarried and live chiefly with my mother" (Woodstock Letters, VII, 5). An elder brother, Henry, was drowned while a boy at school. Until the Revolution Daniel Carroll led the life of the country gentleman of the day, but it may be noted that the Catholic men who had been sent abroad to school were far superior, as a class, to their neighbours, whose narrow and insular education rarely led them to interests beyond their county limits. Carroll was an active partisan of the colonists, serving as a member from Maryland of the old Colonial Congress (1780-1784). He was also a delegate from Maryland to the convention that sat in Philadelphia, 14 May to 17 Sept., 1789, and framed the Constitution of the United States. Thomas FitzSimons of Pennsylvania was the only other Catholic among its members. On his return to Maryland, Carroll was by his efforts largely instrumental in having the Constitution adopted by that State. In opposition to the arguments of Samuel Chase, the Anti-Federalist leader in Maryland, he wrote and printed a public letter defending the proposed Constitution, the last sentences of which read: "If there are errors it should be remembered that the seeds of reformation are sown in the work itself and the concurrence of two-thirds of the Congress may at any time introduce alterations and amendments. Regarding it then in every point of view with a candid and disinterested mind I am bold to assert that it is the best form of government which has ever been offered to the world" (Maryland Journal, 16 Oct., 1787). As one of the four laymen representing the Catholics of the United States, his name is signed to the address of congratulation presented to George Washington on his election as President of the Republic under the Constitution.

In the sessions of the new Congress Carroll served again (1789-1791) as a member from Maryland. When the Congress, at the session held in October, 1784, at Trenton, New Jersey, enacted that a board of three commissioners should lay out a site, between two and three miles square, on the Delaware for a federal city, to be the capital of the nation, he was named with Thomas Johnson and David Stuart as his associates. The choice of the present site of Washington was advocated by him, and he owned one of the four farms taken for it, Notley Young, David Burns, and Samuel Davidson being the others interested. The capitol was built on the land transferred to the Government by Carroll, and there is additional interest to Catholics in the fact that, in 1663, this whole section of country belonged to a man named Pope, who called it Rome. On 15 April, 1791, Carroll and David Stuart, as the official commissioners of Congress, laid the corner-stone of the District of Columbia at Jones's Point near Alexandria, Virginia. When the Congress met in Washington for the first time, in November, 1800, Carroll and Notley Young owned the only two really comfortable and imposing houses within the bounds of the city. Young's name is among those assisting as collectors of subscriptions (1787) for the founding of Georgetown College.

SHEA, *Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll* (New York, 1888); SCHARF, *History of Western Maryland* (Baltimore, 1882); VARNUM, *The Seat of Government of the U. S.* (Washington, 1854); FORD, *Essays on The Constitution of The U. S.* (Brooklyn, 1892); *Madison State Papers* in the archives of the State Department, Washington; *United States Gazette*, files (1791).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Carroll, JOHN, first bishop of the hierarchy of the United States of America, first Bishop and Archbishop of Baltimore, b. at Upper Marlboro, Md., 8 Jan., 1735; died in Baltimore, 3 Dec., 1815. His father, Daniel, born in Ireland, settled at Upper Marlboro, where he became a merchant, and married Eleanor Darnall, a relative of the wife of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. She was very rich and had been well educated in France. Their first son died in infancy, their second, Daniel, figured prominently in Revolutionary history. John, their third son, was

probably baptized at Boone's Chapel, now Rosaryville, Maryland. When twelve years of age, he went to the Jesuits' grammar school at Bohemia in Cecil Co., Maryland, where he was "assiduous in study, pious and amiable". After one year there, he went abroad to St. Omer's College in French Flanders, and for six years pursued a liberal education with "marked capability of mind, attention to studies and docility and kindness of manner". His father died in 1750, and in 1753 John Carroll joined the Society of Jesus. In 1755 he began his studies of philosophy and theology at Liège, and after fourteen years (1769) was ordained priest at the age of thirty-four. The next four years he spent at St-Omer and at Liège teaching philosophy and theology. During the winter of 1772–3 Father Carroll travelled through Europe as preceptor, with the son of Lord Stourton. Upon his return to England he was, for a short time, the guest and chaplain of Lord Arundel at Wardour Castle. This year, 1773, Pope Clement XIV issued (21 July) and published (16 August) at Rome, the Bull suppressing and dissolving the Society of Jesus. This news reached Father Carroll 5 September, and after writing a vindication of the Society he had to provide for his future course of life. In the following spring he returned (26 June) to Maryland and hastened to his mother's home at Rock Creek, with whom and other intimates he had faithfully corresponded while in Europe. As a result of laws discriminating against Catholics, there was then no public Catholic Church in Maryland, so Father Carroll began the life of a missionary in Maryland and Virginia. He built a tiny frame chapel on his mother's estate and here on Sundays (in her house on weekdays) he said Mass when at home. During the next two years he devoted the time left from his devotions to the study of ancient literature and current topics in order to increase his knowledge; yet he did not neglect his social obligations. Apropos of his support at that time he himself wrote: "Catholics contributed nothing to the support of religion in its ministers; the whole maintenance fell on the priests themselves . . . the produce of their lands was sufficient to answer their demands."

In 1776, when a committee composed of Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Chase, and Charles Carroll of Carrollton was about to be sent by the Continental Congress to seek the neutrality of Canada during the War of Independence, "by a special resolution (Feb. 15) Charles Carroll of Carrollton was requested to prevail on Mr. John Carroll to accompany the committee to Canada, to assist them in such matters as they shall think useful". He accepted the honourable office, and spent the remainder of the winter in Canada; he found, however (Shea, Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll, New York, 1888, 148–53), that it was too late to discuss the question of union with the revolted colonies, or even neutrality, and returned to New York at the end of May in company with Benjamin Franklin. His influence on his fellow-countrymen even at this period may be surmised from the fact that, though out of the constitutions adopted by the Thirteen States, only four did away with the old Penal Laws and allowed Catholics absolute equality with other citizens, yet these (Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, and Maryland) were situated nearest to Father Carroll. During these years he chose to live with his mother, then seventy years old, and refused to accept an assignment elsewhere by Father Lewis, formerly Superior of the Jesuits in Maryland, and now Vicar-General of the Vicar Apostolic of London (or the Western District). Father Lewis, however, did not consider him entitled to support from the income of the property belonging to the Jesuits, although he had to labour very hard, often riding twenty-five miles on sick-calls. (Shea, op. cit., 85–86; Campbell in U. S. Cath. Magazine, Baltimore, 1844, III, 364, 365.)

When the war was over Carroll and five other priests met at Whitemarsh, Md., 27 June, 1783, to discuss ways and means to carry on their missionary work and hold their property intact. They held a second meeting 6 November, 1783, and a third 11 October, 1784, at the same place, when they formulated the draft of the regulations binding all the clergy of Maryland. Thereby every priest was maintained and given thirty pounds a year, and each priest agreed to offer ten Masses for every priest who died there. They adopted the following:—

"It is the opinion of a majority of the chapter that a superior '*in spiritualibus*', with powers to give Confirmation, grant faculties, dispensations, bless oils, etc., is adequate to the present exigencies of religion in this country. Resolved therefore,

"1st, That a bishop is at present unnecessary.

"2nd, That if one is sent it is decided by the majority of the chapter that he shall not be entitled to any support from the present estates of the clergy.

"3rd, That a committee of three be appointed to prepare and give an answer to Rome conformable to the above resolution."

In response to a petition sent by the Maryland clergy to Rome, 6 November, 1783, for permission for the missionaries here to nominate a superior who should have some of the powers of a bishop, Father Carroll, having been selected, was confirmed by the pope, 6 June, 1784, as Superior of the Missions in the thirteen United States of North America, with power to give confirmation. He was asked to send a report of the state of Catholicity in the United States. This same year a minister named Charles Henry Wharton, a Marylander, an ex-Jesuit, and distant relative of Father Carroll, attacked the Church, and was answered by Carroll in "An Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States of North America". Its aim and spirit may be gauged from one of its passages wherein Carroll said: "General and equal toleration, by giving a free circulation to fair argument, is a most effectual method to bring all denominations of Christians to an unity of faith." The work was published at Annapolis in 1784, and is the first Catholic work written by an American Catholic published in the United States. Father Carroll was, all the while, distracted, personally wishing the rehabilitation of the Society of Jesus and to remain himself a Jesuit. But officially seeing the need of a bishop, and that too an American, he decided to accept the pope's appointment of himself, and forthwith as Prefect Apostolic sent (Feb., 1785), to Cardinal Antonelli, his acceptance of that office, but urged that some method of appointing Church authorities be adopted by Rome that would not make it appear as if they were receiving their appointment from a foreign power. A report of the status of Catholics in Maryland was appended to his letter, where he stated that 9000 were freemen, 3000 children, and 3000 negro slaves; that some of the more prominent families, despite the dearth of priests (there being then only nineteen in Maryland) were still Catholics in faith, sufficiently religious, though prone to dancing and novel-reading. The pope was so pleased with Father Carroll's report that he granted his request "that the priests in Maryland be allowed to suggest two or three names from which the pope could choose their bishop". In the meanwhile Father Carroll took up his residence in Baltimore (1786–7), where even Protestants were charmed by his sermons delivered in old St. Peter's church. He took an active part in municipal affairs, especially in establishing schools, Catholic and non-Catholic, being president of the Female Humane Charity School of the City of Baltimore, one of three trustees for St. John's College at Annapolis, founder of Georgetown College (1791), head of the Library Company,

the pioneer of the Maryland Historical Society, and President of the trustees of Baltimore College (1803).

He represented to Congress the need of a constitutional provision for the protection and maintenance of religious liberty, and doubtless to him, in part, is due the provision in Article Sixth, Section 3, of the Constitution, which declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States", and also the first amendment, passed this same year by the first Congress, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" (for a more cautious view see Shea, op. cit., 348).

Church troubles, Trusteeism in New York, and Nationalism in Philadelphia, at this time decided the priests of Maryland (March, 1788) to petition Rome for a bishop for the United States. Cardinal Antonelli replied, allowing the priests on the mission to select the city and, for this case only, to name the candidate for presentation to the pope. Twenty-four of the twenty-five other priests in the meeting voted for Father Carroll. Accordingly on 6 November, 1789, Pope Pius VI appointed him bishop. His consecration took place in Mr. Weld's chapel at Lulworth Castle, England, 15 August, 1790, at the hands of the Rt. Rev. Charles Walmesley, Senior Vicar Apostolic of England. Bishop Carroll returned to Baltimore in triumph, 7 December, when he preached an appropriate and touching sermon in St. Peter's church. Troubles in Boston required him soon to go thither, where he removed much prejudice.

In common with their fellow-citizens, the Catholics of the United States hailed with joy the election of George Washington as first president under the new Constitution. Before the inauguration Bishop Carroll, on behalf of the Catholic clergy, united with the representatives of the Catholic laity (Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and Daniel Carroll of Maryland, Dominick Lynch of New York, and Thomas Fitz Simons of Pennsylvania) in an address of congratulation, admirable for its sentiments of exalted patriotism ["An Address from the Roman Catholics of America to George Washington, Esq., President of the United States", London, 1790, fol.; reprint New York, 1865, facsimile and notes; see Shea, op. cit., 349–50, and ibid., the memorable and cordial reply of Washington (12 March, 1790) "To the Roman Catholics of the United States", in which he says: "I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their Revolution, and the establishment of your Government, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed." The original of this reply is preserved in the Archives of the Archbishop of Baltimore]. It may not be out of place to quote here the noble words of Bishop Carroll himself, addressed (10 June, 1789) to a maligner of Catholics: "Their blood flowed as freely (in proportion to their numbers) to cement the fabric of independence as that of any of their fellow-citizens. They concurred with perhaps greater unanimity than any other body of men in recommending and promoting that government from whose influence America anticipates all the blessings of justice, peace, plenty, good order, and civil and religious liberty" (Brent, 97, see below; Shea, op. cit., 153).

On 7 Nov., 1791, he held the First Synod of Baltimore, attended by twenty-two priests of five nationalities. To train priests for his diocese of three million square miles, Bishop Carroll had asked the Fathers of the Company of Saint Sulpice to come to Baltimore, where they arrived in 1791 and started the nucleus of St. Mary's College and Seminary. Bishop Carroll issued his first pastoral letter 28 March, 1792; very practical, yet tender, appealing for support for the clergy by means of the offertory collections. In 1793, for the first time, Bishop Carroll conferred Holy orders, the recipient being the Rev. Stephen Badin, the first priest ordained within the limits of the original thirteen of the United States. In 1795, he ordained to the priesthood Prince Demetrius Gallitzin who was to add 6,000 converts to his flock. In 1798, Bishop Carroll won an interesting and important lawsuit, the famous Fromm Case (Shea, op. cit., 448–5), in which Judge Addison, President of the Court of Common Pleas of the Fifth Circuit of Pennsylvania, decided that "The Bishop of Baltimore has the sole episcopal authority over the Catholic Church of the United States. Every Catholic congregation within the United States is subject to his inspection; and without authority from him no Catholic priest can exercise any pastoral function over any congregation within the United States." In 1792, says Shea (op. cit., 486–7) he interceded with Washington in regard to missions among the Indians; eventually the president recommended to Congress a civilizing and Christianizing policy for the Indians, one result of which was the acceptance of the services of a Catholic priest, to whom a small yearly salary was allowed. After the death of Washington, Bishop Carroll "issued a circular to his clergy (29 Dec., 1799) in regard to the celebration of the 22d of February as a day of mourning, giving directions for such action as would be in conformity with the spirit of the Church, while attesting to the country the sorrow and regret experienced by Catholics at the great national loss" (Shea, op. cit., 495). Having been invited by the unanimous resolution of Congress, in common with the clergy of all denominations and congregations of Christians throughout the United States, he preached a panegyric of the president in St. Peter's church in Baltimore, 22 February, 1800, which was regarded by all who heard it, or read it in print (Baltimore, 1800), says Shea (op. cit., 495), as one of the most masterly which were uttered on that day. Episcopal orders were conferred for the first time in the United States by Bishop Carroll on Bishop Neale, his coadjutor, with right of succession to the See of Baltimore. Plans for building his cathedral now occupied Bishop Carroll's mind, and on 7 July, 1806, he laid the corner-stone on ground bought for $20,000, and the seventh design of the architect, B. H. Latrobe, was accepted.

In 1808, Bishop Carroll became Archbishop, with suffragan sees at New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Bardstown. At a meeting held in Baltimore in 1810, Archbishop Carroll, with Bishop Neale and three of his suffragans, drew up some important regulations for the welfare and direction of their clergy and people (See BALTIMORE, PROVINCIAL COUNCILS OF). Owing to ill-health Archbishop Carroll had to decline the proffered honour of laying the corner-stone of Washington's Monument in Baltimore, in the autumn of 1815. His end was now approaching. To a Protestant minister who said to the dying prelate that his hopes were now directed to another world, Archbishop Carroll replied: "Sir, my hopes have been always fixed on the Cross of Christ". A short while after he said, "Of those things that give me most consolation at the present moment, one is that I have always been attached to the practice of devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary; that I have established it among the people under my care, and placed my diocese under her protection." On 22 November he received the last sacraments, after which he made a touching discourse to the priests present. "The whole population of Baltimore", said a letter from a relative, were "constantly calling to inquire about, and to urge permission to see him." The funeral Mass was offered in St. Peter's pro-Cathedral and the body temporarily laid in the chapel of St. Mary's Seminary till 1824, when the cathedral crypt was ready for the deposit it still guards.

"Archbishop Carroll, though of low stature, had a commanding and dignified appearance", wrote the

Rev. Dr. C. I. White. "The configuration of his head, his whole mien, bespoke the metropolite. . . . He wrote them (Latin, Italian and French) not less readily and tersely than his own. He mingled often in gay society, relished the festivities of polished life, and the familiar intercourse of both clergy and laity of the Protestant denomination. He was wholly free from guile, uniformly frank, generous and placable; he reprobated all intolerance. . . . He ranked and voted with the Federal party. He loved republicanism. His manners were mild, impressive and urbane."

A Baltimore paper of the day said of the burial: "We have never witnessed a funeral procession where so many of eminent respectability and standing among us followed the train of mourners. Distinctions of rank, of wealth, of religious opinion were laid aside in the great testimony of respect to the memory of the man." Another Baltimore paper said: "In him religion assumed its most attractive and amiable form, and his character conciliated for the body over which he presided, respect and consideration from the liberal, the enlightened of all ranks and denominations; for they saw that his life accorded with the benign doctrines of that religion which he professed. In controversy he was temperate yet compelling, considerate yet uncompromising.

Brent says he had "sound judgment, real piety and pre-eminent talents". "The discourses from the pulpit, and the pastoral letters of Archbishop Carroll were alike distinguished for their unction and classical taste. His voice being naturally feeble, the exertions which he made to be distinctly heard from the pulpit rendered his elocution less agreeable there than in other situations requiring less force of lungs. His colloquial powers and resources were great and rich, and his kind and benignant feelings always prompted him to apply them to the best advantage. There was an irresistible charm and elegance indeed in his conversations."

The archives of the Baltimore cathedral contain the original Brief making Father Carroll Superior of the Missions in the United States, and erecting the See of Baltimore and appointing Bishop Carroll, copies of the Briefs raising Baltimore to an archiepiscopal see and conferring the pallium on Bishop Carroll, also very many of his official and private letters, etc.

BRENT, *Biographical Sketch of the Most Rev. John Carroll* (Baltimore, 1843); CAMPBELL, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll* in *United States Catholic Magazine* (1844–5); IDEM, *Desultory Sketches of the Catholic Church in Maryland* in *Religious Cabinet* (1842); WHITE, Appendix to DARRAS, *History of the Catholic Church;* SHEA, *Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll* (New York, 1888).

LOUIS O'DONOVAN.

Cartagena (CARTHAGENA IN INDIIS), ARCHDIOCESE OF.—The city of the same name, residence of the archbishop, is situated on an island to the north of Tierra Bomba (Colombia). Heredia built and fortified it in 1533, and Philip II, King of Spain, in 1579, granted it the title of city; it is now the capital of the State of Bolivar. Pope Clement VII erected it into a bishopric in 1534, and Leo XIII raised it to metropolitan rank in 1900.

Its first bishop was the Dominican Tomás del Toro (1535). Other bishops were: Fra Antonio de Hervia (1590), who was the first professor at the University of Lima; Fra Juan de Labrada (1596), who rebuilt the cathedral; the Franciscan, José Diaz de Lamadrid (1677), who built many churches and hospitals, and who gave to the cathedral a pulpit of marble, mosaics, and a monstrance valued at ninety thousand dollars. Pedro Adán Brioschi was the first archbishop. The diocese contains 400,000 inhabitants; it has 98 parishes, two religious orders of men, and two of women; it has also a university and a college directed by the Jesuits, a seminary, and various houses of education for girls directed by sisters.

[illegible] IX, 612; [illegible] Paris, 1907).

M. DE MOLINARI.

Cartagena, DIOCESE OF (CARTHAGINIENSIS), suffragan of Granada in Spain since the concordat of 1851, previously of Toledo. It includes practically the provinces of Murcia and Albacete, with some towns in those of Alicante and Almeria. The bishop resides at Murcia, the civil capital of the province, which has a population of 111,539. Cartagena was almost completely destroyed by the Vandals in 425, and some writers, e. g. La Fuente, infer that it lost at that time its dignity of metropolitan see. On the other hand the decrees of the Second Council of Tarragona (516) are signed, among others,

CARTAGENA, SPAIN

by a Bishop of Cartagena named Hector. There is no evidence for the statement that St. Fulgentius, brother of St. Isidore of Seville, was Bishop of Cartagena. The city was rebuilt by the Byzantines, and under them attained some measure of its former splendour. At the end of the sixth century Bishop Licinianus was known as author of several epistles on theological subjects, some of which have been preserved (P. L., LXXII, 689–700). In 674 the Byzantines were expelled, and Cartagena ceased to be an episcopal see. Under Moorish rule there is a record of a Bishop of Cartagena named John (998). In 1247 the city was retaken from the Moors, and the see was restored. Its first bishop was a Franciscan, Fray Pedro Gallego, the confessor of King Alfonso X. In 1291 Nicholas IV transferred the residence of the bishop from Cartagena to Murcia, the former city being much exposed to piratical attacks. Among its best-known bishops have been Juan Martínez Siliceo (1540), tutor of Philip II, and later Archbishop of Toledo (1546), and Cardinal Luis Belluga (1704), a great promoter of agriculture. The Catholic population of the diocese is 691,382; there are 132 principal parishes and 87 filial parishes, 620 priests, and 217 churches.

FLÓREZ, *De la Provincia Cartaginense* in *España sagrada* (Madrid, 1763), V, 64–157; LA FUENTE, *Hist. ec.ca de España* (Madrid, 1873–75), II, 30–42, 94–96, 140–45, 389–90, III, 383; VICENTE Y PORTILLO, *Biblioteca histórica de Cartagena* (Madrid, 1889), I.

EDUARDO DE HINOJOSA.

Cartesianism. See DESCARTES.

Carthage, SAINT, whose name is also given as MOCHUDA, was born of a good family, in what is now County Kerry, Ireland, about the year 555. He spent his youth as a swineherd near Castlemaine, and became a monk in a neighbouring monastery under the guidance of St. Carthage the Elder, subsequently receiving priest's orders. In 580 he determined to lead a hermit's life, and he built a cell at Kiltallagh, where his fame soon attracted pilgrims. After a few years the jealousy of two neighbouring bishops forced him to quit his hermitage, and he proceeded on a visit to Bangor, where he spent a year. On the advice of St. Comgall he returned to Kerry and founded churches at Kilcarragh and Kilfeighney. He then

visited Waterford, Clonfert-molua (Kyle), and Lynally, whence, on the recommendation of St. Colman Elo, he settled at Rahan, near Tullamore, in the present King's County.

St. Carthage founded his monastery of Rahan about 590, and soon had hundreds of disciples. He was consecrated Abbot-Bishop of the Fercal district, and composed a rule for his monks, an Irish metrical poem of 580 lines, divided into nine separate sections—one of the most interesting literary relics of the early Irish Church. Numerous miracles are also recorded of him. At length, Blathmaic, a Meathian prince, instigated by the neighbouring monks, ordered St. Carthage to leave Rahan. This expulsion of the saint and eight hundred of his community took place at Eastertide of the year 635. Journeying by Saigher, Roscrea, Cashel, and Ardfinnan, St. Carthage at length came to the banks of the River Blackwater, where he was given a foundation by the Prince of the Decies, and thus sprang up the episcopal city of *Lios-mor*, or Lismore, County Waterford.

Great as was the fame of Rahan, it was completely eclipsed by that of Lismore, although St. Carthage lived less than two years at his new foundation. He spent the last eighteen months of his life in contemplation and prayer, in a cave near the present St. Carthage's Well. When at the point of death, he summoned his monks and gave them his farewell exhortation and blessing. Fortified by the Body of Christ he died on the 14th of May, 637, on which day his feast is celebrated as first Bishop and Patron of Lismore. Short as was St. Carthage's stay in Lismore, he left an ineffaceable impress of his labours in a famous abbey, cathedral, and infant university, but more so in the shining example of an austere and blameless life. Purity was his transcendent virtue, and to guard it he practised the severest penances. On this account St. Cuimin of Connor thus writes of him in an Irish quatrain:

The beloved Mochuda of mortification,
Admirable every page of his history.
Before his time there was no one who shed
Half so many tears as he shed.

Usher had two manuscript copies of the Irish life of St. Carthage; and in 1634 Philip O'Sullivan Beare sent a Latin translation to Father John Bollandus, S. J. The "Vita Secunda" is the one usually quoted. In 1891 the present writer discovered the site of the *Relig Mochuda* in which St. Carthage was buried.

Acta SS. 14 May (III); COLGAN, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ* (Louvain, 1645); LANIGAN, *Eccles. Hist. of Ireland* (Dublin, 1829), II; BARING-GOULD, *Lives of the Saints* (London, 1874), V; O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, 1889), V; GRATTAN FLOOD, *St. Carthage* (Waterford, 1898); HEALY, *Insula Sanctorum et Doctorum* (Dublin, 1902); POWER, *Place-Names of the Decies* (Waterford, 1907); HYDE, *Literary History of Ireland* (London, 1901).

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

Carthage, ARCHDIOCESE OF (CARTHAGINIENSIS).—The city of Carthage, founded by Phœnician colonists, and long the great opponent of Rome in the duel for supremacy in the civilized world, was destroyed by a Roman army, 146 B. C. A little more than a century later (44 B. C.), a new city composed of Roman colonists was founded by Julius Cæsar on the site of Carthage, and became the capital of the Roman province of Africa Nova, which included the province of Africa Vetus, as well as Numidia. From this date Roman Africa made rapid progress in prosperity and became one of the most flourishing colonies of the empire. The history of African Christianity opens in the year 180 with the accounts of two groups of martyrs who suffered at Scillium, a city of Numidia, and Madaura. Twenty years later a flourishing Church existed in Carthage, already the centre of Christianity in Africa. In his "Apology", written at Carthage about 197, Tertullian states that although but of yesterday the Christians "have filled every place among you [the Gentiles]—cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market-places, the very camp, tribes, companies, palaces, senate, forum; we have left nothing to you but the temples of your gods". If the Christians should in a body desert the cities of Africa, the governing authorities would be "horror-stricken at the solitude" in which they would find themselves, "at a silence so all pervading", a stupor as of a dead world (Apol., xxxvii). Fifteen years later the same author asks the Proconsul Scapula: "What will you make of so many thousands, of such a multitude of men and women, persons of every age, sex and rank, when they present themselves before you? How many fires, how many swords will be required?" And with regard to the Christians of the African capital he inquires: "What will be the anguish of Carthage itself, which you will have to decimate, as each one recognizes there his relatives and companions; as he sees there, it may be, men of your own order, and noble ladies, and all the leading persons of the city, and either kinsmen or friends of those in your own circle? Spare thyself, if not us poor Christians. Spare Carthage, if not thyself" (Ad Scapulam, v). It is clear from this that the Christian religion at the beginning of the third century must have had numerous adherents in all ranks of Carthaginian society; Tertullian, if the contrary were the case, would merely have stultified himself by making a claim which could have been so easily disproved. A council of seventy bishops held at Carthage by Bishop Agrippinus at this epoch (variously dated between 198 and 222), substantially corroborates the testimony of Tertullian as to the general progress of Christianity in Africa in the early years of the third century. It is impossible to say whence came the first preachers of Christianity in Roman Africa. It is worthy of note in this regard, however, that from the moment when African Christianity comes into historical prominence, the bishops of Roman Africa are seen in very close relations with the See of Rome. The faithful of Carthage in particular were "greatly interested in all that happened at Rome; every movement of ideas, every occurrence bearing on discipline, ritual, literature, that took place at Rome was immediately re-echoed at Carthage" (Duchesne, Hist. anc. de l'Église, I, 392; cf. Leclercq, L'Afrique chrét., I, iii). Indeed, during the last decade of the second century the Roman Church was governed by an African, Pope Victor (189–199).

The two greatest names in the history of the Church of Carthage are those of Tertullian and St. Cyprian. The former comes on the scene, in the troubled days of the persecution of Septimius Severus, as an able and valiant defender of his religion. He was born at Carthage, about the year 160. In his youth he devoted himself to the study of law and literature, and thus obtained the intellectual training which was to prove of the greatest service to his future corelligionists. His conversion appears to have been influenced by the heroism of the martyrs, and one of his earliest treatises was an exhortation to those ready to die for the Faith (Ad martyres). His first work was a severe arraignment of pagans and polytheism (Ad nationes), and this was followed in a short time (197) by his "Apologeticus", addressed to the imperial authorities. The latter work was calm in tone, "a model of judicial discussion" (Bardenhewer). Unlike previous apologists of Christianity, whose appeals for tolerance were made in the name of reason and humanity, Tertullian, influenced by his legal training, spoke as a jurist convinced of the injustice of the laws under which the Christians were persecuted. The "Apologeticus" was written before the edict of Septimius Severus (202), and, consequently, the laws to which the writer took exception

were those under which the Christians of the first and second centuries had been convicted. From the year of the martyrdom of Scillium and Madaura (180) the Christians of Africa were not molested by the authorities for nearly two decades. But in 197 or 198 the governors recommenced the legal pursuit of the followers of Christ, who soon filled the prisons of Carthage. Tertullian encouraged the "blessed martyrs designate" by what he termed a contribution to their spiritual sustenance (Ad martyres, i), and at the same time protested against the unjust measures of which they were the victims. But the magistrates took no heed of his protests. Christians were daily condemned to exile, torture, death, and, in at least one instance, to a still more dreaded fate (Apol., l). In 202 the new anti-Christian legislation of Septimius Severus appeared in the form of an edict which forbade anybody to become a Jew or a Christian. According to Tertullian the Church at this period was recruited chiefly by conversions (*fiunt, non nascuntur Christiani,* Apol., xviii); the new law, consequently, aimed at cutting off this fertile source of membership, by imposing the death-penalty both on converts and on those who were the instruments of their conversion. Among the martyrs executed at Carthage under the law of Severus were the young matron Vibia Perpetua and the slave Felicitas, the Acts of whose martyrdom, which, perhaps, we owe to Tertullian (Duchesne, op. cit., I, 394), is one of the "jewels of ancient Christian literature". Throughout the trying period inaugurated by the new legislation (202–213), during which the law was enforced with more or less severity according to the disposition of the governor of the moment, Tertullian was the central figure of the Church of Carthage. His rigorism indeed drew him, about the opening year of the persecution, into the sect of the Montanists, but in spite of this lapse he appears not to have lost for many years the confidence of the orthodox; as late as 212 he wrote his letter to the Proconsul Scapula in the name of the Christians of Carthage (Leclercq, op. cit., I, 165). It was only in the following year (213) that he broke definitively with the Church and became the head of an obscure sect, called after him "Tertullianists", which maintained a precarious existence till the age of St. Augustine.

From this time to the election of St. Cyprian (249) little is known of the Church of Carthage. The Acts of Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas mention a certain Optatus, who was Bishop either of Carthage or Thuburbo minus. Agrippinus, already mentioned, was Bishop of Carthage about 197, and the immediate predecessor of St. Cyprian was Donatus, who presided over a council of ninety African bishops which condemned as a heretic Privatus, Bishop of Lambesa. Like Tertullian, Cyprian was a convert to Christianity; he was baptized at Carthage about 246. The period of his episcopate (249–258) is one of the most important, as well as the best known, in the annals of Christianity in Africa. A year after his elevation the edict of the Emperor Decius against the Christians was promulgated, and its appearance was the signal for wholesale apostasy. During the long interval of peace since the persecution of Severus the fervour of the Christians of Carthage had suffered a notable decline. The time was therefore favourable for effecting the emperor's purpose, which was to compel the Christians to renounce their faith and offer sacrifice on the altars of the gods. In the early stages of the persecution capital punishment was not resorted to, except in the case of bishops, but the mere threat of even less severe penalties induced large numbers to comply with the law. Many others, however, proved themselves worthy of their religion and died heroically.

At the beginning of the storm, Cyprian, knowing that as bishop he would be one of the first victims, and judging that in a time so perilous it was his duty for the moment to preserve his life for the good of his flock, retired to a secure refuge. His motives were not, however, correctly construed by some of his people, and even the Roman priests who directed the chief Church of Christendom after the martyrdom of Pope Fabian (236–250) made a rather uncomplimentary allusion, in a letter to the clergy of Carthage, to "the Good Shepherd and the hireling". Cyprian was naturally offended at the tone of this missive, and easily proved to the satisfaction of the Romans that they had misjudged him. But the difficulties which arose in Carthage itself during his retirement were not so easily overcome. In the absence of the bishop five priests hostile to him took it upon themselves to receive back apostates (*lapsi, libellatici*) into communion, merely on the recommendation of confessors awaiting martyrdom in prison. The intercession of confessors for the fallen was then customary, and was always regarded by the bishops as a reason for remitting part of the canonical penance for apostasy. But in Carthage at this time some of the confessors seem to have regarded themselves as having practically superseded the bishops, and issued letters of communion in a tone of command. One of them, for example, gave a note ordering the restoration of the bearer and his friends to communion (*communicet ille cum suis*). Cyprian objected to this usurpation of his authority, which, if not resisted, would destroy the Church's discipline, and he was supported in this attitude by the clergy and confessors of the Roman Church. On this Novatus, one of the rebellious priests, set out for Rome to obtain, if possible, support for his party. But the schismatical envoy at first met with no success. Eventually, however, he won over the priest Novatian and some of the Roman confessors. The object of the alliance was to elect a "confessors' pope", who would support a "confessors' bishop", to be elected in Carthage in opposition to Cyprian. The allies were, however, defeated at the outset by the election of Pope Cornelius, who was on the side of Cyprian. But this check did not at all dispose them to yield; they proceeded to elect an antipope in the person of Novatian. Meanwhile Cyprian had returned to Carthage, where he convened a council of African bishops for the purpose of dealing with the question of the *lapsi*. The decision of the council was moderate: all apostates who repented their fall were admitted to penance, which should last a greater or less time according to the degree of their guilt. The decree to this effect was confirmed by a Roman council under Pope Cornelius. But now, curiously enough, Novatian, who had taken the part of the laxists of Carthage, became a rigorist; he admitted apostates to penance, indeed, but without hope of reconciliation with the Church, even at the point of death. His views, however, were received with little favour, and eventually, through the efforts of Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyprian, and Pope Cornelius, the Roman confessors from whom he had derived his prestige deserted his party and were admitted to communion. The attempts to organize a schism in Carthage were no more successful. Cyprian was supported by all the bishops of Africa, with five exceptions, three of whom were apostates and two heretics.

The years 255–257 witnessed a controversy between Rome and Carthage on a question of discipline which for a short time produced strained relations between these two great centres of Latin Christianity. The trouble arose over the different modes in vogue in Rome and in Africa of receiving into communion persons baptized in heretical sects. In Rome baptism conferred by heretics was *per se* admitted to be valid; in Africa such baptism was regarded as

wholly invalid. The matter was allowed to drop after the death of Pope Stephen (2 August, 257). Africans and Romans preserved their respective practices till the fourth century, when the former, at the Synod of Arles (314), agreed to conform to the Roman custom (Hefele, Hist. of the Councils, I, 188). Cyprian died a martyr in the persecution of Valerian, September, 258.

From this date to the outbreak of the last persecution under Diocletian, in 303, very little is known of the history of the Church of Carthage. Two of the bishops who succeeded St. Cyprian, Carpophorus and Lucian, in this period of forty-five years are mentioned by Optatus, but nothing is related of them save their names. The worldly spirit which had been the cause of so many defections in the African Church of St. Cyprian's age was equally in evidence in the early part of the fourth century. A new form of apostasy characterized this persecution. In large numbers Christians betrayed their faith by giving up to the civil authorities copies of the Scriptures and the liturgical utensils. These renegades, who received the name of "traditors", were indirectly the cause of the gravest division that had yet been seen in Christendom. The Donatist schism originated in the consecration of Cæcilian as Bishop of Carthage (311) by Felix of Aptunga, who was falsely accused of having been a traditor. Its effects on the Church of Africa were disastrous. The obstinacy of the Donatists kept the schism alive for more than a century, and it was only the intervention of the Emperor Honorius in 405 that dealt it a death-blow. The civil penalties then inflicted on the schismatics brought them back to the Church in large numbers, although the sect still existed in 429, when Carthage was taken by the Vandals.

The Vandal occupation of Africa, which lasted over a century (429–534), was a period of severe trial to the Catholics of that country. The disorganization of the African Church was arrested by the reconquest under Justinian of this portion of the empire, but the heresies which, during the sixth and seventh centuries, proved so fruitful in dissensions affected this portion of Christendom like the rest. The final catastrophe came with the fall of Carthage into the hands of the Arabs in 698. From this time the once flourishing Church of Africa is rarely heard of. Apostasy became the order of the day, and in 1053 only five bishops remained in the former proconsulate.

PRIMACY OF CARTHAGE.—In the time of St. Cyprian the Bishops of Carthage exercised a real though not official primacy in the African Church. Roman Africa at this period consisted of three provinces: (1) the province of Africa proper, which comprised the proconsulate, Byzacena and Tripoli; (2) Numidia; (3) Mauretania. These three civil divisions formed in the middle of the third century but one ecclesiastical province. In 305 a Primate of Numidia is mentioned for the first time, and in the course of the fourth century Byzacena, Tripoli, and the Mauretanias each obtained an *episcopus primæ sedis*. These later primatial sees were, however, of little importance; their metropolitans presided over the provincial synods, appointed delegates to the annual councils of Carthage, received the appeals of the clergy of their provinces, and gave letters of travel (*litteræ formatæ*) to the bishops of their jurisdiction who wished to visit Italy (Synod of Hippo, 393, can. xxvii). The provincial clergy had the right, if they preferred, to ignore their immediate metropolitan and appeal directly to the Primate of Carthage. At first the provincial primacy devolved *ipso facto* on the senior bishop of the province, but as this method proved a source of dispute the synod of Hippo of 393 (can. iv) decreed that in case of difference of opinion among the provincial bishops the primate should be "appointed in accordance with the advice of the Bishop of Carthage". It was the right of the Bishop of Carthage also to determine, a year in advance, the date for the celebration of Easter.

COUNCILS OF CARTHAGE.—The earliest council of Carthage of which we know was held about 198 (?); seventy bishops, presided over by the Bishop of Carthage, Agrippinus, were present. According to Cyprian the question of the validity of baptism conferred by heretics came up for discussion and was decided in the negative. After this date more than twenty councils were held in Carthage, the most important of which were: (1) those under St. Cyprian relative to the *lapsi*, Novatianism, and the rebaptism of heretics; and (2) the synods of 412, 416, and 418 which condemned the doctrines of Pelagius. (See AFRICAN SYNODS.)

BISHOPS OF CARTHAGE.—The Acts of the martyrdom of Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas mentioned, as noted above, a Bishop Optatus, who, if he was a Bishop of Carthage, as is generally supposed, is the first known incumbent of this see. It is possible, however, that Optatus was Bishop of Thuburbo minus, and, if so, Agrippinus, who was bishop in 197, heads the list of Bishops of Carthage. From this date to the election of St. Cyprian (249) we know of only two Bishops of Carthage, Cyrus and Donatus. After St. Cyprian (249–258) the succession so far as known (cf. Leclercq, op. cit., II, Appendix; Kirchenlex., II, 1998; Duchesne, op. cit., I, xx) is as follows: between 258 and 311 Carpophorus, Lucian, and Mensurius; Cæcilian (311 till after 325); Gratus, at Council of Sardica (344–), presided at Council of Carthage (349); Restitutus, at Council of Rimini (359); Aurelius (391), presided at Council of Carthage (421); Capreolus (431); Quodvultdeus (437); Deogratias (454–458); Eugenius (481, exiled 496); Boniface (523–535); Repartatus (535, banished 551); Primosus, or Primasius (553 till after 565); Publianus (581); Dominicus (591); Fortunius (632); Victor (635). After this date no Bishop of Carthage is heard of till the middle of the eleventh century.

After eight centuries of abeyance the archiepiscopal See of Carthage was restored by Leo XIII (19 Nov., 1884) and confided to Archbishop (later Cardinal) Lavigerie, to whose zeal it was owing that since 1875 the ancient site of Carthage became again a centre of Christian life (see Baunard, Le Cardinal Lavigerie, Paris, 1898, *passim*). The territory of the new archdiocese, hitherto administered by Italian Capuchins, was enlarged by papal decree 31 March, 1885, and now includes the entire Regency (French Protectorate) of Tunis. By another decree of 28 March, 1886 the eighteen titular canons of the new chapter and their successors enjoy the dignity of papal chamberlains. A magnificent cathedral was dedicated by Cardinal Lavigerie (15 May, 1890) on the famous Hill of Byrsa, in honour of St. Louis IX of France; connected with it are several charitable and educational institutions. A Council of Carthage was held 20 April, 1890, in which the decrees of the Council of Algiers (1873) were renewed and applied to the new ecclesiastical province. The archdiocese counts at present about 35,000 Catholics in a Mohammedan population of 1,600,000; it has fifty-four parishes (*cures*) and fourteen vicariates. It was also owing to Cardinal Lavigerie that the famous excavations on the site of ancient Carthage were begun about 1880 by one of his missionaries, Father Delattre. They were originally carried on at the cardinal's expense, and for some time the church of St. Louis served as a museum for the preservation of the antiquities discovered. Apart from the light thrown by these excavations on the Phœnician and Roman life of ancient Carthage, the discoveries of Father Delattre have greatly increased our knowledge of the early Christian life of Africa, particularly in the fourth and fifth cen-

turies. Many Christian epitaphs and inscriptions have been made known, the Christian architecture of the period has been illustrated by the ground-plans of ancient basilicas, some of them quite famous in Christian antiquity (e. g. the Basilica Major of Carthage), while Christian burial customs and domestic life have had fresh light thrown on them; in a word, the importance of these excavations for our knowledge of Christian antiquity is second only to that of De Rossi's epoch-making discoveries at Rome.

LECLERCQ, *L'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1904); *Afrique* in *Dict. d'Archéol. et de Liturgie* (Paris, 1903); DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'église* (Paris, 1906), I; NEHER in *Kirchenlex.*, s.v.; GSELL, *Monuments antiques de l'Algérie* (Paris, 1901); HEALY, *The Valerian Persecution* (Boston, 1905); BENSON, *Cyprian, his Life, his Times, his Work* (New York, 1897).

For the modern period: LAVIGERIE, *De l'utilité d'une mission archéologique permanente à Carthage* (Algiers, 1881); DELATTRE, *L'Epigraphie chrétienne à Carthage* (Paris, 1881); *Lampes chrétiennes* in *Revue de l'art chrétien* (1890); *L'Archéologie chrétienne à Carthage* (Paris, 1886); *La basilique de Damous-el-Karita* (Paris, 1892); and numerous contributions to *Cosmos* and *Revue de l'art chrétien*, also the local Bulletins of the archæological societies of Constantine, Hippo, and Oran, the *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des travaux historiques*, and the *Nuovo Bullettino di archeologia cristiana;* BABELON, *Carthage* (Paris, 1896); WIELAND, *Ein Ausflug ins altchristliche Afrika* (Stuttgart, 1900); and *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution* (Washington, 1899), 601–14 (translation of the article of PH. BERGER in *Revue des deux mondes*, CLIII, 1899).

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Carthage, COUNCILS OF. See AFRICAN SYNODS.

Carthusian Order, THE.—The name is derived from the French *chartreuse* through the Latin *cartusia*, of which the English "charterhouse" is a corruption. For the foundation of the order see art. BRUNO, SAINT. The following points will be considered here: (I) The Rule; (II) Life of the Monks; (III) Organization; (IV) Development; (V) Present State of the Order; (VI) Distinguished Carthusians; (VII) English Province; (VIII) Carthusian Nuns.

I. THE RULE.—We have two accounts of the manner of life of the first Carthusians, the earliest, written by Guibert, Abbot of Nogent, the second by Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny. The former runs as follows: "The church stands upon a ridge . . . thirteen monks dwell there, who have a sufficiently convenient cloister, in accordance with the cenobitic custom, but do not live together *claustraliter* like other monks. Each has his own cell round the cloister, and in these they work, sleep, and eat. On Sundays they receive the necessary bread and vegetables (for the week), which is their only kind of food and is cooked by each one in his cell; water for drinking and for other purposes is supplied by a conduit. . . . There are no gold or silver ornaments in their church, except a silver chalice. They do not go to the church for the usual canonical hours, as we do [Guibert was a Benedictine], but only for certain of them. They hear Mass, unless I am mistaken, on Sundays and solemnities. They hardly ever speak, and, if they want anything, ask for it by a sign. If they ever drink wine, it is so watered as to be scarcely better than plain water. They wear a hair shirt next the skin, and their other garments are thin and scanty. They live under a prior, and the Bishop of Grenoble acts as their abbot and *provisor*. . . . Lower down the mountain there is a building containing over twenty most faithful lay brothers [*laicos*], who work for them. . . . Although they observe the utmost poverty, they are getting together a very rich library. . . ." (P. L., CLVI, 853 sqq.).

Peter the Venerable adds certain details, lays stress on the poorness of their garments, and mentions that they restricted their possessions both in land and cattle, and fixed their own number at thirteen monks, eighteen lay brothers, and a few servants. Of their diet he says, "They always abstain from the eating of meat, whether in health or ill. They never buy fish, but accept them if given in charity. Cheese and eggs are allowed on Sundays and Thursdays. On Tuesdays and Saturdays, they eat cooked vegetables, but on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, they take only bread and water. They eat once a day only, save at Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, Epiphany, and on certain other festivals. . . . On feast days they go to the refectory, eat twice, and sing the whole office in the church." (P. L., CLXXXIX, 944 D.)

Guibert wrote in 1104, Peter some twenty years later, so there was time for development, which may account for certain discrepancies between the two accounts. The "Customs" of the Chartreuse were not committed to writing till 1127. Bruno had left the world in order to serve God in solitude, and without any intention of founding an order. In the earliest days the hermits had no rule, but all strove to live after Bruno's example and in accordance with the Evangelical counsels. When regular monastic buildings were erected and vocations began to increase, some sort of rule became a necessity. St. Bruno wrote none, but the customs which he introduced, together with additions born of experience, were embodied in the "Consuetudines" written by Guigo, the fifth prior, in 1127. This was not a rule written with authority, but a record of the usages of the mother-house of the order (Ann., I, 305), compiled at the request of the priors of the other charterhouses, and finally accepted by them as their code. In the introduction the writer says that almost all the customs are contained "either in the epistles of the Blessed Jerome, or in the Rule of St. Benedict, or in other authorized writings". A later writer, Boso, the nineteenth prior of the Grande Chartreuse (d. 1313), says, "It is clear that the contents of the Statutes come either from St. Benedict's Rule, St. Jerome's Epistles, the 'Vitæ Patrum' or the 'Collationes' and other writings of Cassian and the Fathers" (quoted in Ann., I, 37). The Rule of St. Benedict (the only monastic rule of those days) gave the norm of those duties which were performed in common, and supplied the arrangement of the Divine Office, the treatment of guests, the form of the vows. Many new departures were introduced to meet the needs of the solitude which is an essential of the Carthusian life; from the Fathers of the Desert came the laura-like arrangement of the building and the solitary life of the cells, while the statutes are probably also indebted to the Rule of Camaldoli (see CAMALDOLESE) (founded by St. Romuald in 1012), which was reduced to writing by the Blessed Rudolf in 1080. The fundamental principle of Camaldoli and the Chartreuse is the same, namely, the combination of Western monasticism as embodied in St. Benedict's Rule with the eremitical life of the Egyptian solitaries. In both orders the superiors were to be priors, not abbots, and in all the earliest Carthusian houses there was, as at Camaldoli, a "lower house" for lay brothers who served the external needs of the contemplative monks at the "upper house". The first hermits tended strongly to be purely eremitical, but the cenobitic development was hastened both by the necessities of life and by the influence of neighbouring Benedictine houses, especially perhaps of Cluny. The union of the two systems was only gradually evolved under the pressure of circumstance.

Guigo's "Consuetudines" were first approved by Innocent II in 1133 (Ann., I, 305) and are still the basis of the modern statutes. In 1258 the general, Dom Riffier, issued a new edition, adding various ordinances passed by the general chapters since 1127; these are known as the "Statuta Antiqua". The "Statuta Nova" with similar additions appeared in 1368. In 1509 the general chapter approved the "Tertia Compilatio", consisting of a collection of the ordinances of the chapters and a synopsis of the statutes. The Carthusian Rule was printed for the first time by Johann Amorbach at Basle in 1510. This volume contains Guigo's "Consuetudines", the

"Statuta Antiqua", the "Statuta Nova", and the "Tertia Compilatio". The "Nova Collectio Statutorum" was published in 1581. This work, which had cost eleven years of preparatory labour, includes in one well-ordered series all the various legislation scattered throughout the cumbersome volume of 1510. A century later a second edition was printed at the Correrie or "lower house" of the Grande Chartreuse by order of Dom Innocent Le Masson, and this, after receiving certain corrections of slight importance, was finally confirmed by Innocent XI by the Bull "Injunctum nobis" of 1588. The fifth edition of the statutes is a verbal reprint of the second. The first part, or "Ordinarium", which is printed separately, is concerned with church ceremonial, the second treats of the government of the order and the observances and occupation of the religious, the third is concerned with the lay brothers and nuns. Guigo's "Consuetudines" contain in substance the customs introduced by St. Bruno with certain additions and modifications. The many formal changes and accretions which the original "Consuetudines" have undergone, have affected neither their substance nor their spirit, but, as Le Masson says, "have been like a change of clothing, which adds nothing and takes nothing from the substance of the body" (Discip. Ord. Cart., I, vii, 9). We must remember that the pictures given by Guibert and Peter the Venerable depict the Carthusian life at a stage of semi-development. The only mitigation of importance introduced since Guigo's day is the decrease of the fasts on bread and water from thrice to once weekly. Additional duties have been laid upon the monks in the shape of extra prayers, the singing of a daily conventual Mass, the lengthening of the night Office and of the Office for the Dead, and the withdrawal of the permission to take a midday siesta, while, instead of having, as formerly, seven or eight hours uninterrupted sleep, their rest is now broken by the long night vigils (P. L., CLIII, 699A).

II. Life of the Monks.—A Carthusian monastery covers a great deal of ground owing to the system of life. It usually consists of the great cloister, round which are the separate houses, or "cells" of the monks, the lesser cloister with cells of various officials, the "obediences", or workshops of the lay brothers and their living rooms, church, chapter-house, refectory, and other conventual offices. The church is usually small and without aisles, divided by a solid screen with a door and two altars into the choir proper and lay brothers' choir. No organ is allowed. There is usually a tribune for visitors. No woman, save the sovereign, may enter a charterhouse. At the side of each cell door is the *guichet* or hatch, through which the monk's food is introduced by a lay brother; within, a covered *ambulacrum*, with a small garden beside it, leads to the house. This consists of five rooms; on the ground floor, a store room for timber and fuel, and a workshop with a lathe and other tools; above, an antechamber, a small library with just sufficient room for bookcase, chair, table, and the cell proper, whose furniture consists of a wooden box-bedstead with woollen blankets, and mattress of straw, a table for meals, a few chairs, a stove, and a stall with a *prie-Dieu*, known as the *oratorium*.

The Carthusian life is essentially solitary and contemplative with a certain admixture of the cenobitic element (see I). A very large part of the day is devoted to saying the three Offices (i. e. that of the day, the Office of Our Lady, which is called *de Beatâ*, and the Office of the Dead), while much time is given to mental prayer. The rest is divided between manual labour, study, and a little recreation. The whole *horarium* depends on whether the Office of the day be that of the *feria* or of a Sunday or feast. The following is the ferial arrangement, which is by far the commoner. The Carthusian's day begins at half-past five, when a junior monk, going the round of the cloister, rings a bell hanging near the sleeper's ear. The church bell rings at six, when Prime of the day is said in the oratorium, followed by Terce *de Beatâ*. All offices said in the oratorium are accompanied by full choir ceremonial, as bowing, covering, and uncovering. At half-past six the Angelus sounds, and the monk remains at prayer till a quarter to seven, when he goes to the church. The conventual Mass, which is always sung, is preceded by adoration of the Blessed Sacrament and the litanies of the saints. The Carthusian liturgy differs considerably from the Roman Rite, being substantially that of Grenoble in the twelfth century with some admixture from other sources. There are no servers at the high Mass, and the priest is attended by the deacon, who wears neither alb nor dalmatic, but the *cuculla ecclesiastica* (see below) and, for the Gospel only, a stole. The subdeacon merely reads the Epistle at the lectern in the middle of the choir. There are many other points of difference. Copes and monstrances are unknown in the charterhouse. After the conventual Mass the priests say their private Masses, reciting Terce with the server before vesting and Sext *de Beatâ* after their thanksgiving.

At about half-past eight the monk returns to his cell and is occupied with manual work and meditation till ten, when, after saying Sext of the day, he fetches his dinner from the *guichet*. The meal is copious and excellently cooked, consisting of vegetable soup, fish or eggs, vegetables, cheese, butter and fruit, and a small bottle of wine or, in England, of rather thin beer. After dinner there is an hour and a half of solitary recreation, which may be spent in garden, ambulacrum, or cell at will, and is followed by None, spiritual reading, study, and manual labour till half-past two, when Vespers *de Beatâ* are said. At a quarter to three the monk leaves his cell for the second time, going to the church to sing Vespers, and, except on feasts and their vigils, Vespers and Matins of the Dead. He returns to his cell about four, and, after half an hour's study, takes his supper, consisting generally of eggs and a little salad. This is followed by spiritual reading and examination of conscience, known in the order as the "recollection". At a quarter to six, but earlier on the eve of a feast, the bell sounds for Complin of the day and *de Beatâ*. At about half-past six the monk retires to bed, still wearing the greater part of his habit. Five hours after the Complin bell, he rises and says Matins and Lauds *de Beatâ* with the Psalm "Deus venerunt gentes" and certain prayers for the recovery of the Holy Land. These last were ordered to be said during Mass by the Lateran Council in 1215, and were retained voluntarily by the Carthusians after the law ceased to bind, but transferred to this hour. At a quarter to twelve the monk leaves his cell for the third and last time to sing Matins and Lauds with Lauds of the Dead. This takes two and a half to three hours. To a visitor it is very impressive. A large portion of the Office is sung in complete darkness save for the sanctuary lamps, the rest by the light of small oil lamps carefully shaded to throw their light only on the choir books, one of which is provided for every three religious. The Carthusian chant, a species of Gregorian, has a special character of its own, slow and plaintive. "As the duty of a good monk is rather to lament than to sing", say the rubrics, "we must so sing that lamentation, not the joy of singing, be in our hearts." At about a quarter past two in the morning the Carthusian returns to his cell, where he says Prime *de Beatâ*. His total of sleep, thus broken into two parts, is seldom less than seven hours. On Sundays and feast days this *horarium* is considerably modified. The community assemble for all the Hours of the Great Office in church, and in the refectory for both meals. These latter are always eaten in silence, while the Scripture or some homily of

the Fathers is chanted to the solemn tones of the nocturn-lessons. On these days also there is a common recreation with talking in the cloister for the solemnly professed, but only on Sundays for all. Once every week, the monks go out for a walk together, during which they converse. This is known as the *Spatiamentum* and usually lasts about three and a half hours.

During the great monastic fast, which lasts from 14 Sept. to Ash Wednesday, except for Sundays and feast days, dinner is an hour later, and supper consists of a glass of wine and a crust of bread *ne potus noceat* (Statutes). During Lent, Vespers are sung before dinner, which is not till midday and supper is as above. Meat is never allowed on any account, though, in a case of life and death, the monk may, if not solemnly professed, be dispensed. Once a week there is a fast on bread and water and during Advent and Lent, on Fridays and on certain vigils *lacticinia* are forbidden.

The Carthusian wears the ordinary monastic habit in white serge, but the scapular which is joined by bands at the side and has the hood attached to it, is known as the "cowl". The long flowing garment with wide sleeves, which usually bears this name, is used only by the deacon at high Mass. No beard is worn, and the hair is shaved except for a narrow strip round the head. Novices wear a black mantle and their cowl is short and unjoined. The postulancy usually lasts one month, the novitiate one year, at the end of which simple vows are taken; the solemn vows are taken four years later.

The lay brothers live an entirely cenobitical life, and are occupied in the servile work of the establishment. Their habit differs only slightly from that of the fathers. After two years postulancy and novitiate, the lay novice becomes a *donné*, wearing a brown habit, but takes no vows. He may remain always in this condition, but it requires eight more years to become a solemnly professed lay brother. The lay brothers and *donnés*, collectively known as the *Familia*, are under the procurator, and have their own chapel, chapter-house, and refectory. Their Office consists of a large number of Paters and Aves. They attend the night Office, conventual Mass, and Vespers, on Sundays and feasts, but usually only the first part of the night Office.

III. Organization.—The prior of the Grande Chartreuse, who is elected by the monks of that house, is always the general of the order. He wears no insignia, but is the only one in the order who receives the title of "Reverend Father", all other religious being known as "Venerable Fathers". The general chapter, which consists of the visitors and all the priors, meets annually, and receives the resignations of all the superiors of the order including the general. These it reinstates or removes at will. Its ordinances have the force of law, but do not become permanent unless twice renewed. The visitors, who are appointed by the chapter, make a visitation of each charterhouse every two years, to enquire into its condition and reform any abuses. The first general chapter of the order was held by St. Anthelm in 1142, and in the year 1258 its powers were confirmed by Pope Alexander IV. To the wise ordinances of this body and to its series of distinguished generals the order owes its claim *nunquam reformata quia nunquam deformata*.

The prior of each house is, in strict law, elected by the professed monks of the community, if there are four present who have been actually professed for that house or who are original founders. Nowadays he is generally appointed by the father general and the chapter. The prior is assisted by various officials. These are the vicar, who takes the prior's place in case of necessity, the procurator, who is entrusted with the temporal administration and the care of the lay brothers, the coadjutor, who looks after guests and retreatants, the antiquior, who takes the vicar's place, the sacristan, and the novice-master.

IV. Development.—From its very nature the order grew slowly. In 1300 there were but 39 monasteries, but during the fourteenth century 113 were founded, extending as far as Silesia, Bohemia, and Hungary. During the Great Schism there were two generals, but both resigned on the election of Alexander V in 1409 and the order was once more united. During the fifteenth century, 44 charterhouses were founded and in 1521 there were in all 206, but during the sixteenth century 39 were destroyed by the Reformation and only 13 founded. In 1559 a foundation in Mexico was projected but fell through owing to the opposition of the King of Spain. Writing in 1607 Le Masson says, "We number about 2,500 choir monks and 1,300 lay brothers and *donnés*, giving an average of a dozen Fathers and eight or nine lay brothers to each house". Between 1600 and 1667, 22 monasteries were founded, and then no more till the nineteenth century. The order entirely escaped the scourge of commendatory superiors. Joseph II suppressed 24 houses, and in 1784 the Spanish Government compelled its charterhouses to separate from the order.

The French charterhouses were less infected with Jansenism than most of the ancient orders. Owing to the energy of the general, Dom Antoine de Mongeffond, only thirty monks out of a total of over 1,000, and those mostly belonging to the Paris house, ultimately refused to sign the "Unigenitus". These fled to Utrecht. At the outbreak of the Revolution there were 122 charterhouses, which were nearly all suppressed, as the French armies swept over Europe. In 1816 the monks returned to the Grande Chartreuse. The Spanish houses were suppressed in 1835; the Port-Dieu in Switzerland, which had escaped the earlier storm, in 1847; the monasteries in Italy for a second time during the course of the *Risorgimento;* and the restored French houses as a consequence of the Association Laws of 1901.

V. Present State of the Order.—In 1900 the monks possessed eleven monasteries in France and nine in other parts of Europe. The French houses are now empty and four new or restored houses have been opened in Spain and Italy. The following is a list of the charterhouses existing at the end of 1907. In Italy: Farneta, near Lucca, recently repurchased and occupied by the general and the *conventus Cartusiæ;* Pisa; Florence, where the monks are merely custodians of a national monument; Trisulti, near Alatri; La Torre, in Calabria; Vedana, in the Diocese of Belluno; La Cervara, near Genoa, recently repurchased. The *Procura* of the order at Rome. In Spain: Monte Allegro, near Barcelona; Aula Dei, Peñaflor, near Saragossa; Miraflores with its splendid royal tombs; the liqueur is made at the Casa de los Cartujos, Tarragona. In England: Parkminster, in Sussex, is the largest charterhouse in the world, with thirty-six cells and 3,166 feet of cloister. It now contains the community of Notre-Dame des Près, Montreuil, as well as its own. In Switzerland: Val-Sainte in Canton Friburg. In Germany: Hain near Düsseldorf. In Austria: Pletterjack, founded in 1403, abandoned 1595, and since rebuilt. In Belgium: the printing works belonging to Montreuil are now at Tournai. There are 300 solemnly professed monks, 35 junior professed, and 15 novices, making 350 choir monks, of whom about 20 are not yet priests; also about the same total of lay brothers, lay novices, and *donnés*. The badge of the order is a globe surrounded by a cross and seven stars, with the motto "Stat crux, dum volvitur orbis".

The famous liqueur is a secret manufacture, invented by the monks in the nineteenth century, as a means of subsistence, to take the place of the broad acres lost in the Revolution. The large proceeds, after assisting to pay for the maintenance of the vari-

ous charterhouses and the building of new ones, has been entirely devoted to various works of charity (Heimbucher, Die Orden und Kongregationen, Paderborn, 1907, I, 489).

VI. Distinguished Carthusians.—Besides St. Bruno the best known saints of the order are: St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln (d. 1200); St. Anthelm, seventh prior of the Grande Chartreuse, and first general, who died Bishop of Belley in 1178; St. Arthold, Bishop of Belley (d. 1206); St. Stephen of Châtillon, Bishop of Die (d. 1213). Many members have been beatified, among them the English Carthusian martyrs and Bl. Nicolò Albergati, Cardinal and Bishop of Bologna. There have been about seventy Carthusian bishops and archbishops, including a few cardinals. There has never been a Carthusian pope.

Guibert mentions the richness of the library of the *chartreuse* (see I), and in his "Consuetudines" Guigo writes, "We desire that books be looked after most carefully as the continual food of our souls, and that they be written [*fieri*] with the utmost diligence, so that we may preach the Word of God by the work of our hands, since we cannot do so with our mouths", and again, "we teach writing to almost all whom we receive" (P. L., CLIII, 693). Throughout the Middle Ages the Carthusians were famous copyists. St. Bruno himself was the first Carthusian author, writing commentaries on the Psalms and on St. Paul's Epistles (v. Löbbel, op. cit. *infra*, 179–241). He was followed by Guigo, who, besides the "Consuetudines", wrote "Meditations" and a "Life of St. Hugh of Grenoble". Writers of the order have mostly treated of ascetics and mystical theology. The following are among the more famous: Ludolf of Saxony (d. after 1340), the author of a well known "Vita Christi"; Henry of Kalkar (d. 1408), who converted Gerhard Groot; Denis the Carthusian (d. 1471), the *Doctor Ecstaticus* whose works are now being edited by the order in 45 vols.; Lauspergius (d. 1539); Surius (d. 1578), whose "Vitæ" still form a useful supplement to the Bollandists' unfinished "Acta"; Nicholas Molin (d. 1638); Petreius (d. 1640); Innocent Le Masson (d. 1703); Le Couteulx (d. 1709); Tromby, who flourished c. 1783, all historians of the order. The first book printed at a charterhouse was issued from the presses of the Schola Dei near Parma in 1477. The modern printing works of the order were transferred in 1901 from the *chartreuse* of Montreuil to Tournai.

VII. English Province.—The first English charterhouse was founded at Witham in Somerset by King Henry II in 1178, the tenth and last by Henry V in 1414 at Sheen. (For list see Hendriks.) At the time of Henry VIII's breach with Rome the monks, especially those of the London charterhouse (founded 1370), offered a stanch resistance. The fourth of May, 1535, is memorable for the deaths of the protomartyrs of the English Reformation, the Bridgettine Monk Richard Reynolds, and the three Carthusian Priors, John Houghton of London, Robert Lawrence of Beauvale, and Augustus Webster of Axholme. During the next five years fifteen of the London Carthusians perished on the scaffold or were starved to death in Newgate Gaol. On Mary's accession nineteen monks belonging to various houses gathered at Sheen under Prior Maurice Chauncy, a monk of the London Charterhouse, who, to his lasting sorrow, had lost the crown of martyrdom by taking the Oath of Supremacy. The restoration was short-lived, for on Mary's death the monks were once more driven into exile. Prior Chauncy died in 1581, but the English community kept together in different parts of the Low Countries with varying fortunes, until the charterhouse of Sheen Anglorum at Nieuport, with a community of six choir monks and two *donnés*, was suppressed by Joseph II in 1783. The last prior, Father Williams, died at Little Malvern Court, 2 June, 1797. His papers, the seal of Sheen Anglorum, and various relics are now in the possession of the Carthusians of Parkminster. A charterhouse was founded at Perth in 1429 by King James I of Scotland, and a short-lived foundation was made at Kinalehin in South Connaught in 1280, being abandoned by the order in 1321.

VIII. Carthusian Nuns.—In the Priorship of St. Anthelm, about 1245, the nuns of the ancient Abbey of Prébayon asked to be received into the order, and Blessed John of Spain, Prior of Montrieux, was ordered to adapt the Carthusian Rule to their needs. The nuns have never been numerous. Two convents were founded in the twelfth century, nine in the thirteenth, and four in the fourteenth, but of all these only nine were in existence in 1400. In 1690 when Innocent Le Masson published the "Statuts des Moniales" there were only five, four of which were in France and one near Bruges; the last was suppressed by Joseph II in 1783, and the others disappeared in the French Revolution. In 1820 the surviving nuns reassembled at Lozier (Isère), and finally settled in 1822 at Beauregard, some miles from the Grande Chartreuse. Thence foundations were made in 1854 at Bastide-Saint-Pierre (Tarn-et-Garonne), and in 1870 at Notre-Dame du Gard near Amiens. The nuns are still at Beauregard, but the rest are in exile at Burdine in Belgium, and at San Francesco, and Motta Grossa near Turin. The total number of nuns is about 140, of whom 90 are "consecrated".

The Carthusian nuns have always been famed for their regularity and fervour. Convents which had become lax were cut off from the order by the general chapter. The small number of convents is explained not only by the severity of the rule, but also by the great reluctance to accept new houses always displayed by the order. In 1368 the acceptance of new houses was forbidden by the general chapter, and this prohibition was frequently reiterated. The life of the nuns is very similar to that of the monks, with certain exceptions. They have single rooms instead of separate dwellings, two recreations every day, eat together daily, are not bound to wear the *cilicium*, and if ill are cared for in an infirmary. They are allowed eight hours sleep. Eleven hours daily are given to prayer and meditation, as well as work for the poor or for the church. The arrangement of their Office is practically that of the monks. Perpetual enclosure has been practised since the thirteenth century, and visitors are only received at a grille and in the presence of another nun. Each convent is divided into two distinct parts: (1) the monastery proper with the cells and conventual offices; (2) the dwelling of the two monks, who are known as the vicar and the coadjutor. These two direct the nuns and have two or three lay brothers to serve them. The two fathers live exactly as if in a charterhouse, attending Office in stalls placed in the sanctuary of the church, which is divided from the nuns' choir by a curtained grille. The nuns are subject to the general chapter which appoints the vicar. They elect their own prioress, though the vicar has the first voice in the election; the prioresses must consult the vicar in all important matters and, like the priors, are bound to tender their resignation to each general chapter.

The habit is the same as that of the monks, with the exception of the hood, for which a veil is substituted, white for the young religious, and black for the "consecrated" nuns. According to the statutes the vows should be solemn, but since the Revolution they have been regarded as simple by the Church. No widow is received. The Carthusian nuns have retained the privilege of the consecration of virgins, which they have inherited from the nuns of Prébayon. The consecration, which is given four years after the vows are taken, can only be conferred by the diocesan. The rite differs but slightly from that given in the "Pontifical". The nun is invested with a crown,

ring, stole and maniple, the last being worn on the right arm. These ornaments the nun only wears again on the day of her monastic jubilee, and after death on her bier. It is a consecrated nun who sings the Epistle at the conventual Mass, though without wearing the maniple. At Matins, if no priest be present, a nun assumes the stole and reads the Gospel. There are also lay sisters, *Données*, and *Sœurs Tourières*. Famous among Carthusian nuns have been St. Roseline of Villeneuve and Bl. Beatrix of Ornacieux.

The most complete general notice together with a full bibliography is given in HEIMBUCHER, *Orden u. Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche* (2d ed., Paderborn, 1907); see also *La Grande Chartreuse par un Chartreux* (Lyons, 1898). Sources for St Bruno's life are in *Acta SS.*, October, III; the only modern critical life is LÖBBEL, *Der Stifter des Karthäuserordens*, in *Kirchengeschichtl. Studien* (Münster, 1899), V, pt. I. The *Vie de S. Bruno par un religieux de la Grande Chartreuse* (Montreuil, 1898) gives the traditional version. TROMBY, *Storia critica-cronologica e diplomatica del patriarca s. Brunone e del suo ordine Cartusiano* (10 vols., Naples, 1773); LE COUTEULX, *Annales ordinis Cartusiensis* (8 vols., Montreuil, 1901); LEFEBVRE, *S. Bruno et l'Ordre des Chartreux* (2 vols., Paris, 1883); HENDRICKS, *The London Charterhouse* (London, 1889); CHAUNCY, *Historia aliquot martyrum* (Montreuil, 1888); *The Chartreuse of S. Hugh in Sussex*, in *The Month* (August, 1887); GRATTAN FLOOD, *The Carthusians in Ireland*, in *Ir. Eccl. Rec.* (Sept., 1907). The best description of the Carthusian life is THOROLD, *Six Months at the Grande Chartreuse*, in *The Dub. Rev.* (April, 1892); *Statuta ordinis cartusiensis a domino Guigone priore cartusie edita* (Basle, 1510); *Statuts des Moniales Chartreuses* (Correrie, 1690). For the spirit of the order see LE MASSON, *Directorium Novitiorum utriusque sexus*, in *Nova Collectio Statutorum* (4th ed., Correrie, 1736); *The Carthusians* (Rochdale, 1902), an official pamphlet; *La vie contemplative, son rôle apostolique par un Chartreux* (Montreuil, 1900).

RAYMUND WEBSTER.

Cartier, GEORGES-ETIENNE, a French Canadian statesman, son of Jacques Cartier and Marguerite Paradis, b. at St. Antoine, on the Richelieu, 16 Sept., 1814; d. in London, 20 May, 1873. He studied at Montreal College (Sulpicians). During the Canadian rebellion (1837–38) he fought at the battle of St. Denis. Forced to cross the frontier, he was reported frozen to death in the forests of Vermont. He practised law successfully in Montreal. Elected for Verchères (1849), he followed Lafontaine and Baldwin, the founders of constitutional government in Canada. He was successively honoured with important seats in the Cabinet. Under the Union of the two Canadas (1841–67) he was four times Attorney-General of Lower Canada: in 1856, in 1857, with the leadership of his province; in 1858 as Premier of Canada, and in 1864. After the Confederation (1867) he was Minister of Militia.

The following important measures are mostly due to his influence: the Grand Trunk Railway (1852); the final settlement (1854) of the seigniorial (feudal) tenure, which had become an obstacle to agriculture and industry; Victoria Bridge (inaugurated in 1860); the judiciary decentralization of Lower Canada; the creation of normal schools (1857); the modification of the criminal laws (1864); the codification of civil laws (1865). To avert legislative union, detrimental to the nationality and faith of the French Canadians, Cartier concurred in effecting—as a remedy—the Confederation of Upper and Lower Canada (Ontario and Quebec) with the Maritime Provinces (Nova Scotia and New Brunswick). By his ability, energy, and patriotism, he succeeded in securing for his native province as a condition *sine qua non* a degree of autonomy and a parliamentary representation proportionate to its historical and political importance, and in safeguarding the rights of the English and French minorities respectively in the provinces of the former Union. Under the Confederation, he contributed to the building of the Intercolonial Railway, the acquisition of the North-West Territories, framing for Manitoba a constitution which respected the rights of minorities. He likewise shared in drawing British Columbia and Vancouver into the Confederation, and in realizing the Canadian Pacific Railway. Cartier was created a baronet in 1868.

During twenty-five years he was the uncontested leader of his province in the struggle for equal rights. A man of indomitable energy, equally loyal to the Catholic Faith, to his French-Canadian origin, and to the British Crown, he directed his fellow-countrymen in the path of progress and prosperity, assuring to them the advantages of responsible government and a large share of influence in the councils of the nation.

TURCOTTE, *Le Canada sous l'Union* (Quebec, 1872); *Revue canadienne* (Montreal, 1873); *Courrier du Canada* (Quebec, 1873); TASSÉ, *Discours de Sir Georges Cartier* (Montreal, 1893).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Cartier, JACQUES, the discoverer of Canada, b. at Saint-Malo, Brittany, in 1491; d. 1 September, 1557. Little is known of his youth, but it is probable that he followed some of his countrymen on their adventurous expeditions to Newfoundland or to Brazil. Cartier offered his services to Philippe de Chabot, Seigneur de Brion and Admiral of France, at a time when Francis I was about to renew those attempts at French colonization in which Thomas Aubert (1508), Jean Denys (1506), the Baron de Léry (1528), the brothers Parmentier (1520), and Verrazano the Florentine (1523) had been the principal agents. His reputation as a mariner marked him out for preferment. Two small ships of sixty tons, equipped with sixty men each, were placed at his disposition; he set sail, 20 April, 1534, from Saint-Malo, and in twenty days made Cape Bonavista, Newfoundland. Continuing his explorations northwards, Cartier entered the Strait of Belle Isle and explored the coast of Labrador as far as Brest, then, turning south, followed the western coast of Newfoundland as far as Cape St. John. He then sailed towards the Magdalen Islands, which, as well as Prince Edward Island, he sighted, and, advancing towards the west, he visited the entrance of the Miramichi River, Chaleurs Bay, and Gaspé Basin. Thence, crossing the estuary of the St. Lawrence to the northern coast, he shaped his course back to France.

JACQUES CARTIER
(From the original Painting in the Town Hall of Saint-Malo, France)

This first voyage lasted 137 days. On his return, Cartier made a circumstantial report of his expedition, and next year the king offered him a commission to continue his explorations. Three ships, fitted out with 110 men, set sail 26 May, 1535, and this time, determined to attempt the ascent of the great river, Cartier went up as far as Hochelaga (Montreal), returning to pass the winter at Stadacona (Quebec), near which were four or five Indian villages. Having entrenched himself at the mouth of the River Lairet, a tributary of the Sainte-Croix, he was able to live quietly during the winter, but unfortunately the scurvy broke out among his companions of whom twenty-five died. After planting a cross on the spot where they had wintered, Cartier sailed for France (6 May). He arrived safely at Saint-Malo, 16 July.

During a third voyage to Canada, undertaken in the year 1541, with five ships, Jacques Cartier passed the winter at the entrance of the River Cap-Rouge, fortifying his position for fear of being molested by the neighbouring savages. At this place, which he named Charlesbourg-Royal, Cartier awaited the arrival of the Sieur de Roberval, whom the king had charged to colonize Canada (1540). However, the spring having arrived without Roberval, Cartier thought it wise to return to France. Reaching Newfoundland, he met Roberval, who wished him to return to Canada. Cartier, however, persisted in setting sail for France, and the issue of Roberval's attempts at colonization afterwards justified the conduct of the discoverer of Canada. The King of France, as solicitous as was Cartier himself for the safety of Roberval, resolved to send an expedition to his relief. Cartier assumed command of this expedition, and hence his fourth voyage (1543), of which we have no details. After that he crossed the sea no more, but retired to his manor of Limoilou, near Saint-Malo, where he remained until his death.

Voyages de Jacques Cartier au Canada en 1534 (Paris, 1865); *Bref récit et succincte narration de la navigation faite en 1535 et 1536 par le Capitaine Jacques Cartier* (Paris, 1863); MANET, *Biographie des Malouins célèbres* (Saint-Malo, 1824); DUPLAIS, *La Bretagne et ses fils* (Paris, 1887); HAROUT, *Jacques Cartier* (Nantes, 1884); JOÜON DES LONGRAIS, *Jacques Cartier* (Paris, 1885); DIONNE, *Jacques Cartier* (Quebec, 1889).

N. E. DIONNE.

Carvajal, BERNARDINO LOPEZ DE, Cardinal, b. 1455, at Plasencia in Estremadura, Spain; d. at Rome 16 Dec., 1523. He was a nephew of the famous Cardinal Juan Carvajal, and owing to the universal esteem for the latter advanced rapidly in the ecclesiastical career at Rome, whither he came during the pontificate of Sixtus IV (1471-84). Under Innocent VIII he held successively the Spanish sees of Astorga (1488), Badajoz (1489), and Cartagena, in which latter quality he was sent as nuncio to Spain, and by their Catholic Majesties sent back as Spanish ambassador to Alexander VI, by whom he was made Cardinal of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus in 1493, which title he exchanged in 1495 for that of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme. In the next following years he was sent twice as legate to the German imperial court, also to Naples, and acted as Governor of the Campagna. In 1503 he was made Bishop of Siguenza in Italy, and Administrator of Avellino; from 1507 to 1509 he was in turn Cardinal-Bishop of Albano, Frascati, Palestrina and Santa Sabina. In spite of this rapid advancement and his numerous benefices he is best remembered as the leading spirit of the schismatical Council of Pisa (1511), which he organized with the aid of four other cardinals (Briçonnet, Francesco Borgia, Sanseverino, and René de Prie); dissatisfaction with this treatment by Julius II, and subserviency to the excommunicated French king, Louis XII, led Carvajal to this rebellious attitude. Moroni (Diz., X, 134) says that he went so far as to accept the office of antipope (Martin VI) at Milan whither the Council was soon transferred. Von Reumont says (Gesch. d. Stadt Rom. III, ii, 78-79) that in Pisa he was known to the urchins of the street as "Papa Bernardino". It would seem, therefore, that ambition was his chief failing; otherwise he was reputed a good theologian and a friend of art and letters, virtuous, eloquent, and skilful in the business of the curia. Both Carvajal and his colleagues were excommunicated by Julius II, and deposed from their offices, which act of the pope was confirmed by the Fifth Lateran Council (1512). At the seventh session (1513) of this council the Italian cardinals, Carvajal and Sanseverino, separated from their two French colleagues, formally renounced the schism, and were restored by Leo X to their offices. (Pastor, Gesch. d. Päpste, Freiburg, 1906, IV (1), 37-40). Carvajal was later made Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia and Dean of the Sacred College, with his uncle's former title of San Marcello, and as such welcomed to Rome Adrian VI, (op. cit. IV (2) 47-48), whom he survived, and Clement VII. He had lived at Rome under eight popes, and was buried in his titular church of Santa Croce, where a magnificent sepulchral monument perpetuates his memory. The noble but modernized frescoes (Pinturicchio school) in the tribuna of the apse, representing the Discovery of the Holy Cross, are owing to his generosity. His natural gifts, inherited prestige, numerous benefices, high offices, love of splendour, and great wealth attracted to him more than once the favourable attention of several conclaves, but at a critical period in his career he stood in his own light by fathering an ugly and perilous schism on the very eve of the Protestant Reformation.

ANTONIO, *Bibl. Hisp. nova* (Madrid, 1783), I, 215–16; EGGS, *Purpura docta* (Rome, 1798), III, 278; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, *Conciliengeschichte*, VIII, 470 sqq.; SANDRET, *Le Concile de Pise*, in *Revue des quest. hist.* (1883), XXXIV, 425 sqq.; ROSSBACH, *Das Leben und die politisch-kirchliche Wirksamkeit des Bern. Lopez de Carvajal, Kardinal von Santa Croce* (Breslau, 1893); MAURENBRECHER, *Gesch. der kath. Reformation* (Nördlingen, 1880), I, passim.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Carvajal, GASPAR DE, Dominican missionary, b. in Estremadura, Spain, c. 1500; d. at Lima, Peru, 1584. Having entered the Order of St. Dominic in Spain, he went to Peru in 1533 and devoted himself to the conversion of the native Indians. In 1540 Carvajal accompanied the famous expedition of Gonzalo Pizarro to the territory of Quixos and the Amazon. After several months of toilsome travel Pizarro and his followers reached Canelos, the limit originally proposed for their expedition; but hearing from the natives of the existence of a rich and fruitful land beyond, they resolved to press forward. They soon found themselves in a country destitute of provisions and infested with tribes of fierce and unfriendly Indians. Coming to the River Napo, Pizarro decided to send a small band of men accompanied by Carvajal and under the command of Francisco de Orellana down the river in search of provisions. Having reached the point of confluence of the Napo and Amazon, Orellana resolved to abandon his brigantine to the course of the river. Carvajal and another member of the expedition, Sánchez de Vargas, protested against this proceeding of dishonour and treachery. They were both promptly landed by Orellana, and later Pizarro and his men found them in the wilderness. The expedition returned to Quito in 1542 with only eighty survivors of the original four hundred. Carvajal was sent by his superiors to the mission of Tucuman, where for several years he laboured with unceasing zeal and devotion for the conversion of the native tribes in this immense territory. Having been elected to the office of provincial, he spent the greater part of four years in organizing and extending the province and founding new convents. In 1565 he was chosen to represent the province of Peru at Rome, but in all probability he did not cross the ocean.

Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography, I, 545–46; PRESCOTT, *History of the Conquest of Peru* (Philadelphia, 1900).

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Carvajal (CARVAGIAL), JUAN, CARDINAL, b. about 1400 at Truxillo in Estremadura, Spain; d. at Rome, 6 December, 1469. Little is known of his early youth, except that he made much progress in canon and civil law, and by 1440 had attained distinction at Rome as auditor of the Rota (q. v.) and governor of the City. Thenceforth his life was to be spent mostly in the foreign service of the Holy See; his contemporary, Cardinal Jacopo Ammanati, says (Comment., I, 2, 7) that he was sent twenty-two times as papal legate to various rulers and countries. Between 1441 and 1448 he spent much time in Germany and laboured, in union with Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa (q. v.), to

placate the strong feelings of the German princes against Eugene IV, to overcome their "neutrality" in the last, and schismatic phase of the Council of Basle, and to bring about the treaties known as the Concordat of the Princes (1447) and the Concordat of Aschaffenburg or Vienna (1448; see CONCORDAT). He was rewarded by Eugene IV (14 December, 1446) with the Cardinal's hat and the Title of St. Angelo *in foro piscium*. In 1444 and again in 1448 he was sent to Bohemia to promote the cause of religious unity but failed both times, owing to the stubbornness of the Calixtines and the influence of John Rokyzana, Archbishop of Prague, beloved in Bohemia, but whose orthodoxy was suspected at Rome (see HUSSITES).

In 1455 Carvajal was sent by Callistus III to Hungary to preach a vigorous crusade against the Turks, and for six years was the soul of the first effectual resistance made by Christian Europe to the ominous progress of the Ottoman conquerors of Constantinople (1453). Aided by the famous Capuchin preacher, St. John Capistran (q. v.), he gathered an army of about 40,000 men, effected a union with the troops of John Hunyady (q. v.), and on 22 July, 1456, the siege of Belgrade, the key of the Danube, was raised by a glorious victory that inaugurated the century-long resistance of Christian Hungary to the propaganda of Islam. He reconciled King Ladislaus (1457), with Emperor Frederick III, and in 1458 made peace between the Magyar nobles in favour of Matthias Corvinus as successor of Ladislaus. He was still in Hungary, organizing the defence of that bulwark of Christendom, when Pius II invited the princes of Christian Europe to meet him at Mantua (1459) to confer on the common danger and the need of a general crusade. While Cardinal Bessarion (q. v.) sought in Germany something more than brilliant promises, Carvajal continued his labours in Hungary, which he left only in the autumn of 1461, after six years of extraordinary service for the common good of Christian Europe, but "grown old and feeble", says Pastor (History of the Popes), "in that severe climate, amid the turmoils of the Court and the camp, and the fatigues of travel... [in] that bleak country of moorlands and marshes". He was made Cardinal-Bishop of Porto and Santa Rufina on his return. He had long held the See of Plasencia in Spain, where a noble bridge across the Tagus, built by him, is yet known as "the cardinal's bridge". In spite of his age and feeble health, he was still willing to take a foremost part in the crusade that Pius II was preparing at Ancona in 1464, when the death of that pope (14 August) put an end to the enterprise. His last legation was to Venice in 1466.

From all his journeys Carvajal brought back nothing but the reputation of an unspotted priesthood (Pastor, op. cit., IV, 131). "Such a legate", wrote the King of Hungary, "truly corresponds to the greatness of our need" (op. cit., II, 391). By his contemporaries he was considered the ornament of the Church, comparable to her ancient Fathers (Cardinal Ammanati) and the sole reminder of the heroic grandeur of Rome's earliest founders (Pomponius Lætus). Though genial in intercourse, there was something awe-inspiring about this saintly man whose ascetic life enabled him to provide liberally for the poor and for needy churches. Denifle mentions (Die Universitäten, I, 813), a college founded by him at Salamanca. His discourse in the papal consistories, says Pastor, was brief, simple, clear, logical, and devoid of contemporary rhetoric; his legatine reports have the same "restrained and impersonal character". Palacky, the non-Catholic historian of Bohemia writes of Carvajal (Geschichte Böhmens, IV, ii, 372): "Not only in zeal for the Faith, in moral purity and strength of character, was he unsurpassed, but he was also unequalled in knowledge of the world, in experience of ecclesiastical affairs, and in the services which he rendered to the papal authority. It was chiefly due to his labours, prolonged during a period of twenty years that Rome at last got the better of Constance and Basle, that the nations returned to their allegiance, and that her power and glory again shone before the world with a splendour that they had not seen since the time of Boniface VIII." Pastor says of him that he was absolutely free from the restless ambition and self-glorification so common among the men of the Renaissance, and seemed born for ecclesiastical diplomacy. His dominant idea was the consecration of his life to the Church and the promotion of the glory and power of Christ's Vicar. "Pars hæc vitæ ultima Christo neganda non est" (I must not refuse to Christ this last portion of my life) were the words in which he offered himself to Pius II as leader of a relief to the diminutive Christian Republic of Ragusa hard pressed in 1464 by the Turks. He left no printed works; among his manuscript remains are a defence of the Holy See, reports of his legations, a volume of letters, and discourses sacred and profane. He was buried in San Marcello al Corso. A monument erected to him there by Bessarion bears these words: Animo Petrus pectore Cæsar erat (A Peter in spirit, a Cæsar in courage).

PASTOR, *History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages* (tr. London, 1894), IV, 131–35 and passim; LOPEZ, *De rebus gestis S. R. E. Card. Carvajal commentarius* (Rome, 1754)—the chief source of information; PRAY, *Annales regni Hungariæ* (Vienna, 1776), pt. III; S. KATONA, *Hist. critica regum Hung. stirpis mixtæ* (Pesth, 1780), VI, xiii, ii, 1448–58; WADDING, *Annales Ord. Minorum*, XII, 332; ANTONIO, *Bibl. Hisp. Vetus* (1788), II, 296; VAST, *Le Cardinal Bessarion* (Paris, 1878).—Dr. Pastor says (IV, 145) that a complete and really critical biography of Carvajal would be a valuable work.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Carvajal, LUIS DE, Friar Minor and Tridentine theologian, b. about 1500; the time of his death is uncertain. Of the noble and wealthy family of Carvajal in the old Spanish province of Bætica, Carvajal was possessed of extraordinary gifts of mind and heart, and at an early age was sent to the University of Paris, where he completed his studies. Having entered the Franciscan Order, he taught theology at Paris, whence he was sent as legate of Cardinal Angelus to the Council of Trent. During the fifth session, in which the doctrine of original sin was discussed, Carvajal addressed the Council in favour of the Immaculate Conception, in defending which he had already won fame at Paris; it was doubtless owing to him that the Council inserted the words beginning "Declarat tamen" at the end of the fifth canon of this session. The last glimpse we get of Carvajal is at Antwerp in 1548, at which time he brought out the third edition of his "Theologicarum sententiarum liber singularis". Besides this work, he is the author of the "Declamatio expostulatoria pro immaculatâ conceptione" (Paris, 1541) and of a defence of the religious orders against Erasmus, entitled "Apologia monasticæ professionis" (Antwerp, 1529).

WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, XVIII, 1546, XXIV; MERKLE, *Conc. Trid. Diariorum*, etc. (Freiburg, 1901), I, 491; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, IV, 1177; *Acta Ord. Minorum*, Dec. (1904), 475.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Carvajal, LUISA DE, b. 2 Jan., 1568, at Jaraizejo, Spain; d. 2 Jan., 1614, at London, a lady of high birth, who received from God what appears to have been a special vocation to go to England and minister to those who were suffering for the Faith. Left an orphan at the age of six, she was brought up by her uncle and aunt at Pampeluna, where she showed evidence of extraordinary sanctity. She resolutely refused to marry; yet she had no attraction to the religious life. On the death of her aunt and uncle she collected a few women of her uncle's former household, and they led a life of prayer together. This continued for twelve years, until her Jesuit confessor at length allowed her to fulfil her desire

of setting out for England, in 1605. On arriving in London, Luisa assembled a little community similar to the former one at Pampeluna. She spent her time in visiting those in prison, and going to the houses of others in danger of apprehension. She had the happiness of ministering to Father Roberts, O. S. B., and Thomas Somers, a secular priest, immediately before their martyrdom. Her life attracted the attention of the authorities, who said she was doing more to convert Protestants than twenty priests. On two occasions pretexts were found for putting her in prison; on each occasion she was released at the instance of the Spanish ambassador. Attempts were then made with the latter to procure her removal from the kingdom. These would probably in the end have succeeded, had they not been prevented by her death which occurred on her forty-sixth birthday.

A Spanish Life was published in 1632; LADY GEORGIANA FULLERTON, *Life of Louisa de Carvajal*, in *Quarterly Series* (London, 1873, 1881, 1889).

BERNARD WARD.

Carve, THOMAS, historian, b. in Co. Tipperary, Ireland, 1590; d. probably in 1672. His correct name was Carew, that of a family of great influence in Munster during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. From his own works it is clear that the Butlers of Ormonde were his patrons during his early years. It is not certain where he was educated, but he was ordained priest, and passed some years in an Irish diocese. On the invitation of Walter Butler, then Colonel of an Irish regiment serving in Austria, he left Ireland and remained for some time as chaplain to Butler's regiment. He returned to Ireland twice (1630, 1632), and on the death of Butler he acted as chaplain to Devereux, Butler's successor in the command of the Irish forces fighting under Ferdinand II. He accompanied the troops during several of the campaigns of the Thirty Years' War, and had thus a good opportunity of observing the events recorded in his history of the war. In 1640 he was appointed chaplain to the English, Scotch, and Irish forces in Austria, and continued to hold that position till 1643, when he went to reside at Vienna as a choral vicar of the Cathedral of St. Stephen. His last book was published at Sulzbach in 1672. The principal works from his pen are: (1) "Itinerarium R. D. Thomæ Carve Tipperariensis, Sacellani majoris in fortissima juxta et nobilissima legione strenuissimi Colonelli D. W. Devereux", etc. (Mainz, 1639–41, pts. I–II; Speyer, 1648, III; new ed., 1 vol., 1640–41). A new edition of the whole work was published at London, 1859. It gives a good account of the Thirty Years' War. In connexion with the mysterious career of Wallenstein it is particularly valuable. (2) "Rerum Germanicarum ab anno 1617 ad annum 1641 gestarum Epitome" (1641). (3) "Lyra seu Anacephalæosis Hibernica, in qua de exordio, seu origine, nomine, moribus ritibusque Gentis Hibernicæ succinte tractatur, cui quoque accessere Annales ejusdem Hiberniæ necnon rerum gestarum per Europam 1148–1650" (Vienna, 1651; 2nd ed., Sulzbach, 1666). (4) "Enchiridion apologeticum Noribergæ" (1670). (5) "Responsio veridica ad illotum libellum cui nomen Anatomicum examen P. Antonii Bruodini, etc." (Sulzbach, 1672).

An account of Carve is given by KEARNEY in his *Preface to the Itinerarium* (London, 1859); WARE-HARRIS, *Writers of Ireland* (Dublin, 1746), 144–161; SHIRLEY, *Catalogue of the Library of Lough Fea* (Dublin), 35–36; LOWNDES, *Bibl. Manual* (Bohn), 382–383.

JAMES MACCAFFREY.

Caryll JOHN, poet, dramatist, and diplomatist, b. at West Harting, England, 1625; d. 1711; not to be confounded with his nephew, John Caryll, immortalized by a line in Pope's "Rape of the Lock". He was head of an old English Catholic and royalist family at that time settled at West Harting, in Sussex. His father, of whom he was heir, was likewise named John; his mother was a daughter of William, second Baron Petre. Of his education he received part at the English college of Saint-Omer, in Artois, part at the English College in Rome. During the reign of Charles II he produced several plays and poems of more than average merit. In poetry his chief performances were a translation of Ovid's Epistle of Briseïs to Achilles, first appearing in 1680 in a work entitled "Ovid's Epistles, translated by several hands", and afterwards separately; also a translation of Vergil's first Eclogue, printed in Nichol's "Select Collection of Miscellany Poems" and published in 1683. His plays, both of them brought out at the Duke of York's Theatre, were a tragedy written in 1666 and called "The English Princess, or the death of Richard III" (Samuel Pepys, who saw this piece acted 7 March, 1667, found it no more than "pretty good"), and a comedy entitled "Sir Solomon Single, or the Cautious Coxcomb", which came out in 1671, upon the pattern of Molière's "Ecole des Femmes". In 1679, during the national madness brought on by Titus Oates's pretended "Popish Plot", Caryll, as a Catholic of distinction, was committed to the Tower of London, whence he had the good luck soon to be let out on bail. When James II succeeded to the throne in 1685, he sent Caryll as his agent to the court of Pope Innocent XI, withdrawing him some months later upon the Earl of Castlemaine's appointment to that post. Caryll was then appointed secretary to Queen Mary of Modena, in whose service he continued after the Revolution of 1688, when he followed the exiled royal family across the sea to Saint-Germain. From his voluntary expatriation, however, there ensued no confiscation of his property until 1696, when, by reason of his implication in one of the plots to overthrow William III, he having furnished money for that purpose, his estate at West Harting was declared forfeited and himself attainted. His life interest in West Harting was thereon granted to Lord Cutts, but redeemed by Caryll's nephew aforesaid for £6,000. The dethroned King James II died in 1701, being succeeded in his rights and claims by his son, the so-called Pretender, who as King James III conferred upon Caryll the empty title of Baron Caryll of Dunford and the office of one of his secretaries of state. Meanwhile, in 1700, Caryll had published anonymously another work, this time in prose, entitled "The Psalmes of David, translated from the Vulgat". He died 4 September, 1711, and was buried at Paris in the church of the Scotch college, of which he had been a benefactor and where there was set up a tablet to his memory. He left no issue. His wife was Margaret, a daughter and co-heir of Sir Maurice Drummond. One of his sisters, Mary, became first abbess of the English Benedictine nuns at Dunkirk. The last of the Caryll family, a grandson of the above mentioned nephew, died in poverty at Dunkirk in 1788.

THOMPSON, in *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, IX, 254, 255; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, I, 419, 420; FOLEY, *Rec. Eng. Prov. S. J.*, III, 534 et sqq.; *Caryll MSS.* (Brit. Mus.).

C. T. BOOTHMAN.

Carystus, a titular see of Greece. According to legend it was named after Carystus, a son of Chiron. The ancient city is often mentioned by geographers, chiefly on account of its beautiful marble and its amianth obtained from Mount Oche. The see was at first a suffragan of Corinth, but early in the ninth century was made a suffragan of Athens and before 1579 of Euripos (Chalcis). Only two Greek bishops are mentioned by Lequien (II, 197): Cyriacus, who subscribed the letter of the bishops of Hellas to the Emperor Leo in 458, and Joel at the beginning of the eighteenth century. At least another titular may be mentioned, Demetrius, a friend of Michael Acominatos, the famous Metropolitan of Athens in the

thirteenth century. The bishopric was maintained in 1833, but under the district name of Carystia, its titular residing at Kyme. In 1900 it was united to Chalcis (Euripos), the capital of the island. As to the Latin see, we read that Innocent III assigned it with other suffragans to the Archbishopric of Athens. In the "Gerarchia Cattolica" (1907, 244) it is assigned to its original metropolis, Corinth. No residential bishop is known. Lequien (III, 857) mentions an obviously titular bishop of 1718. Carystus is to-day a village of about 2000 inhabitants on the southern coast of Eubœa.

HOPF, *On the History of Carystus from 1205 to 1470* in *Sitzungsb. Akadem. Wissensch.* (Vienna, 1853), XI, 555–606; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.* (London, 1878), I, 555.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Casalanzio, JOSÉ, SAINT. See JOSEPH CALASANCTIUS, SAINT.

Casale Monferrato, DIOCESE OF (CASALENSIS), a suffragan of Vercelli. Casale Monferrato, the ancient *Bodincomagus*, is a city in the province of Alessandria, Piedmont (Italy), on the River Po, and has been a stronghold since the time of the Lombards. King Liutprand enlarged it, and Emperor Otto II made it the chief town of a marquisate, giving it to the sons of Aleran, Duke of Saxony; later it was inherited by Emperor Michael VIII, Palæologus, who sent thither his son Theodore. In 1533, the dynasty of the Palæologi being extinct, Charles V gave it to the Gonzaga. From 1681 to 1706 it was in the hands of the French, from whom, in 1713, it passed to the House of Savoy. Casale was created a see in 1474 by Sixtus IV; previously it belonged to the Diocese of Asti. Its first bishop was Bernardino de' Tebaldeschi; his successor was Gian Giorgio Paleologo (1517), who also governed the marquisate for his nephew, a minor. Among its noteworthy bishops were: the Dominican Benedetto Erba (1570), most zealous for the Christian instruction of children and the introduction of the Tridentine reforms, in which good work he was associated with St. Charles Borromeo; he was also the founder of the *monti di pietà*; Giulio Careta (1614), who imitated other contemporary bishops and founded an oratory for priests, and when the pest was ravaging Casale (1630) himself nursed the sick; Scipione Pasquali (1645), author of a history of the campaign of Charles Emmanuel of Savoy against Montferrat. Among the churches of Casale are the cathedral, one of the finest monuments of Lombard architecture, and that of St. Hilary (Ilario). The diocese has a population of 200,500, with 140 parishes, 562 churches and chapels, 322 secular and 86 regular priests, 8 religious houses of men and 8 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XIV, 563; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 324.

U. BENIGNI.

Casali, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, musician, b. at Rome in 1715; d. there 1792. From 1759 until his death he held the position of choir-master in the church of St. John Lateran. Of his numerous compositions a mass in G major and several motets (Confitebor tibi, Ave Maria, Exaltabo, Improperium) have been reprinted in Lueck's "Collection" (Ratisbon, 1859). These compositions, while liturgical in spirit and form, show a considerable departure from the great period of the Roman School in a freer use of the dissonance, and they also bear witness to the influence of the opera in which form Casali also wrote. Most of his works are preserved in the library of Abbate Santini in Rome. Casali was one of the last of that period to write for voices *a capella*.

KORNMÜLLER, *Kirchenmusikalisches Lexikon;* MENDEL, *Musikalisches Lexikon.*

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Casanare, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF, in the Republic of Colombia, South America, administered by the Augustinians, subject to the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. The city of Casanare, situated on the river of the same name, was formerly a part of the Diocese of Tunja (Archdiocese of Bogotá). The vicariate was created in 1893, though efforts were made in this direction as early as 1884. Its territory forms an immense triangle bounded on the north-east by the Meta, on the north-west by Venezuela, on the west by the Andes. The conterminous dioceses are Bogotá, Tunja, and Pamplona. The population in 1893 was about 110,000 souls, ministered to by 10 priests. The territory of the vicariate coincides with the political district (*Intendencia*) of Casanare and takes its name from the Casanare River, an affluent of the Meta. The seat of the vicariate is at Tamara; other important places are Nunchia, Tame, Arauca, Orocué, Moreno, Trinidad, etc. Its first missionaries were Jesuits, who established there 126 reductions (see PARAGUAY). After their expulsion (1767) the original barbarism took the place of civilization and religion. The churches built by the first Jesuit missionaries were large and well furnished; even to-day local merchants and private individuals exhibit candlesticks and other objects that once belonged to these abandoned and despoiled churches. At present (1907) there are about 30 missionaries in the territory and 3 convents of Sisters of Charity. The revolutions of 1895 and 1899 interfered seriously with the progress of the missions.

Gerarchia Cattolica (Rome, 1907), 327; *Ann. Pont. Cath.* (Paris, 1907), 341; STREIT, *Kathol. Missionsatlas* (Steyl, 1906), p. 27 and map 28.

U. BENIGNI.

Casanata (or CASANATTA), GIROLAMO, Cardinal, b. at Naples, 13 July, 1620; d. at Rome, 3 March, 1700. His father, Tommaso Casanatta, was a member of the supreme council of the kingdom. Girolamo studied law at the university of his native town and practised in the courts for some time. Eventually he gave up the brilliant promises of a secular career and entered the service of the Church, in deference to the advice of Cardinal Pamphily whom he had met on a visit to Rome. When that cardinal became pope as Innocent X, Casanata was made private chamberlain and soon advanced rapidly in the ecclesiastical career, becoming in turn Governor of Sabina, Fabriano, Ancona, and Camerino. In the last-named city he became a close friend of its bishop, Emilio Altieri, afterwards Clement X. In 1658 Alexander VII sent him as inquisitor to Malta, whence he was shortly recalled to Rome and made prelate of the "Consulta" and active member of the courts known as the "Segnatura di Grazia" and the "Segnatura di Giustizia". He was Consultor of the Congregation of Rites and of Propaganda, and governor of the conclave that chose the successor of Alexander VII; under Clement IX he was made assessor of the Holy Office (Congregation of the Inquisition). He was appointed secretary of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars by Clement X, and 13 June, 1673, was named Cardinal-Deacon of the Title of Santa Maria in Porticu, and later (1686) Cardinal-Priest of the Title of San Silvestro in Capite. In 1693 Innocent XII bestowed on him the office of Librarian of the Vatican (Bibliotecario di Santa Romana Chiesa). On his death-bed he was assisted by two Dominicans, Father Cloché, the general of the order, and Father Massoulié. He was buried in St. John Lateran, though his heart was deposited in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, the church of the Dominicans, to whom he was always warmly attached, and who looked on him as their benefactor. The many responsible offices held by Casanata are evidence of his uncommon wisdom and his extensive curial experience. In the conduct of these offices it was necessary that he study profoundly the numerous and grave doctrinal, disciplinary, and political questions brought before the Holy See in the latter half of the

seventeenth century. It will suffice to recall the controversies concerning Quietism (Michael Molinos, Fénelon, Madame Guyon), the Gallican Liberties, the right of *Régale*, the Four Articles of 1682, the Chinese Rites controversy between the Jesuits and the Dominicans and other orders, not to speak of various doctrinal errors of the time, not unlike our own in its extravagant theological fancies, and the diffusion of lax moral theories so frequently condemned by contemporary popes.

The Casanatense Library (see below) still preserves 1125 manuscript volumes of opinions, reports, and statements (*voti, relazioni, posizioni*) concerning matters treated in the various Congregations to which Casanata belonged. So far these precious materials have been too little utilized to justify a satisfactory account of the part he played in contemporary ecclesiastical administration. His curial duties did not prevent him from taking an interest in letters and the sciences. He was on friendly terms and corresponded with the learned men of his day. Among those whom he encouraged most was Zaccagni (q. v.), whom he induced to publish the well-known collection of materials for the ancient history of the Greek and Latin Churches, "Collectanea monumentorum veterum Ecclesiæ græcæ et latinæ" (Rome, 1694, 4to). His chief service to learning, especially the theological sciences, was the Casanatense Library (Biblioteca Casanatense) founded and endowed by him. While living he had collected a library of about 25,000 volumes; this he left to the above-mentioned Dominican convent of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, together with an endowment fund of 80,000 *scudi* (almost as many dollars), to provide for the administration of the trust and for the acquisition of new books. In 1655 the same convent had inherited the library of Giambattista Castellani, chief physician of Gregory XV, with 12,000 *scudi* for the erection of a suitable edifice. Cardinal Casanata, moreover, ordered that the new library should be accessible to the public six hours daily, excepting feast-days. In addition to the library staff he provided for a college (*theologi casanatenses*) of six Dominicans of different nationalities (Italian, French, Spanish, German, English, Polish). Each of them must previously have received the degree of Doctor from one of the most famous universities of Europe. Aided by the resources of the library, they were to devote themselves to the defence and propagation of Catholic doctrine. Moreover, two professors were to expound regularly the text of St. Thomas Aquinas ("Summa Theologica" and other writings). In other words, by means of the new library, he had created at Rome another centre of intellectual activity (see "Minerva", 1892-93, II, 622). After the loss of the temporal power (1870) the library was declared national property, but the Dominicans were left in charge until 1884. At present the Casanatense Library is entirely under lay management. It has 5238 manuscripts, among them 64 Greek codices (15 of them the gift of Casanata), and 230 Hebrew texts (rolls and books), among which are 5 Samaritan codices. The *incunabula* (books printed before 1500) number 2036; there is also a large collection of Roman governmental proclamations (*bandi, editti*) from 1500 to 1870, comedies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, etc. Father Cloché, the General of the Dominicans, placed in the library a statue of Cardinal Casanata, the work of the sculptor Le Gros. An inscription records the formal permission of Clement XI to preserve there the books of heretical authors.

TOURON, *Hommes illustres de l'ordre de saint-Dominique* (1743–49), IV, 534 sqq.; *Monumenta Ord. Præd. Historica*, XIII, 335; BACALARI, *Index codicum græcorum bibliothecæ Casanatensis* (Florence, 1894); GUSTAVO SACERDOTE, *Catalogo dei codici ebraici della biblioteca Casanatense* (Florence, 1897); VAGLIO AND COLANERI, *La Biblioteca Casanatense* (Rome, 1896).

U. BENIGNI.

Casartelli, LOUIS CHARLES. See SALFORD, DIOCESE OF.

Casas (originally CASAUS), BARTOLOMÉ DE LAS, b. at Seville, probably in 1474; d. at Madrid, 1566. His family was from France and settled at Seville. He called himself Casaus during his youth, and changed the name to Casas later on.

Francisco Casaus, or Casas, the father of Bartolomé, had accompanied Columbus on his second voyage and brought back an Indian boy whom he left to his son as a servant. Bartolomé studied law at Salamanca, took his degree of Licentiate, and enjoyed a fair reputation as a lawyer. He possessed the confidence of the Spanish Governors of the Antilles after the departure of Columbus, and the first of these, Ovando, took him to the Island of Hispañola in 1502. Both Ovando and his successor, Velasquez, relied, in more ways than one, on the advice of Las Casas, who did not, however, remain much longer a layman, for in 1510 we find him a secular priest.

The condition of the Indians, especially those of the Greater Antilles, was not a satisfactory one. The earliest Spanish colonists in America were not the choicest examples of their race, neither were they numerous enough to improve the country and its resources as fast as they wished. Hence it was that the Indians were pressed into service; but those of the Antilles were not fitted for labour. With them the women, not the men, formed the labouring class. This the Spaniards did not know and, as Europeans, could not understand. Nor could they comprehend how the Indian was physically unfit for manual labour, owing to the lack of training. Hence the aborigines were overworked, and in many cases harshly treated, while epidemics were imported from the Old World, and a rapid decrease of the indigenous population set in. Las Casas saw all this, and sought to prevent it by every means at his disposal. He received, in the first years of his activity, full support from the clergy in America, and still more in Spain, where Cardinal Cisneros was counted among his most unfailing supporters.

In becoming a priest Las Casas gained two important points: almost complete freedom of speech and material independence. As an ecclesiastic he could penetrate nearly everywhere, and express himself as he liked. The rapid disappearance of the Indians in the Antilles caused much concern in Spain. Fears were entertained that it would ruin the colonies. Las Casas proposed a remedy. He suggested and, with characteristic vehemence, insisted that the natives should be placed under the control of the Church, and separated from contact with any portion of the laity. This measure could not replace the many aborigines who had already perished, and it gave but little relief to the remnant. Yet the Crown, always anxious to assist the Indians, and most favourably impressed by the philanthropic endeavours of Las Casas, was willing and eager that he should make a trial. The north-eastern coast of South America (Venezuela) was selected, and Las Casas was sent there in 1519 with ample means for the experiment. It must be stated, however, that when Las Casas was in Spain the second time, in 1517, he had made great efforts to secure farmers as emigrants for the Antilles, but failed. About the same time another measure of relief was proposed: the importation of negroes. Las Casas was one of its advocates. When he went to Venezuela he took with him seven negroes as his own personal slaves, and it is certain that he recommended the distribution of negroes through the Antilles, allowing five or six hundred to each island.

The charge often made against Las Casas, that he introduced negro slavery into the New World, is unjust. As early as 1505 negroes were sent to

the Antilles to work in mines. After that they were repeatedly imported, but without his co-operation. Besides, slavery was at that time sanctioned by Spanish custom and law. But the fact that he tolerated slavery in the case of negroes, while condemning Indian servitude, appears to us a logical inconsistency. It did not occur to him that the personal liberty of negroes and Indians alike was sacred, and that in point of civilization there was little difference between the two races. At a later period he recognized his error, but the cause of the Indians had so completely absorbed his sympathies that he did nothing for the black race.

The first attempt of Las Casas to carry out his plan of educating the Indian apart from the white man resulted in disastrous failure, caused by the Indians themselves. After establishing a post at Cumaná, Las Casas returned to give an account of what he had done. In the meantime the aborigines, seeing a large building of frail material, filled with commodities ultimately destined for distribution among them as time went on, forcibly appropriated the supplies, set fire to the buildings, and, after killing as many of the Europeans as could not escape, withdrew to the interior with their booty. It was a sore blow to the priest, but, instead of drawing the true lesson from it, he laid the blame on his countrymen, accusing them of having instigated the catastrophe out of ill will towards himself and his projects. Thereafter the colonization of the New World became in his eyes a grave offence, even a sin. Embittered in spirit, he joined the Dominican Order and began a fierce crusade for what he considered the rights and interests of the Indians.

In his active sympathy for the American aborigines Las Casas had not stood alone. He had on his side, in principle, the sovereigns and the most influential men and women of Spain. He was sincerely admired for his absolute devotion to the cause of humanity, his untiring activity and zeal. He stood out among the men of his day as an exceptionally noble personality. But the more perspicacious among his admirers saw, also, that he was eminently unpractical, and, while they supported within reason, they could not approve the extremes which he peremptorily demanded. His very popularity spoiled his character. Among the clergy, the Hieronymites, who had been entrusted with the conversion and training of the Antillean natives, were his first active supporters. After his entry into the Order of Preachers, the Dominicans naturally stood by him. The conquest of Mexico brought the Spaniards into intimate contact with the most numerous and most cultured groups of Indians in America. The degree of culture and the civil polity of these groups were overrated, and the character of the people misunderstood, as well as their social organization. They were represented as highly civilized, and the coercion accompanying the conquest, even if indispensable for the changes which alone could set the aborigines upon the path of progress, appeared to many to be wanton cruelty. Las Casas was prompt to raise the cry of condemnation.

It was in 1522 that, after the failure of his plan at Cumaná, Las Casas retired to a Dominican convent on the Island of Santo Domingo, where he soon after began to write his voluminous "Historia de las Indias". His picture of the earliest times of Spanish colonization is gruesome. He exaggerated the number of aborigines on the island at the time of discovery, and magnified into a deed of revolting cruelty every act which savoured of injustice. Sober common sense demands the revision and correction of his indictments. The life which Las Casas would have desired to lead could not, in the face of his disappointments, be led by a man of his temperament. At the same time the authorities favoured further investigations into the condition of the Indians, chiefly in the regions last occupied. He therefore went to Nicaragua in 1527. Everywhere he found abuses, and everywhere painted them in the blackest colours, making no allowances for local conditions or for the dark side of the Indian character. That the natives, owing to centuries of isolation, were unable to understand European civilization did not enter his mind. He saw in them only victims of unjustifiable aggression. It is greatly to the credit of the Spanish Government's goodwill to have not only tolerated but encouraged the visionary designs of Las Casas, who became more and more aggressive. Some of his biographers have unjustifiably extended the scope of his travels at that time. He is credited with having made a journey to Peru in the execution of his philanthropic mission; the truth is that Las Casas never touched South America, except on its northern coast. Nevertheless, he addressed to the king a memorial, couched in violent terms, on Peruvian affairs, of which he had not the least personal knowledge.

The critical question was that of Indian labour. Slavery had repeatedly been abolished, except in the case of prisoners of war and as a punishment for rebellion. The most rational solution appeared to be to let the Indian pass to enfranchisement through progressive stages of training under the supervision of the whites, such as might have the effect of initiating him little by little in the ways of European civilization. This plan demanded a feudal condition of things, and the *Repartimientos* and *Encomiendas*, while abolishing personal servitude, substituted for it agrarian serfdom. While not eliminating the possibility of individual and official abuses, however, it checked them in many ways. Las Casas was not satisfied with the improvement; it was not radical enough for him. He continued to agitate, and, though he does not appear as the framer of the "New Laws" for the Indies (promulgated in 1542), it is certain that those enactments were due to his influence with the Government, with the clergy, and with persons who, guided more by humanitarian theories than by practical knowledge of the New World, would not have stopped short of complete emancipation, regardless of its consequences to European settlement. The strong support which Las Casas found in Spain discredits the accusations of tyranny brought against the Spaniards by Las Casas himself and by his partisans. His violent denunciations were not only unjust, but extremely ungrateful. Throughout his career he never lacked either the means for support or for carrying out his schemes. But his vehemence and sweeping injustice estranged more and more those who, fully desirous of aiding the Indians, had to acknowledge that gradual reform, and not sudden revolution, was the true policy.

The "New Laws", with their amendments of 1543 and 1544, were a surprise and a source of much concern, especially in America. They did not abolish serfdom, but they limited it in such a manner that the original settlers (*Conquistadores*) saw before them utter ruin by the eventual loss of their fiefs. The newly acquired territories belonged to the Crown. Those who had suffered unspeakable hardships, exposures, and sacrifices to secure this new continent for Spain had a right to expect compensation for themselves and their descendants. That expectation was now suddenly threatened with disappointment. Not only this, but the Indians obtained such favours that, as long as Spanish rule lasted in America, the reproach was justly made to the mother country that a native enjoyed more privileges than a creole. A storm of indignation broke out in America against the new code, and against Las Casas as its promoter. About that time the Emperor Charles V had Las Casas proposed for the episcopal

see of Cuzco, in Peru, but he refused it. He had often declared that he would never accept any high office. In the case of Cuzco it was not so much modesty as prudence, for in Peru his life would have been in imminent danger. Certain it is that he afterwards accepted the Bishopric of Chiapas, in Southern Mexico. Notwithstanding his egregious failure in Venezuela, the Crown was disposed and even anxious to give him further opportunities and means to try once more the practicability of his schemes. He was in Central America, with intermissions, until 1539, disseminating his views and causing trouble everywhere. Received at Guatemala in the most friendly manner by Bishop Marroquin, he turned against his benefactor, because, while the latter was in full harmony with him so far as concerned his efforts in favour of the natives, he differed with him in regard to the mode of procedure. Little by little he alienated the sympathy of the most influential members of his own order, such, for example, as Fray Domingo de Betanzos. Some of the Franciscans, among them the celebrated missionary Fray Toribio de Paredes (Motolinia), took a decided stand against the methods of relief urged by Las Casas. Officials and private individuals, exasperated by the violence of his language, retorted with equal acrimony, and accusations of inconsistency were made against him. While he refused absolution to those who held fiefs, he did not hesitate to take advantage of personal service without compensation. Even his private character was, though unjustly, assailed. It must be said that Las Casas had set the example by his treatment of Bishop Marroquin.

The laws of the Indies were gradually modified so as to afford the necessary protection to the natives without injuring too much the interests of the settlers. But the bitterness of Las Casas grew with age. In 1552 there appeared in print his "Brevísima Relacion de la Destruycion de las Indias", a most injudicious book, glaringly partial, based upon testimony often very impeachable and always highly coloured. That so passionate and one-sided a document should have been published with the permission of the authorities argues a broad tolerance on the part of the Spanish Government, which, moreover, still continued its support to Las Casas. In 1555 an annual pension of 200,000 *maravedis* was granted to him, and five years later this was increased to 350,000 *maravedis*. Disappointed at the failure of his extravagant plans, he spent the last ten years of his life in comparative quietness, dying in the convent of Atocha, at Madrid, in the ninety-third year of his age.

Las Casas was a man of great purity of life and of noble aspirations, but his conviction that his own views were flawless made him intolerant of those of others. By no means thoroughly acquainted with the character of his Indian wards, he idealized them, but never took time to study them. His knowledge of them was far less correct than that of such men as Motolinia. Neither was he in any exact sense a missionary or a teacher. Between the years 1520 and 1540 he accompanied some of his Dominican brethren on missions—for instance, to Honduras. He occasionally visited certain districts, but the life of constant personal sacrifice among the aborigines was not to his taste. With the exception of what he wrote on the Indians of the Antilles, in the "Historia de las Indias", he has left very little of value to ethnology, for the bulky manuscript entitled "Historia apologética" is so polemical in its tone as to inspire deep mistrust. He did almost nothing to educate the Indians. The name "Apostle of the Indies", which has been given him, was not deserved; whereas there were men opposed to his views who richly merited it, but who had neither the gifts nor the inclination for that noisy propaganda in which Las Casas was so eminently successful. Although for over fifty years an ecclesiastic, he always remained under the spell of his early education as a lawyer. His controversy with Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda on the Indian question is a polemic between two jurisconsults, adorned with, or rather encumbered by, theological phraseology.

Las Casas left no linguistic contributions like those of Marroquin, Betanzos, Molina, and other devoted priests. He was, however, a prolific writer, though not all of his writings have been published. The "Historia apologética de las Indias", for instance, has been only partly printed in the "Documentos para la Historia de España" (Madrid, 1876). The "Historia de las Indias", the manuscript of which he completed in 1561, appeared in the same collection (1875 and 1876). His best-known work is the "Brevísima Relacion de la Destruycion de las Indias" (Seville, 1552). There are at least five Spanish editions of it. It circulated very quickly outside of Spain and in a number of European languages. Appearing at a time when every seafaring nation of Europe was jealous of Spain's American possessions, and bent upon damaging Spanish reputation for religious, as well as for political and commercial reasons, this violent libel, coming from a source so highly considered as Las Casas, was eagerly welcomed. Latin translations of it issued from Frankfort, 1598, Oppenheim, 1614, Heidelberg, 1664; French translations from Antwerp, 1579, Amsterdam, 1620 and 1698, Rouen, 1630, Lyons, 1642, Paris, 1697 and 1822; Italian from Venice, 1630, 1643, and 1645. A German translation appeared in 1599; Dutch translations at Amsterdam in 1610, 1621, and 1663. There is an English version: "A Relation of the first voyages and discoveries made by the Spaniards in America" (London, 1699). Many of the writings of Las Casas have been included in the work of J. A. Llorente: "Œuvres de Don Bartollomé de las Casas" (Paris, 1822).

A biography, or rather panegyric, of Las Casas has been written by QUINTANA in *Vidas de Españoles célebres* (Madrid, 1807). See also: YCAZBALCETA, *Documentos para la Historia de México* (Mexico, 1866), II, and *Bibliografía Mexicana del Siglo XVI* (Mexico, 1886). Passing over the innumerable more or less correct sketches and mentions of Las Casas in modern works, the sources may be noted which date from the lifetime of the celebrated Dominican, GOMARA, *Historia general de las Indias* (Saragossa, 1552; Medina del Campo, 1553; Antwerp, 1554; Saragossa, 1555). A most important but partial source is OVIEDO, *Historia general y natural de las Indias* (Madrid, 1850). From the beginning of the seventeenth century there is HERRERA, *Historia de los Hechos de los Castellanos en las Islas y Tierra firme del Marocéano* (Madrid, 1601–15; Antwerp, 1728; Madrid, 1726–30). Lately there have appeared the interesting biographical data of the book of DIEGO GUTIERREZ DE SANTA CLARA, *Historia de las Guerras civiles del Perú* (Madrid, 1904), I. The most extensive biographers of Las Casas have been two monks of his own order: ANTONIO DE REMESAL, *Historia general de las Indias occidentales, y particular de la gobernacion de Chiapas y Guatemala* (Madrid, 1619, and, under a somewhat different title, 1620); AUGUSTIN DÁVILA Y PADILLA, *Historia de la Fundación y Discurso de la Provincia de Santiago de México* (Madrid, 1596; Brussels, 1625). Finally the voluminous collection, *Documentos inéditos de Indias*, contains many documents touching upon Las Casas or emanating from his pen.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Case, PIERRE DE. See JERUSALEM.

Caserta, DIOCESE OF (CASERTANA).—Caserta is the capital of the province of that name in Southern Italy, situated in a fertile and pleasant region about twenty miles from Naples. It attained a certain importance under the Lombards and later under the Normans, and the counts of Caserta were once powerful lords in that vicinity. Later it was held as a fief by various noble families, last of all by the Gaetani, who made it over to Charles III of Savoy, King of Naples, by whom it was transformed into a second Versailles. The royal castle, the work of the architect Vanvitelli, is an edifice of great magnificence. Splendid residences were afterwards built in the vicinity by the aristocracy of Naples. It is not known when Caserta became an

episcopal see. The first-known bishop was Ranulfo whose election in 1113 was confirmed by Senne, Archbishop of Capua. Other bishops of note were: Andrea (1234), who finished the beautiful belfry of the cathedral; Secondo (1285) and Azzone (1290), champions of ecclesiastical liberty; Antonio Bernardo della Mirandola (1552), a famous student of Aristotle; Benedetto Mandina (1594), a zealous promoter of an alliance of Christian princes against the Turks; the Franciscan, Bonaventura Caballo (1669), renowned for his piety and his preaching. In 1818 Pius VII united this see with that of Caiazzo, but Pius IX made them separate sees. Caserta is a suffragan of Capua, and has a population of 96,800, with 51 parishes, 176 churches and chapels, 267 secular and 38 regular priests, and 7 religious houses of men and 10 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XX, 241–60; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 374–76.

U. BENIGNI.

Casey, JOHN, mathematician, b. at Kilkenny, Ireland, 12 May, 1820; d. at Dublin, 3 Jan., 1891. He received his early education in the school of his native town. As soon as his age permitted he took service under the Board of National Education and taught in various schools, finally becoming head master of the Central Model School of Kilkenny. In his leisure moments he cultivated his natural taste for mathematics, learning at the same time Latin, French, and German. His success in obtaining a geometrical solution of Poncelet's problem brought him to the notice of mathematicians, including Dr. Salmon and Professor Townsend of Trinity College, Dublin. Following the advice of the latter, he entered Trinity in 1858, though approaching his fortieth year. He won a sizarship in 1859, a scholarship in 1861 and took his B. A. degree in 1862. During the following eleven years he was mathematical master in the Kingstown School where he gained distinction by his success in training candidates for the Indian Civil Service examinations. In 1873 he became professor of higher mathematics and mathematical physics at the Catholic University in Dublin. Shortly afterwards he was offered a professorship at Trinity which he refused, preferring to devote his energies to the advancement of Catholic higher education. In 1881 he was elected to a fellowship in the Royal University and at the same time was appointed lecturer on mathematics at University College, Stephen's Green, a position which he held until his death.

Casey carried on an extensive correspondence with mathematicians at home and abroad, and during his life received many distinctions in recognition of his work in mathematics. In 1866 he was elected a member of the Royal Irish Academy, serving for many years as a member of its council, and for four years as vice-president. He received the honorary degree of LL.D. from Trinity in 1869. In 1874 he was elected a member of the London Mathematical Society, and in 1875 he was made a Fellow of the Royal Society. In 1878 he served as secretary of the British Association during its Dublin meeting. From 1862-1868 he was one of the editors of the "Oxford, Cambridge and Dublin Messenger of Mathematics" and for several years Dublin correspondent of the "Jahrbuch über die Fortschritte der Mathematik". Casey was an enthusiastic and devoted teacher and yet found time for much original work in mathematics, confining himself chiefly to geometry which he treated with much ability. He was withal a man of ardent piety, being a member of the Third Order of St. Francis and for many years a daily communicant. He was the author of a number of mathematical papers, many of them published in the "Philosophical Transactions" and in the "Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy". In 1881 he began a series of textbooks which were highly esteemed. Among his works are: "On Cubic Transformations" (Dublin, 1880); "Sequel to Euclid" (Dublin, 1881); "Treatise on the Analytic Geometry of the Point, Line, Circle and Conic Sections" (Dublin, 1885); "Treatise on Plane Trigonometry containing an account of the Hyperbolic Functions" (Dublin, 1888); "Treatise on Spherical Trigonometry" (Dublin, 1889).

Irish Monthly (1891), XIX, 106, 152; *Proc. Royal Society* (1891), XLIX, 30, p. xxiv.

H. M. BROCK.

Casgrain, HENRI RAYMOND, author of some of the best works in French Canadian literature, b. at Rivière Ouelle, 16 September, 1831; d. at Quebec, 2 February, 1904. His father, a proprietor of the old feudal regime who had been a member of the Canadian ministry, gave him a careful education at the College of Sainte-Anne-de-la-Pocatière. Having finished his classics he studied medicine, but became a priest in 1856. For several years he discharged his clerical duties at Beauport and Quebec, until poor health and a serious affection of the eyes compelled him to retire; thenceforth he was free to devote himself entirely to literary pursuits. He first wrote tales, such as, "Le tableau de la rivière Ouelle", "La jongleuse", "Les pionniers canadiens", for periodicals, his work appearing, 1860–68, in the "Soirées canadiennes et foyer canadien". In these narratives, which were well received, he depicted the life and customs of the early colonists of Canada. He has also left several biographies of Canadian writers, including lives of de Gaspé, Garneau, Crémazie, Chauveau. Casgrain's instinct for research led him to devote himself almost exclusively to history. His historical works include: "Histoire de la Mère Marie de l'Incarnation" (1864); "Histoire de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec" (1878); "Une paroisse canadienne au XVII^{e} siècle"; "Pèlerinage au pays d'Evangéline" (1885); "Montcalm et Lévis" (1891); "Une seconde Acadie" (1894); "Histoire de l'asile du Bon-Pasteur de Québec" (1890); "Les sulpiciens et les prêtres des Missions étrangères en Acadie" (1897); not to mention numerous monographs, archæological studies, and letters of travel written for the press. Ill-health compelled him to spend a long time in Europe, and he turned necessity to profit by making researches in the archives of France; thus he gathered many valuable documents for the history of his own country. Under his direction the Government of Quebec published (1888–1895) the collection known under the name of "Documents de Lévis", dealing with the last wars between the French and English in Canada, which he had secured from the family of this name. He also collected and published the works of Crémazie, the national poet of the French Canadians, under the title: "Œuvres de Crémazie" (1882). Some of Casgrain's writings have been crowned by the French Academy. He was professor of history at Laval University, and president of the Royal Society of Canada (1889–1890). As historian, poet, and literary critic Casgrain has exercised considerable influence upon the intellectual movement in Canada, and has accomplished much in making his country known. Although almost blind he was gifted with remarkable fecundity. That he had read in his youth many of the works of the Romantic school is betrayed by a style inclined to over-elaboration, but his diction grew purer as time went on. His literary judgments are not always accurate, and his appreciations of historical events are sometimes at fault. It has even been said that he was better fitted to write tales than history. However, everything considered, his work, as a whole, has real worth. Above all he was a patriot; his one thought was to increase the fame of his country. Casgrain's outlook is somewhat restricted, but his flights of fancy are frequently beautiful, and he is always interesting. He left unedited memoirs, which were bequeathed, together with his

manuscripts and a part of his fortune, to Laval University.

ROUTHIER, *Eloge historique de M. H. R. Casgrain* in *Royal Society Transactions*, new ser., X, 35; also *Presidential Address*, 1st ser., VIII, and Bibliography, XII; LAFLAMME, *L'abbé Henri Raymond Casgrain* in *Annuaire de l'université de Laval* (1904–05), XLVIII, 174; CAMILLE ROY, *L'abbé Casgrain* in *La Nouvelle-France* (1904), III, 257, 408, 511. For criticism see KÉRALLAIN, *La jeunesse de Bougainville* (Paris, 1896); ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVIII^e siècle*, II, 268.

J. EDMOND ROY.

Cashel, a town in the County Tipperary, Ireland, which is also a Catholic archbishopric and the see of a Protestant bishop. The Rock of Cashel, to which the town below owes its origin, is an isolated elevation of stratified limestone, rising abruptly from a broad and fertile plain, called the Golden Vein. The top of this eminence is crowned by a group of remarkable ruins. This ancient metropolis has lost its importance and most of its inhabitants. The population is less than 3000. Originally known as Fairy Hill, or *Sid-Druim*, the "Rock" was, in pagan times, the dun or castle of the ancient Eoghnacht Chiefs of Munster. In Gaelic *Caiseal* denotes a circular stone fort and is the name of other places in Ireland. The "Book of Rights" suggests that the name is derived from *Cais-il*, i. e. "tribute-stone", because the Munster tribes paid tribute on the Rock. Here, Corc, the grandfather of Aengus Mac Natfraich, erected a fort, and Cashel subsequently became the capital of Munster. Like Tara and Armagh it was a celebrated court, and at the time of St. Patrick claimed supremacy over all the royal duns of the province, when Aengus ruled as King of Cashel. About 450, Patrick preached at the royal dun and converted Aengus. The "Tripartite Life" of the saint relates that while "he was baptising Aengus the spike of the crozier went through the foot of the King" who bore with the painful wound in the belief "that it was a rite of the Faith". And, according to the same authority, twenty-seven kings of the race of Aengus and his brother Aillil ruled in Cashel until 897, when Cerm-gecan was slain in battle. There is no evidence that St. Patrick founded a church at Cashel, or appointed a Bishop of Cashel. St. Ailbe, it is supposed, had already fixed his see at Emly, not far off, and within the king's dominions. Cashel continued to be the chief residence of the Kings of Munster until 1100. Hence its title, "City of the Kings". Before that date there is no mention in the native annals of any Bishop, or Archbishop of Cashel. Cormac MacCullinan is referred to, but not correctly, as Archbishop of Cashel, by later writers. He was a bishop, but not of Cashel, where he was king. The most famous man in Ireland of his time, but more of a scholar and warrior than an ecclesiastic, Cormac has left us a glossary of Irish names, which displays his knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and the "Psalter of Cashel", a work treating of the history and antiquities of Ireland. He was slain in 903, in a great battle near Carlow.

Brian Boru fortified Cashel in 990. Murtagh O'Brien, King of Cashel, in presence of the chiefs and clergy, made a grant in 1101 of the "Rock" with the territory around it to O'Dunan, "noble bishop and chief senior of Munster", and dedicated it to God and St. Patrick. Then Cashel became an archiepiscopal see, and O'Dunan its first prelate as far as the primate, St. Celsus, could appoint him. At the synod of Kells, 1152, Cardinal Paparo gave a pallium to Donat O'Lonergan of Cashel, and since then his successors have ruled the ecclesiastical province of Munster. In 1127 Cormac MacCarthy, King of Desmond, erected close to his palace on the "Rock" a church, now known as Cormac's Chapel, which was consecrated in 1134, when a synod was held within its walls. During the episcopate of Donal O'Hullican (1158–82), the King of Limerick, Donal O'Brien, built in 1169 a more spacious church beside Cormac's Chapel, which then became a chapter-house.

The "City of the Kings" had a full share in the vicissitudes of the times. Maurice, a Geraldine, filled the see from 1504 to 1523, and was succeeded by a natural son of Pierce, Earl of Ormond, Edmund Butler, prior of Athassal Abbey. In addition to the wars between the Irish and English there now arose a new element of discord, the Reformation introduced by Henry VIII. The archbishop shared in the family failings, propensity for plundering and servility to the king. While residing at Kilmeaden Castle he levied black-mail on the traders of the Suir, robbing their boats and holding their persons for ransom. At a session of the privy council held at Clonmel, 1539, he swore to uphold the spiritual supremacy of the king and denied the power in Ireland of the Bishop of Rome. It does not appear that he left the Church. He died 1550 and was buried in the cathedral. Roland, a Geraldine (1553–61), was created archbishop by Queen Mary. After a vacancy of six years Maurice FitzGibbon (1567–78) a Cistercian abbot was promoted to the archbishopric by the pope, and James MacCaghwell was put forward by Elizabeth. Thus began the new religion at Cashel. FitzGibbon, who belonged to the Desmond family, being deprived of his see fled to France and passed into Spain where he resided for a time at the Court. He conferred with the English ambassador at Paris in order to obtain pardon for leaving the country without the Queen's sanction, and to get permission to return. In this he failed, and going back to Ireland secretly he was arrested and imprisoned at Cork, where he died (1578) after much suffering. On the death of MacCaghwell, Elizabeth advanced Miler MacGrath, a Franciscan, and apostate Bishop of Down, to the See of Cashel. He held at the same time four bishoprics and several benefices, out of which he provided for his numerous offspring. Having occupied the see fifty-two years and wasted its temporalities, he died 1622. His monument in the ruined cathedral bears a strange epitaph written by himself.

Dermod O'Hurley of Limerick, a distinguished student of Louvain and professor at Reims, was appointed (1581) by Gregory XIII. Having laboured secretly for two years among his flock, he was discovered and brought before the Lord Justices at Dublin. He suffered cruel tortures rather than take the Oath of Supremacy. He was hanged outside the city (1583). The story of the See of Cashel varies little for more than two centuries following; it is a narrative of struggle and persecution for the old Faith. The roll of its prelates presents men illustrious by learning, wisdom, and piety, as in former days. Meanwhile, on "the Rock" the monuments to the Faith and art of a noble period were yielding to the spoiler and falling to decay. Dr. James Butler 2nd (1774–91), on being appointed settled in Thurles, where the archbishops have since resided. His successor, Archbishop Bray (1792–1820), built a large church in the early part of the nineteenth century, on the site of which Archbishop Leahy (1857–74) erected a splendid cathedral in Romanesque style. It was completed and consecrated in 1879 by Archbishop Croke (1874–1902), and dedicated to Our Lady of the Assumption. St. Albert (feast 8 Jan.), a reputed former bishop, is the patron of the diocese. The Archbishop of Cashel is Administrator of the ancient Diocese of Emly.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF CASHEL comprises the Archdiocese of Cashel with the Diocese of Emly and eight suffragan sees: Cloyne, Cork, Kerry, Killaloe,

Limerick, Ross, Waterford and Kilfenora. The Bishop of Galway is Apostolic Administrator of Kilfenora. *Statistics for 1908.*—Archdiocese of Cashel and Diocese of Emly: archbishop, 1, parishes, 46, parish priests, 44, administrators, 2, curates, 67, secular clergy, 103, regular clergy, 3, parochial and district churches, 84, houses of regular clergy (Augustinians), 1, theological seminary (at Thurles), 1, college (at Rockwell, Cashel), 1, convents of nuns, 15, with 322 members, monasteries of brothers, 4, with 24 members, Catholic population (1901) 111,185, non-Catholic population (1901) 4659, total 115,844.

COLGAN, *Acta Sanctorum* (Louvain, 1645); LANIGAN, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland* (Dublin, 1905); WARE-HARRIS, *Works on Ireland* (Dublin, 1764); PETRIE, *The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland* (Dublin, 1845); *Book of Rights*, ed. O'DONOVAN (Dublin, 1847); RENEHAN, *Collections of Irish Church History* (Dublin, 1861), I; *Spicilegium Ossoriense* ed. MORAN (Dublin, 1863); HEALY, *Life and Writings of St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1905).

J. J. RYAN.

Casimir, SAINT, Prince of Poland, b. in the royal palace at Cracow, 3 October, 1458; d. at the court of Grodno, 4 March, 1484. He was the grandson of Wladislaus II Jagiello, King of Poland, who introduced Christianity into Lithuania, and the second son of King Casimir IV and Queen Elizabeth, an Austrian princess, the daughter of Albert II, Emperor of Germany and King of Bohemia and Hungary. Casimir's uncle, Wladislaus III, King of Poland and Hungary, perished at Varna in 1444, defending Christianity against the Turks. Casimir's elder brother, Wladislaus, became King of Bohemia in 1471, and King of Hungary in 1490. Of his four younger brothers, John I, Albert, Alexander, and Sigismund in turn occupied the Polish throne, while Frederick, the youngest, became Archbishop of Gnesen, Bishop of Cracow, and finally cardinal, in 1493. The early training of the young princes was entrusted to Father Dlugosz, the Polish historian, a canon at Cracow, and later Archbishop of Lwów (Lemberg), and to Filippo Buonaccorsi, called Callimachus. Father Dlugosz was a deeply religious man, a loyal patriot, and like Callimachus, well versed in statecraft. Casimir was placed in the care of this scholar at the age of nine, and even then he was remarkable for his ardent piety. When Casimir was thirteen he was offered the throne of Hungary by a Hungarian faction who were discontented under King Matthias Corvinus. Eager to defend the Cross against the Turks, he accepted the call and went to Hungary to receive the crown. He was unsuccessful, however, and returned a fugitive to Poland. The young prince again became a pupil of Father Dlugosz, under whom he remained until 1475. He was later associated with his father who initiated him so well into public affairs that after his elder brother, Wladislaus, ascended the Bohemian throne, Casimir became heir-apparent to the throne of Poland. When in 1479 the king went to Lithuania to spend five years arranging affairs there, Casimir was placed in charge of Poland, and from 1481 to 1483 administered the State with great prudence and justice. About this time his father tried to arrange for him a marriage with the daughter of Frederick III, Emperor of Germany, but Casimir preferred to remain single. Shortly afterwards he fell victim to a severe attack of lung trouble, which, weak as he was from fastings and mortifications, he could not withstand. While on a journey to Lithuania, he died at the court of Grodno, 4 March, 1484. His remains were interred in the chapel of the Blessed Virgin in the cathedral of Vilna.

St. Casimir was possessed of great charms of person and character, and was noted particularly for his justice and chastity. Often at night he would kneel for hours before the locked doors of churches, regardless of the hour or the inclemency of the weather. He had a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and the hymn of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, "Omni die dic Mariæ mea laudes anima", was long attributed to him. After his death he was venerated as a saint, because of the miracles wrought by him. Sigismund I, King of Poland, petitioned the pope for Casimir's canonization, and Pope Leo X appointed the papal legate Zaccaria Ferreri, Bishop of Guardalfiera, the Archbishop of Gnesen, and the Bishop of Przemyśl to investigate the life and miracles of Casimir. This inquiry was completed at Thurn in 1520, and in 1522 Casimir was canonized by Adrian VI. Pope Clement VIII named 4 March as his feast. St. Casimir is the patron of Poland and Lithuania, though he is honoured as far as Belgium and Naples. In Poland and Lithuania churches and chapels are dedicated to him, as at Rozana and on the River Dzwina near Potocka, where he is said to have contributed miraculously to a victory of the Polish army over the Russians. In the beginning of the seventeenth century King Sigismund III began at Vilna the erection of a chapel in honour of St. Casimir, which was finished under King Wladislaus IV. The building was designed by Peter Danckerts, of the Netherlands, who also adorned the walls with paintings illustrating the life of the saint. In this chapel is found an old painting renovated in 1594, representing the saint with a lily in his hand. Two other pictures of the saint are preserved, one in his life by Ferreri, and the other in the church at Krosno in Galicia.

POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi, Wegweiser* (2nd ed.), 1236; CHEVALIER, *Bio-bibl.*, s. v.; ESTREICHER, *Bibliografia poloka* (Cracow, 1903), XIX, 210–12; PRILESZKY, *Acta sanctorum Hungariæ* (Tyrnau, 1743), I, 121–32; FERRERI, *Vita beati Casimiri confessoris ex serenissimis Poloniæ regibus* (Cracow, 1521) in *Acta SS.*, March, I, 347–51; ST. GREGORY, *Miracula S. Casimiri* in *Acta SS.*, March, I, 351–57; IDEM, *S. Casimiri theatrum seu ipsius prosapia, vita, miracula* (Vilna, 1604); CIATI, *La santità prodigiosa di S. Casimiro* (Luccoa, 16..); *Officium S. Casimiri confessoris M. D. Lithuaniæ patrini* (Vilna, 1638); COLLE, *Compendio della vita di S. Casimiro* (Palermo, 1650); TYSZKIEWICZ, *Królewska droga do nisba albo zycie św. Kazimierza* (Warsaw, 1752); *Św. Kazimier*, in *Przyjaciel ludu* (Lissa, 1846), XIII; PEKALSKI, *Zywoty św. Patronów polskich* (Cracow, 1866); PRZEZDZIECKI. *Oraison de saint Casimir à la très sainte Vierge* (Cracow, 1866); LESZEK, *Zywot św. Kazimierza Jagiellończyka* (Cracow, 1818); PALLAN, *Św. Kazimierz* (Tarnów, 1893); PAPÉE, *Swiety Kazimierz królewicz polski* (Lemberg, 1902); PAPÉE, *Studya i szkice z czasów Kazimierza Jagiellończyka* (Warsaw, 1907), 141–54.

L. ABRAHAM.

Casium, a titular see of Lower Egypt (Ptolemy, IV, v, 12), not far from Pelusium, and near the sandhills known by Greek geographers as *Kasion Oros*, to-day El-Katieh, or El-Kas. There was at Casium a temple of Zeus Kasios, the Aramean god Qāsiou, and Pompey, who had been murdered near the place, was buried there. The town is mentioned in Georgius Cyprius (ed. Gelzer, 694), Hierocles' "Synecdemos" (727, 2), and Parthey's "Notitia Prima", about 840, as a bishopric depending on Pelusium in Augustamnica Prima. Only one bishop is known, Lampetius, present at Ephesus in 431. He was sent by St. Cyril, with Hermogenes, Bishop of Rhinocorua, to Rome, where both were present at the consecration of Pope Sixtus III. Many letters of St. Isidore of Pelusium are addressed to him (Lequien, II, 545).

SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.* (London, 1878), I, 558.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Casot, JEAN-JACQUES, the last surviving Jesuit of the old Canada mission, b. in Liège, Belgium, 4 Oct., 1728; d. at Quebec, 16 March, 1800. With him ended the long line of the sons of St. Ignatius who laboured in Canada during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. At his death the Society of Jesus became extinct in New France. He first joined the Society as a lay brother at the novitiate in Paris, 16 Dec., 1753, and left for Canada towards the close of 1756, where he was employed as cook at the college of Quebec. He was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Briand, of Quebec, in order to preserve from extinction as long as possible the So-

THE ROCK OF CASHEL

ciety of Jesus in Canada. He was an humble and devout religious who "deprived himself of the very necessaries of life, in order that he might expend the whole of whatever property he had received from his deceased brethren in promoting and multiplying as widely as he could different works of zeal and charity" (English Menology, S. J.). Upon his decease, the property of the Jesuits in Canada passed into the possession of the British Crown. His portrait forms the frontispiece of Thwaites' "Jesuit Relations" (Cleveland, 1896–1901), LXXI, 125.

ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1906), II, 236; *Menology of the Eng. Assistancy* (Roehampton, 1902), I, 127; *Les Ursulines de Québec* (Quebec, 1864–66), III, 347.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Cassander, GEORGE, a Flemish Humanist and theologian, b. 15 August, 1513, at Pitthem in West Flanders; d. 3 February, 1566, at Cologne. He studied at Louvain, where he was graduated in 1533. In 1541 he was appointed professor of belles-lettres at Bruges, but resigned two years later, partly from a natural desire to travel for instruction, and partly in consequence of the opposition aroused by his pro-Reformation views. On his journeys, which were undertaken in the company, and at the expense of his friend, Cornelius Wouters, he visited Rome, and in 1544 came to Cologne, where he settled permanently in the summer of 1549. He soon abandoned the classics for the study of the Bible and ecclesiastical questions, and had already published several classical, Biblical, and patristic treatises, when in 1556 he commenced a series of liturgical works. His "Hymni Ecclesiastici" (1556) were followed in 1558 by the "Liturgica de ritu et ordine Dominicæ cœnæ celebrandæ". Both publications were placed on the Index. As a completion of the "Liturgica", his "Ordo Romanus" appeared (1558); and in 1560 the "Preces Ecclesiasticæ" were published. Cassander's activity in promoting religious peace between Catholics and Protestants began with the publication of his anonymous book: "De officio pii viri in hoc religionis dissidio" (1561). This work, written at the request of the jurist, Francis Baldwin, and submitted by him to the Colloquy of Poissy (Sept., 1561), gave offence to both sides. Calvin wrote a violent answer, in which he unjustly berated Francis Baldwin as the author of the publication. On the Catholic side, William Lindanus, afterwards Bishop of Roermonde, remonstrated with Cassander by letter, and would have attacked him publicly had it not been for the intervention of a secretary of the King of Spain.

At the request of William, Duke of Cleves, Cassander wrote in 1563 a treatise against the Anabaptists: "De Baptismo Infantium". It was supplemented in 1565 by "De Baptismo Infantium: Pars Altera". The treatise, "De sacrâ communione Christiani populi in utrâque panis et vini specie" (Cologne, 1564), a plea in favour of the reception of communion under both species by the laity, attracted the attention of the Emperor Ferdinand I, who was himself a partisan of the idea. The latter, wishing to use the author as peacemaker between Catholics and Protestants, invited him to Vienna. Cassander, prevented by illness from acting upon the invitation, wrote his "Consultatio de articulis Religionis inter Catholicos et Protestantes controversis", which he addressed to Maximilian II (1564), as Ferdinand I had died before its completion. This work, however, failed to satisfy either side. It is most probable, though not universally admitted, that Cassander died in full submission to the Catholic Church. He certainly always wished to remain a faithful member of the Church; but it is equally certain that some of his opinions were Protestant to the core. He advocated, for example, the division of ecclesiastical doctrines into fundamental and non-fundamental articles, the supremacy of private judgement, and the human origin of the papal primacy. An incomplete collection of his works was issued at Paris in 1616, and placed on the Index the following year.

DE SCHREVEL, *Hist. du sémin. de Bruges* (Bruges, 1883–95), I, 263–65, 387–609; FRITZEN, *De Cassandri ejusque sociorum studiis irenicis* (Münster, 1865); PASTOR in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

N. A. WEBER.

Cassani (also CASANI), JOSEPH, b. at Madrid, 26 March, 1673, entered the Society of Jesus, 16 Nov., 1686, was still in active exercise of priestly functions in 1745, and d. in 1750. He was one of the founders of the *Academia de la Lengua española* at Madrid, and published there a "Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana" in 1726–1730, in six volumes. He was a very prolific writer. Among his works may be noted: "Admirable vida, singulares virtudes etc. del extático Varon P: Dionisio Rickel" (Madrid, 1738); "Varones ilustres de la Compañia de Jesus"; "Escuela militar de fortificacion"; "Tratado de la naturaleza y orígen de los cometas" (Madrid, 1737). He was a member of the *Academia* from 6 July, 1713. Although he never visited America, he appeals particularly to Americans through his "Historia de la Provincia de la Compañia de Jesus del Nuevo Reyno de Granada en la América" (Madrid, 1741), the only regular chronicle of the Jesuit Order in Colombia thus far extant. The fact that Cassani was never in the New World detracts somewhat from the usefulness of this otherwise valuable history, as far as ethnologic and ethnographic data are concerned; otherwise it is a conscientious and earnest work, giving interesting data, chiefly of the missions in the upper Orinoco basin. The work is exceedingly rare.

SOMMERVOGEL-DE BACKER, *Bibl. des écriv. de la c. de J.*; *Diccionario hispano-americano;* SALVÁ, *Catálogo de la Biblioteca de Salvá* (Valencia, 1874); ACOSTA, *Compendio hist. del Descub. y Conoiz., de la Nueva Granada* (Paris, 1848); BRINTON, *The American Race* (New York, 1891).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Cassano all' Ionio, DIOCESE OF (CASSANENSIS), suffragan of Reggio. Cassano all' Ionio is a city of Calabria, province of Cosenza, situated in a fertile region in the concave recess of a steep mountain. It was already known in Cæsar's time as *Cassanum.* It is not known when it became an episcopal see; in 1059 mention is made of a bishop of Cassano, otherwise unknown. In 1096 we read of a bishop known as Saxo (Sassone). Other bishops worthy of mention are: Antonello dei Gesualdi (1418), learned in canon and civil law; Belforte Spinelli (1432), who while yet a layman assisted at the Council of Constance, under Martin V was sent on important missions, and later renounced the world and retired to Venice, leaving his rich library to the Collegio Spinelli of Padua; Cristoforo Giacoazzi (1523), later Cardinal, called to Rome by Paul III on account of his skill in ecclesiastical affairs; Giovanni Angelo Medici (1553), afterwards Pius IV; the Englishman, Audoeno Ludovico Cambrone (1588), who was sent by Pope Gregory XIII on different missions, and never resided in Cassano; the Franciscan, Deodato de Arze (1614); the two Theatines, Paolo Palombo (1617) and Gregorio Caraffa (1648); the Augustinians, Luigi Balmaseda (1670) and Vincente de Magistris (1671). The diocese has a population of 130,000, with 46 parishes, 200 churches and chapels, 253 secular and 10 regular priests, 2 religious houses of men and 3 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 238; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 376.

U. BENIGNI.

Casserly, PATRICK S., educator, b. in Ireland; d. in New York, where for many years he conducted a classical school. He was also associate editor of the "New York Weekly Register". He translated the "Sublime and Beautiful" of Longinus, and "Of the Little Garden of Roses and Valley of Lilies" of Thom-

as à Kempis; edited Jacob's "Greek Reader" (1836), of which sixteen editions were published, and a text-book on Latin Prosody (1845), which is still extensively used in classical schools, and wrote and published a pamphlet entitled "New England Critics and New York Editors", in reply to an article in the "North American Review" on the merits of certain Greek class-books. EUGENE, his son, b. in Ireland, 1822; d. at San Francisco, California, 14 June, 1883. He was graduated from Georgetown University, and in 1844 was admitted to the New York Bar. During the years 1846-7 he served as Corporation Counsel in New York, and in 1850 moved to San Francisco, where he took an active part in both local and national politics. In 1869 he was elected United States Senator from California, but resigned his seat and returned to San Francisco, November, 1873, to resume the practice of the law.

Pilot (Boston, 4 Jan., 1868); *Catholic Family Almanac* (New York, 1885); *Donahue's Magazine* (Boston, 1895); SHEA, *History of Georgetown University* (New York, 1889), 207; *Appleton's Cycl. of Am. Biog.* (New York, 1900), I, 553.

THOMAS GAFFNEY TAAFFE.

Cassia, SIMONE À FIDATI À. See SIMONE.

Cassian, JOHN, a monk and ascetic writer of Southern Gaul, and the first to introduce the rules of Eastern monasticism into the West, b. probably in Provence about 360; d. about 435, probably near Marseilles. Gennadius refers to him as a Scythian by birth (*natione Scytha*), but this is regarded as an erroneous statement based on the fact that Cassian passed several years of his life in the desert of Scete (*heremus Scitii*) in Egypt. The son of wealthy parents, he received a good education, and while yet a youth visited the holy places in Palestine, accompanied by a friend, Germanus, some years his senior. In Bethlehem Cassian and Germanus assumed the obligations of the monastic life, but, as in the case of many of their contemporaries, the desire of acquiring the science of sanctity from its most eminent teachers soon drew them from their cells in Bethlehem to the Egyptian deserts. Before leaving their first monastic home the friends promised to return as soon as possible, but this last clause they interpreted rather broadly, as they did not see Bethlehem again for seven years. During their absence they visited the solitaries most famous for holiness in Egypt, and so attracted were they by the great virtues of their hosts that after obtaining an extension of their leave of absence at Bethlehem, they returned to Egypt, where they remained several years longer. It was during this period of his life that Cassian collected the materials for his two principal works, the "Institutes" and "Conferences". From Egypt the companions came to Constantinople, where Cassian became a favourite disciple of St. John Chrysostom. The famous bishop of the Eastern capital elevated Cassian to the diaconate, and placed in his charge the treasures of his cathedral. After the second expulsion of St. Chrysostom, Cassian was sent as an envoy to Rome by the clergy of Constantinople, for the purpose of interesting Pope Innocent I in behalf of their bishop. It was probably in Rome that Cassian was elevated to the priesthood, for it is certain that on his arrival in the Eternal City he was still a deacon. From this time Germanus is no more heard of, and of Cassian himself, for the next decade or more, nothing is known. About 415 he was at Marseilles where he founded two monasteries, one for men, over the tomb of St. Victor, a martyr of the last Christian persecution under Maximian (286–305), and the other for women. The remainder of his days were passed at, or very near, Marseilles. His personal influence and his writings contributed greatly to the diffusion of monasticism in the West. Although never formally canonized, St. Gregory the Great regarded him as a saint, and it is related that Urban V (1362–1370), who had been an abbot of St. Victor, had the words *Saint Cassian* engraved on the silver casket that contained his head. At Marseilles his feast is celebrated, with an octave, 23 July, and his name is found among the saints of the Greek Calendar.

The two principal works of Cassian deal with the cenobitic life and the principal or deadly sins. They are entitled: "De institutis cœnobiorum et de octo principalium vitiorum remediis libri XII" and "Collationes XXIV". The former of these was written between 420 and 429. The relation between the two works is described by Cassian himself (Instit., II, 9) as follows: "These books [the Institutes] . . . are mainly taken up with what belongs to the outer man and the customs of the cœnobia [i. e. Institutes of monastic life in common]; the others [the "Collationes" or Conferences] deal rather with the training of the inner man and the perfection of the heart." The first four books of the "Institutes" treat of the rules governing the monastic life, illustrated by examples from the author's personal observation in Egypt and Palestine; the eight remaining books are devoted to the eight principal obstacles to perfection encountered by monks: gluttony, impurity, covetousness, anger, dejection, *accidia* (ennui), vainglory, and pride. The "Conferences" contain a record of the conversations of Cassian and Germanus with the Egyptian solitaries, the subject being the interior life. It was composed in three parts. The first instalment (Books I–X) was dedicated to Bishop Leontius of Fréjus and a monk (afterwards bishop) named Helladius; the second (Books XI–XVII), to Honoratus of Arles and Eucherius of Lyons; the third (Books XVIII–XXIV), to the "holy brothers" Jovinian, Minervius, Leontius, and Theodore. These two works, especially the latter, were held in the highest esteem by his contemporaries and by several later founders of religious orders. St. Benedict made use of Cassian in writing his Rule, and ordered selections from the "Conferences", which he called a mirror of monasticism (*speculum monasticum*), to be read daily in his monasteries. Cassiodorus also recommended the "Conferences" to his monks, with reservations, however, relative to their author's ideas on free will. On the other hand, the decree attributed to Pope Gelasius, "De recipiendis et non recipiendis libris" (early sixth century), censures this work as "apocryphal", i. e. containing erroneous doctrines. An abridgment of the "Conference" was made by Eucherius of Lyons which we still possess (P. L., L, 867 sqq.). A third work of Cassian, written at the request of the Roman Archdeacon Leo, afterwards Pope Leo the Great, about 430–431, was a defence of the orthodox doctrine against the errors of Nestorius: "De Incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium" (P. L., L, 9–272). It appears to have been written hurriedly, and is, consequently, not of equal value with the other works of its author. A large part consists of proofs, drawn from the Scriptures, of Our Lord's Divinity, and in support of the title of Mary to be regarded as the Mother of God; the author denounces Pelagianism as the source of the new heresy, which he regards as incompatible with the doctrine of the Trinity.

Yet Cassian did not himself escape the suspicion of erroneous teaching; he is in fact regarded as the originator of what, since the Middle Ages, has been known as Semipelagianism. Views of this character attributed to him are found in his third and fifth, but especially in his thirteenth, "Conference". Preoccupied as he was with moral questions he exaggerated the rôle of free will by claiming that the initial steps to salvation were in the power of each individual, unaided by grace. The teaching of Cassian on this point was a reaction against what he regarded as the exaggerations of St. Augustine in his treatise "De correptione et gratiâ" as to the irresistible power of grace and predestination. Cassian saw in the doc-

trine of St. Augustine an element of fatalism, and while endeavouring to find a *via media* between the opinions of the great Bishop of Hippo and Pelagius, he put forth views which were only less erroneous than those of the heresiarch himself. He did not deny the doctrine of the Fall; he even admitted the existence and the necessity of an interior grace, which supports the will in resisting temptations and attaining sanctity. But he maintained that after the Fall there still remained in every soul "some seeds of goodness . . . implanted by the kindness of the Creator", which, however, must be "quickened by the assistance of God". Without this assistance "they will not be able to attain an increase of perfection" (Coll., XIII, 12). Therefore, "we must take care not to refer all the merits of the saints to the Lord in such a way as to ascribe nothing but what is perverse to human nature". We must not hold that "God made man such that he can never will or be capable of what is good, or else he has not granted him a free will, if he has suffered him only to will or be capable of what is evil" (*ibid.*). The three opposing views have been summed up briefly as follows: St. Augustine regarded man in his natural state as dead, Pelagius as quite sound, Cassian as sick. The error of Cassian was to regard a purely natural act, proceeding from the exercise of free will, as the first step to salvation. In the controversy which, shortly before his death, arose over his teaching, Cassian took no part. His earliest opponent, Prosper of Aquitaine, without naming him, alludes to him with great respect as a man of more than ordinary virtues. Semipelagianism was finally condemned by the Council of Orange in 529.

The best edition of the works of Cassian is that of PETSCHENIG (Vienna, 1886–1888); a tr. of his writings by GIBSON is published in the series of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Oxford and New York, 1894), XI. See also HOLE in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* I, 414 sqq. (London, 1877); GODET in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1906), II, 1824 sqq. BARDENHEWER, *Les Pères de l'église* (Paris, 1905), II; GRÜTZMACHER in *Realencyklopädie f. prot. Theol.* (Leipzig, 1897), III, 746 sqq.; POHLE in *Kirchenlex.*, II, 2021 sqq.; HOCH, *Lehre des Johannes Cassianus von Natur und Gnade*, etc. (Freiburg, 1896); CHEVALIER, *Rep. bio-bibliogr.* (Paris, 1905), 796–97.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Cassidy, WILLIAM, journalist, essayist, critic, b. at Albany, New York, U. S. A., 12 Aug., 1815; d. there 23 Jan., 1873. One of the most accomplished and brilliant journalists of his time, he was educated at the Albany Academy and Union College, graduating in 1833. He studied law with John Van Buren, eighth President of the United States, was appointed State Librarian 1843, and became editor of the Albany "Atlas". On consolidation of the "Atlas" with the "Argus", he assumed the editorship of the new paper and retained it to his death. As a writer he was terse, incisive, vigorous, and scholarly, and was a conversationalist of rare power. He was a member of the State Constitutional Convention in 1871, and in 1872 was appointed by Governor Hoffman on the commission to revise the Constitution. His influence was that of a pen wielded by a master of thought, and his achievements those of the exponent of party and the leader of political councils. At his funeral held from the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, Albany, Bishop McNeirny pontificated. Both houses of the State Legislature then in session adjourned out of respect to the deceased.

Argus files (Albany, 24–26 Jan., 1873); *Cassidy Memorial* (Albany, 1874).

J. T. DRISCOLL.

Cassini, GIOVANNI DOMENICO, astronomer, b. at Perinaldo (Nice, Italy), 8 June, 1625; d. at Paris, 14 September, 1712. After two years at Vallebone he entered the Jesuit College at Genoa and studied under Casselli. Coming by chance across some books on astrology, he took up the serious study of astronomy, abandoning his belief in the former pseudo-science. In 1644 the Marquis Malvasia invited him to Bologna, where he was building an observatory. In 1650 he filled the chair of astronomy at the university, left vacant by the death of Cavalleri. Together with the Marquis Tanara he was sent to Pope Alexander VII to plead for Bologna against Ferrara in the dispute over the navigation and the courses of the rivers Reno and Po. His studies in hydraulic engineering procured for him the position of inspector of water and waterways. Later he was appointed by Mario Chigi, the brother of Alexander VII, superintendent of the fortifications of Fort Urban. In 1663 he was delegated to arrange the difficulty that had arisen between the pope and the Grand-duke of Tuscany, about the course of the River Chiana. All this time he continued his astronomical work. The Abbé Picard, prior of Rillé in Anjou and successor of Gassendi in the chair of astronomy at the Collège de France, recommended Cassini to Colbert, the Minister of Louis XIV, and after some delay Pope Clement IX consented to lend Cassini to France for a few years. He reached Paris in 1669. In 1671 he went to live in the observatory which was then built partly under his direction. In 1673 he was finally persuaded by the king to become naturalized. Soon afterwards he married a Frenchwoman, Geneviève Delaître, and became himself a thorough Frenchman. His blindness (1711) was probably caused by over-exertion in the course of his work. Fontenelle points out his calm and gentle character, based on a deeply religious nature, which made him bear almost cheerfully even total blindness. While working for Pope Alexander VII he sent a manuscript to the Jesuit Riccioli, a friend and astronomer at Bologna, treating of the Immaculate Conception, and recommending that it should be celebrated as a special feast.

Cassini was principally an observer. We owe to him the calculation of the rotation periods of the planets Jupiter, Venus, and partly of Mars, by means of observations of the motion of spots on their disks. These results were very important in those days, because they furnished analogues to the disputed motion of the earth. With the aid of Campani's long telescopes, he added four satellites of Saturn to the one that had been seen by Huyghens. He studied the causes of the librations of the moon, observed the zodiacal light, and developed a theory of the motion of comets. His first achievement was the re-establishment and improvement of the gnomon and the meridian, traced by Ignazio Dante in the church of St. Petronius, Bologna, for the purpose of fixing the time of the solstices and reforming the calendar.

He was very industrious, and constantly held the attention of the public. He interested the king and the court in his work, and as director of the observatory trained a great number of astronomers, among whom were many of the Jesuits belonging to the Chinese Mission. His Italian memoirs are almost all collected in his "Opera Astronomica" (Rome, 1666). His very numerous French publications appear scattered in the "Journal des Savants" and "Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences", of which latter he was a member.

DÉLAMBRE, *Histoire de l'astr.* (Paris, 1821); FONTENELLE, *Eloge de J. D. Cassini* (Paris, 1825); MÄDLER, *Geschichte der Himmelskunde* (Braunschweig, 1873); DROHOJEWSKA, *Les savants modernes; Cassini* (Lille, 1887).

WILLIAM FOX.

Cassino, MONTE. See MONTE CASSINO.

Cassiodorus, Roman writer, statesman, and monk, b. about 490; d. about 583. His full name was Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator, the last being a surname. Although of Syrian ancestry, his family had been for at least three generations one of the

most important in Bruttium (Southern Italy). His great-grandfather successfully defended Bruttium during the Vandal invasion of 455; his grandfather was signally favoured by Valentinian III and Aetius, but chose to retire early from his honourable career, and his father went through all the degrees of the magistracy, at length being made prætorian prefect and a patrician by Theodoric.

Cassiodorus or, more properly, Senator, born on the paternal estate at Scyllaceum (Squillace) in 490 or somewhat earlier, made his first appearance as councillor to the prætorian prefect about 501. A panegyric on Theodoric attracted this prince's attention, and between 507 and 511 he appointed Cassiodorus quæstor. The rule prohibiting a magistrate of that time to govern his own province was waived by Theodoric in favour of Cassiodorus's father and again a second time when Cassiodorus himself was made *corrector*, i. e. governor, of Lucania and Bruttium. Consul in 514, he was minister in 526 when Theodoric died. From the time of his quæstorship he had remained the king's regular councillor, and he retained his influence throughout the regency of Amalaswintha, who made him prætorian prefect. But Gothic power was passing through a serious crisis. Athalaric, the son of Amalaswintha, died in 534; Theodahadus, who had been made king by Amalaswintha, had the latter slain and in 536 himself fell a victim to Witiges, who, in turn, was taken prisoner in 540 by Belisarius, the Byzantine general. Cassiodorus decided to retire. Several years previously Benedict of Nursia had founded among the ruins of a temple of Apollo at Monte Cassino a monastery which was to serve as a model for all the West, and it was undoubtedly in imitation of Benedict's institution that Cassiodorus erected the monastery of Vivarium on his own estate. Here he spent his remaining days, which must have been numerous, as we are told that at the age of ninety-three he was still writing. If born in 490, he could not therefore have died before 583.

The writings of Cassiodorus may be classified according to the two great divisions of his life, namely, his public career and time of religious retirement. While in office he devoted himself to work relating to politics and public affairs. There still remain fragments of two of his panegyrics, which, conformably to an already ancient tradition among Roman office-holders, he dedicated to the Gothic kings and queens. One was addressed to Eutharic, Theodoric's son-in-law (518 or 519); the other was delivered at Ravenna on the occasion of the marriage of Witiges and Matheswintha (536). A great wealth of instances drawn from Roman history and illustrations from mythology serve the purpose of placing in relief the story of high heroic deeds set forth amid a clatter of empty phrases. In 519 Cassiodorus published a chronicle dedicated to Eutharic, the consul of the year. It is in substance a list of consuls, preceded by a table of the kings of Assyria, Latium, and Rome, and accompanied by a few notes. Cassiodorus uses successively an abridgment of Livy, the histories of Aufidius Bassus, St. Jerome, and Prosper, and the "Chronicle of Ravenna". The historical comments appended to the names of the consuls are taken at random from these sources without either skill or accuracy. From the year 496 Cassiodorus wrote from his own experience and with a pronounced partiality for the Goths. He betrays the same inclination in his "History of the Goths", published between 526 and 533 and of which we have only the abridgment edited by Jornandes in 551. Finally, as the bequest of his official career, we have his letters gathered into twelve books, the "Variæ", at the close of 537. This voluminous correspondence does not contain as much historical information as one would expect, dates, figures, names of men and places being frequently omitted as opposed to elegance of style. On the other hand, useless and pompous digressions, commonplaces of ethics or history, form the basis of these compositions. "The reader", says Mommsen, "often hesitates as to the meaning of what is said and is ever vainly seeking a reason for its being said." Cassiodorus carefully avoids all concrete details of the troublous time in which he lived, all that might in any way offend either Goths, Romans, or Byzantines. He is even lavish in his praise of those princes who were killing one another: Amalaswintha, Theodahadus, and Witiges. Books VI and VII of the "Variæ" are a collection of formulæ, the first of a kind quite common in the Middle Ages. These letters were designed for use on any occasion where a magistrate was created, needing only the insertion of new names. The letters in the other books are scarcely more interesting. However, such was the taste of the time, and the correspondence of Symmachus is almost equally insipid.

Cassiodorus seems to have begun his ecclesiastical writings with the "De animâ", which, after 540, he added to the "Variæ" as a thirteenth book. This little treatise sets forth the nature and origin of the soul, its vices and virtues, following chiefly the opinions of Claudianus Mamertus and St. Augustine—Cassiodorus being still in secular life when he wrote it. He indicates as the first fruit of his conversion a commentary on the Psalms which occupied him for several years. The works composed during his religious retirement reveal his anxiety to make his literary investigations serviceable to his monks; they also manifest a peculiar taste for figures and the symbolism of numbers. The commentary on the Psalms is founded chiefly on the "Enarrationes" of St. Augustine. The "Complexiones in epistolas et acta apostolorum et apocalypsin"—thus named because, in them, instead of commenting verse by verse, Cassiodorus combines several verses in order to paraphrase them—are also compilations; perhaps he refers to this work when he says that he has purged of all heresy an exposition by Pelagius of the Epistle to the Romans. He had the "Jewish Antiquities" of Flavius Josephus translated and also the ecclesiastical histories of Theodoret, Sozomen, and Socrates. He himself made extracts from the translations of these three historians and combined them in the "Historia Tripartita", a hasty composition, teeming with errors and contradictions, but nevertheless much used throughout the Middle Ages as a manual of history. In another compilation he united the grammatical treatises and their commentaries ascribed to Donatus with the book of Sacerdos on figures; towards the close of his life Cassiodorus added thereto a treatise on orthography, merely another collection of extracts. The "De computo paschali" of 562 is not his but an anonymous work, added by a copyist to the chronicle of Cassiodorus.

Of all the work achieved by this author in his monastic retreat, what we of to-day find most interesting is the "Institutiones divinarum et sæcularium litterarum", written between 543 and 555. His object was to furnish the monks with means of interpreting Holy Writ, but the plan of study which he suggests is far in advance of simple meditation on the Bible. He demands the reading of commentators, of Christian historians, to whom he adds Flavius Josephus, of chroniclers, and of the Latin Fathers. He recommends the liberal arts; he proclaims the merit gained by those who copy the Sacred Books, and outlines the rules to be followed in the correction of the text. Finally, in a second part, he resumes the theory of the liberal arts by following the division worked out by St. Jerome, Martianus Capella, and St. Augustine. He distinguishes the arts, notably grammar and rhetoric, from the sciences,

which are arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. Dialectics, to which he attributes great importance, he considers part art and part science. Of course, Cassiodorus subordinates the profane studies to theology, but, unlike Isidore, for example, his extracts and compendiums do not dispense the monks from making further researches; they rather provoke such research by referring to books with which he was careful to equip the convent library. It had been his dream to found the first theological faculty in Rome; at least he had the merit of putting in the first rank of monastic occupations intellectual work, to which St. Benedict had allotted no place. During his public career Cassiodorus endeavoured to reconcile two races, the Goths and the Romans; in his religious retreat he laboured with greater success to harmonize the culture of the ancient with that of the Christian world. Modern civilization was the outgrowth of the alliance brought about by him.

GARET (GARETIUS), *Cassiodori opera omnia* (Rouen, 1679; Venice, 1729); also in *P. L.*, LXIX–LXX; *Variæ*, ed. MOMMSEN in *Mon. Germ. hist.: Auct. ant.* (Berlin, 1894), XII; *Chronicon* in *Chronica minora*, ed. MOMMSEN, II; *Mon. Germ. hist.: Auct. ant.* (Berlin, 1894), XI, 109–161; HODGKIN, *The Letters of Cassiodorus, Being a Condensed Translation of the Variæ* (London, 1886); MORTET, *Notes sur le texte des institutions de Cassiodore* (Paris, 1904), and in *Revue de philologie* (1900, 1903); ROGER, *L'Enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin* (Paris, 1905), 175–187; ZIMMER, *Pelagius in Ireland* (Berlin, 1901), 200–216; HARTMANN in PAULY, *Real-Encyc. des class. Alt.*, ed. WISSOWA, VI, part I, s. v. *Cassiodorus* (Stuttgart, 1899), 1671, sqq. For earlier bibliography see CHEVALIER, *Rép. Bio-bibl.*

PAUL LEJAY.

INFLUENCE OF CASSIODORUS UPON CHURCH MUSIC.—In his work on the liberal arts (De Artibus ac Disciplinis Liberalium Litterarum) Cassiodorus writes of music under the heading, *Institutiones musicæ*, and this latter treatise has been reprinted by Gerbert (Scriptores eccl. de mus. sacr., I) and is particularly valuable for the study of the early beginnings of the music of the Church. Cassiodorus did not go to the original sources—the Greek theoricians—for his knowledge of the Greek system of music, which was the only one then known and which he taught his monks. He borrowed from the Roman author Albinus, whose works are now lost. Cassiodorus, with Boethius, is the chief exponent of the theory of music between antiquity and the early Middle Ages. For this reason his writings are of great assistance to the many students who are occupied in restoring the chant of the Church, especially as to its rhythm, in accordance with the oldest tradition. His works also contain instructive information about musical instruments in use in his time, namely the flute, shawm, bag-pipe, pipe of Pan, and the organ.

DREVES, *Aurelius Ambrosius* (Freiburg, 1893); RIEMANN, *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1906).

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Cassock. See COSTUME, CLERICAL.

Casson, FRANÇOIS DOLLIER DE, fourth superior of Saint-Sulpice, Montreal, Canada, b. near Nantes, France, 1636; d. in 1701. He was first a soldier and served as a captain under Marshal Turenne, his bravery eliciting this general's esteem. In 1657 he entered the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice, at Paris, was admitted into the Company, and went to Canada in 1666. There he devoted himself with great ardour to missionary work and, in company with Father Galinée, a fellow Sulpician, made a reconnoitring tour of Lakes Erie and Ontario; unfortunately, his account of the expedition has been lost. In 1671 Father de Casson succeeded Father de Queylus as superior of the Sulpicians, and while in this position contributed largely to the development of Villemarie (Montreal), planned the laying out of its streets, began the canal known since by the name of Lachine, and, moreover, stimulated the energy of the colonists under trying and hazardous circumstances. He wrote a "Histoire du Montréal" (Mémoires de la société historique de Montréal, 1869), and "Récit de ce qui s'est passé au voyage que M. de Courcelles a fait au lac Ontario" (Bibliothèque nationale de Paris, old French supplement, no. 13, 516, 516, fol. 207–218).

LOBINEAU, *Les vies des saints prêtres de Bretagne et des personnes d'une éminente piété qui ont vécu dans cette province* (Paris, 1838), V, 305–312; LETOURNEAU, *Les saints prêtres français du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1897); BERTRAND, *Bibliothèque sulpicienne* (Paris, 1900), I, 157–160.

A. FOURNET.

Cassovia, (Hung. *Kassa;* Germ. *Kaschau;* Slav, *Kosîce*), DIOCESE OF (CASSOVIENSIS), in Hungary, founded in 1804 by the division of the Diocese of Agria, in the archdiocese of the same name, and the Dioceses of Cassovia and Szatmar. It includes Abauj, Sáros, and Zemplén. Its first bishop was Andrew Szabó (1804–19). The chief benefactors of the diocese were the Bishops Emerich Palugyay (1831–38); John Perger (1868–76), and Constantin Schuster (1877–87). The episcopal city, situated among vine-clad hills, on the Hernád, 130 miles north-east of Budapest, is one of the principal towns of Northern Hungary and the seat of numerous industries. The population in 1900 was about 40,000, mostly Catholic Magyars. The Cathedral of St. Elizabeth (restored 1882–96) is one of the most beautiful monuments of Gothic art in Hungary. There are in the diocese 197 parish churches and about 300 priests. The ecclesiastical seminary has about fifty students of theology. Premonstratensian Canons have houses at Cassovia and also at Lelesz. There are also in the diocese four small convents of Franciscans, two houses of Piarists, besides Ursulines, Dames Anglaises, Sisters of Charity, etc. In 1900 the Catholic population of Latin Rite was 307,186; Greek Catholics, 160,527. The Protestant population numbered 898,727; Israelites, 35,475. An illustrated description of the diocese in two volumes was printed on the occasion of its first centenary (1904). A history of the diocese was then published.

A. FISCHER-COLBRIE.

Castabala, a titular see of Asia Minor, Latin title suppressed, 1894. This city was situated somewhere on the river Pyramos (now Djihan) in Cilicia, and was also known as Hieropolis. It was probably near Osmanié, in the vilayet of Adana, perhaps at Kestel or Kastal, a village five or six miles south of Anazarbus. Others have located it, erroneously, at Karanlik or Kartanlik between the Pyramos and Ægæa (now Ayas), or at Kara Kaya near Demir Kapou (Amanicæ portæ). According to Hierocles, Georgius Cyprius, and Parthey's "Notitiæ episcopatuum" (I), it was a suffragan of Anazarbus, metropolis of Cilicia Secunda. About the tenth century it seems to have been confounded with or united to Mamista, i. e., Mopsuestus. Seven bishops are mentioned by Lequien (II, 901). The first, Maris, is spoken of in an apocryphal letter of St. Ignatius, and another letter is addressed to him. Moyses was present at Nicæa in 325. Theophilus, a semi-Arian and friend of St. Basil, was sent to Rome on an embassy with two colleagues. The last, Theodorus, attended the Trullan Council in 692.

RAMSAY, *Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), 342; a paper in *Revue des études anciennes* (1901), III, 279; ALISHAN, *Sissouan* (Venice, 1899), 173, 427, 476.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Castagno, ANDREA, or ANDREINO DEL, Florentine painter, b. near Florence, 1390; d. at Florence, 9 August, 1457. Little is known of his life. Vasari tells us that his father was only a poor labourer and that the painter himself commenced life as a keeper of cattle. It is not known what led him to study art, or who was his first master. In 1434, after the return of the Medici, he was given a commission to commemorate in painting on the façade of the palace the execution of the Albizzi, the Peruzzi,

etc. From that time he went by the name of Andrea degli Impiccati". In 1454 Pope Nicholas V commissioned him to decorate the apartments of the Vatican. Vasari recounts that Andrea, having learned the secret of oil-painting from Domenico Veneziano, and wishing to remain the sole master of the art, assassinated his comrade. It is known, however, that Domenico survived him four years. Castagno is one of the artists who, with Paolo Uccello (b. 1497) and Filippo Lippi (b. 1406), contributed most actively to the Masaccio revolution in art. His works, however, show the influence of the frescoes of the Brancacci's chapel. He was greatly influenced also by the work of the sculptor Donatello. He has neither the passion of the latter, nor the moral grandeur of Masaccio, nor the elegance of Lippi. But in his own domain, which is the perfecting of plastic and of the resources of drawing, no one has made more progress than he. His paintings have been scattered and cannot be studied anywhere but in Florence. The most celebrated of his works is the life-like and strongly-executed equestrian portrait of Niccolò da Tolentino, in the Cathedral of Florence, which forms the pendant to that of John Hawkwood by Uccello (1436). Most remarkable is the "Last Supper", which hangs in the refectory of the old convent of S. Appolonia. The figures, almost colossal, have a power of anatomy, an individuality, a savage life which forces one to forget the absence of all religious emotion. Such characteristics are also found in the frescoes of the Villa Carducci, which are now at the National Museum. They represent Thomyris, Esther, and the Cumæan Sibyl, the poets Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, statesmen such as Acciaiuoli, Farinata degli Uberti, and Pippo Spano. These last, by the energy of their attitude, the hang of their draperies, and their heroic aspect, produce an impression of grandeur and solemnity which is found nowhere in the Florentine school of the fourteenth century outside of the works of Masaccio and Signorelli.

VASARI, *Le Vite de' Pittori;* CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *History of Painting in Italy;* MÜNTZ, *La renaissance*, I, 623; BERENSON, *The Florentine Painters.*

LOUIS GILLET.

Castellammare di Stabia (CASTRI MARIS, STABIÆ), DIOCESE OF (STABIENSIS).—The seat of the diocese is an industrial city, situated on the Bay of Naples, on a slope of Monte Gauro, and famous for its health-giving mineral springs. It is also a naval station. The city was built near the ruins of the ancient *Stabiæ*, buried in A. D. 79 under the ashes and scoria of Vesuvius. The history of this city is more or less that of Naples. It has been a fortified town since the time of the House of Anjou, and it is supposed that Christianity was introduced there at an early period. Previous to Ursus, present at the Roman synod under Pope Symmachus, in 499, no register was kept of the bishops of this city. Among its noteworthy bishops were: Lubentius, present in Rome in 649; St. Castellus (827); Palmerio (1196), champion of ecclesiastical rights against Frederick II; Giovanni Fonseca (1537), a famous theologian at the Council of Trent; Ludovico Gravina (1581) and C. Vittorino Maso (1599), learned theologians and canonists; also the accomplished orator, Clemente del Pezzo (1651). In 1818 Pius VII united with this see Torre Patria, the ancient *Liternum*. The diocese has a population of 70,400, with 26 parishes, 90 churches and chapels, 220 secular and 30 regular priests, 4 religious houses of men and 11 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia*, XIX; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 1377.

U. BENIGNI.

Castellana, ANDREA DE. See SCALIMOLI.

Castellaneta (CASTANIA), DIOCESE OF (CASTELLANETENSIS), suffragan of Taranto. Castellaneta is a city of the province of Lecce, in Southern Italy, about twenty-four miles from Taranto (Tarentum). Nothing is known of this city previous to 1080, when it was taken by Robert, Duke of Tarentum, who expelled its Byzantine inhabitants, at which time, probably, the episcopal see was created; in the same year Tarentum was made a metropolitan see. A Bishop of Castellaneta, Joannes, is first mentioned in 1088. In 1818 the Diocese of Mottola was united with the Diocese of Castellaneta. There is a record of an otherwise unknown Bishop of Mottola who died in 1040; his successor was a certain Liberius. The diocese has a population of 38,600, with 6 parishes, 41 churches and chapels, 53 secular and 16 regular priests, 2 religious houses of men and 6 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 141; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 378.

U. BENIGNI.

Castellanos, JUAN DE, b. in Spain in the first half of the sixteenth century; date of death unknown. He came to America previous to 1545 as a cavalry soldier, and acquired some means on the Pearl Coast. Abandoning the military profession he became a secular priest at Cartagena and, declining the dignities of canon and treasurer, went as curate to Tunja on the Colombian table-land. There he composed his epic poem, "Elegias de Varones ilustres de Indias", the first part of which appeared at Madrid in 1588, and the first three parts in 1837. The remainder of the work is still in manuscript. The Lenox Branch of the New York Public Library possesses a complete and handsome copy. The verse is better than that of Ercilla's "Araucana"; it treats successively of the deeds of the principal Spaniards who distinguished themselves in America, beginning with Columbus, and is an invaluable source for the colonial history of northern South America, including many details of ethnography and ethnology.

Castellanos enjoyed the advantage of being among the earliest "conquerors", and was acquainted with nearly every prominent leader of the time. He relies to some extent upon Oviedo for many details, stating that Oviedo communicated to him verbally what he knew by personal experience of the settlement at Cartagena. Castellanos' poem is the second of a series of epic compositions in Spanish treating of the early colonization of America, Ercilla's being the earliest in date of publication.

Besides the not always exact information imparted by ARIBAU in his edition of the second and third part of the *Elegias*, the following may be consulted: NICOLAS ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca hispana nova* (Madrid, 1733–38); ANTONIO LEON Y PINELO, *Epitome*, etc. (Madrid, 2nd. ed. 1737–38); ACOSTA, *Compendio histórico del Descubrimiento y de la Colonización de la Nueva Granada* (Paris, 1848).

A full discussion of the life of Castellanos, as far as data are accessible, is given by VERGARA, *Historia de la literatura en Nueva Granada*. THE HAKLUYT SOCIETY in MARKHAM's tr. of *The Expedition of Ursúa and Aguirre* has some biographical information, taken from ACOSTA. Allusions to Castellanos are also in BANDELIER, *Gilded Man* (New York, 1893). MENDIBURÚ, *Diccionario hist. biog.* (Lima, 1876), II, contains a notice in which there are some errors. He attributes to Castellanos the authorship of a *Historia Indiana*, about which, however, nothing else is known.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Castelli, BENEDETTO, mathematician and physicist; b. at Perugia, Italy, 1577; d. at Rome, 1644. He was destined by his parents for the service of the Church and entered the Order of St. Benedict, at Monte Cassino. There he became abbot, and in 1640 he was transferred to the Abbey of Santo Benedetto Aloysio. He was specially interested in the mathematical sciences and their application to hydraulics. Galileo, his teacher, and Toricelli, one of his pupils, speak very highly of his scientific attainments, and both of them frequently asked his advice. In 1623 Urban VIII invited him to Rome and later appointed him chief mathematician to the pope and public pro-

fessor of mathematics in the University of Rome. In 1625 he was sent with Monsignore Corsini to study the disorders occasioned by the waters of the Romagna, and to propose a remedy. Here he completed his important work on the "Mensuration of Running Water", in which he developed the important relations, that the speed of a current varies inversely as the area of its cross section, and that the discharge from a vessel depends on the depth of the tap below the free surface of the water. He was often consulted in other provinces of Italy in connexion with drainage, water-supply, prevention of floods, and the like.

His chief work is "Della misura dell'acqua corrente" (Rome, 1628; 3d ed., 1660), translated into English by Salusbury (London, 1661), and into French by Saporta (1664), reprinted (Bologna, 1823) in Cardinali's collection "d'autori italiani che trattano del moto dell'acqua". Another work is "Risposta alle oppositioni del Sig. Lodvico, &c., contro al trattato del Sig. Galileo, Delle cose che stanno sopra acqua" (Bologna, 1655). According to Poggendorf, the invention of the helioscope is ascribed to him.

Salusbury, *Math. Collections and Translations* (London, 1661); *La Grande Encycl.*, s. v.

William Fox.

Castelli, Pietro, Italian physician and botanist, b. at Rome in 1574; d. at Messina in 1662. He was graduated in 1617, studied under the botanist Andrea Cesalpino, and was professor at Rome from 1597 to 1634 when he went to Messina. He laid out the botanical gardens at Messina (1635), where he cultivated many exotic medicinal plants. He was equally distinguished as a botanist, chemist, and surgeon. He stoutly maintained the necessity for all physicians of studying anatomy, and declared in 1648 that he had dissected more than one hundred corpses. The learned Dane, Thomas Bartolinus, was led by Castelli's fame to visit him in Messina, in 1644, and speaks of his activity as a publicist. He wrote no less than one hundred and fifty pamphlets. Among these there is one written in 1653 in answer to inquiries by Hieronymus Bardi of Genoa, wherein Castelli speaks of the cinchona plant and its curative properties in cases of malaria. He seems to have had but little knowledge of the plant, and no experience in its medicinal application. Still, the pamphlet is noteworthy as being the first Italian publication that mentions the Peruvian febrifuge.

Rompel, *Kritische Studien über die Chinarinde* (Feldkirch, 1905).

Charles G. Herbermann.

Castello, Giovanni Battista, Italian painter, sculptor, and architect; b. at Gandino, in the Valle Seriana, in the territory of Bergamo, in 1509 (some writers state 1500 or 1506); d. at Madrid, in 1579. He is commonly called Il Bergamasco, to distinguish him from Giovanni Battista Castello, a Genoese, who was a miniature-painter. When young, he was entrusted to the care of Aurelio Busso of Crema, a pupil of Polidoro da Caravaggio, by whom he was taught the first principles of his art. That painter took him to Genoa, and after some time left him in that city, unprotected and without means, but considerably advanced in his studies. A Genoese nobleman, Tobia Pallavicino, took him under his protection and sent him to Rome to study the great masters there, where he became very proficient in painting, sculpture, and architecture. On his return to Genoa he decorated the palace of his protector and painted some frescoes in the church of San Marcellino. He made a great reputation by his painting of the Martyrdom of St. Sebastian, in the monastery of San Sebastiano and, together with Luca Cambiasco, was employed by the Duke Grimaldi, in the Nunziata di Portoria in Genoa, Castello painting on the ceiling of the choir the Saviour as Judge of the World, and Luca painting the laterals with the Fate of the Blessed and the Reprobate. On visiting his native country, desiring to leave there something worthy of his fame, he undertook his great work in the hall of the Lanzi Palace at Gorlago, where he has represented some of the most interesting subjects of the Iliad.

Towards the latter part of his life (1567) he was invited by Charles V to visit Spain and was employed by that monarch in the palace of the Pardo, which he ornamented with subjects from Ovid. He also executed some works in the Escorial and other palaces, and died holding the office of architect of the royal palace. As architect, he is supposed to have remodelled the church of San Matteo in Genoa and to have designed the imperial palace at Campetto. The paintings of Castello show correct design, with excellent colouring, more nearly allied, however, to the Venetian than to the Roman school.

Milizia, *Lives of Celebrated Architects*, II, 65, 66; Pilkington, *Dict. of Painters*, 105; Bryan, *Dict. of Painters and Engravers*, I, 267, 268; Champlin and Perkins, *Cycl. of Painters and Paintings*, I, 145.

Thomas H. Poole.

Castellon de la Rana. See Segorbe.

Castelnau (Chateauneuf), Pierre de. See Pierre de Castelnau (Chateauneuf), Blessed.

Castelsardo, Diocese of. See Ampurias.

Castiglione, Baldassare, an Italian prose-writer, b. at Casatico, near Mantua, 6 December, 1478; died at Toledo, Spain, 7 February, 1529. After receiving a classical education at Milan, he went to the court of Ludovico il Moro. Soon, however, owing to his father's death in 1499, he left the Sforza and became a retainer of Francesco Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua. In September, 1504, Urbino became his new residence, and here, in the service of Duke Guidobaldo da Montefeltro, he spent the best years of his life. The splendour of the Montefeltro court was such as to attract thither the most distinguished writers and artists of the time, and in their midst Castiglione, though engrossed in momentous affairs of state, drank at the fountain-head of art and literature. In 1513 Francesco Maria della Rovere, Guidobaldo's successor, made him a count and later his ambassador to the Holy See. In 1524 Pope Clement VII sent him as a special envoy to Charles V, but, in spite of his good offices on behalf of the pontiff Rome was sacked on the 6th of May, 1527, and Clement made a captive. This melancholy event broke Castiglione in health and spirits and hastened his death. Great honours were paid to his memory, and Charles the Fifth was said to have called him "one of the best knights in the world". His fame, however, mainly rests on his "Cortegiano" (Courtier), a work in four books, describing the accomplishments and moral character of the ideal courtier. He began writing it in 1514 and finished it four years later, but polished its style so elaborately as to delay its publication until 1528, one year before his death. A truly representative son of the Renaissance, he exhibited in his "Courtier" brilliant classical scholarship and exquisite taste, combined with a keen spirit of observation and noble conceptions. As a result "Il Cortegiano" gradually acquired a world-wide reputation, and was translated into a dozen languages, including Japanese. The latest English translation is that of Opdyke (New York, 1902). His many letters, in part unpublished, are of considerable importance.

Cian, *Il Cortegiano del Conte B. C. annotato e illustrato* (Florence, 1894); Martinati, *Notizie storico-bibliografiche intorno al Conte B. C.* (Florence, 1890).

Edoardo San Giovanni.

Castiglione, Carlo Ottavio, Count, philologist and numismatist, b. of an ancient family at Milan,

Italy, 1784; d. at Genoa, 10 April, 1849. He was descended from Baldassare Castiglione, the author of the "Cortegiano". Early in life he displayed a great aptitude for languages and numismatics and quickly acquired a mastery of almost all the Indo-Germanic and Semitic languages. In 1819 he published a description of the Cufic coins in the Gabinetto of Brera at Milan, under the title, "Monete cufiche del musee di Milano" (Milan, 1819). His principal work in Oriental literature is entitled "Mémoire géographique et numismatique sur la partie orientale de la Barbarie appelée Afrikia par les Arabes, suivi de recherches sur les Berbères atlantiques" (Milan, 1826). In this he endeavours to ascertain the origin and the history of the towns in Barbary whose names are found on Arabic coins. Outside of Italy he is perhaps best known by his edition, begun in 1819, of some fragments of the Gothic translation of the Bible by Ulfilas, which had been discovered in 1817 by Cardinal Mai among the palimpsests of the Ambrosian Library. At first Castiglione brought out some specimens in conjunction with the cardinal, but later at various times he published by himself a number of fragments of the Epistles of St. Paul. Besides these he wrote numerous unpublished works on linguistics.

BIONDELLI, *Vita di C. O. Castiglione* (Milan, 1856).

EDMUND BURKE.

Castiglione, GIOVANNI BENEDETTO, painter and etcher, b. at Genoa, Italy, 1616; d. at Mantua, 1670. In Italy he was known as *Il Grechetto* from his beautiful colouring, and in France as *Il Benedetto*. Some authorities make him a pupil of Paggi and Andrea de' Ferrari, and others of Van Dyck. But as Van Dyck left Genoa when Castiglione was nine years old, and since Genoa was rich in Van Dyck's works, it is more than probable that the young man never saw Van Dyck, but had ample opportunity, in his native city, to study his works and those of Rubens also. He travelled throughout Italy and painted in nearly every large city. In 1654 Charles II, Duke of Mantua, generously gave him an apartment in his own palace and pensioned him. Castiglione did his best work in Mantua. His specialty was animal painting, but he enjoys an excellent reputation as a landscape, historical, and portrait painter. He frequently chose Biblical subjects, but, apparently only when these afforded him a chance to introduce animals. He was fond of painting kermesses, village, market, and rural scenes, and closely approached the marvellous Dutchmen in this kind of work. His touch was spirited, his colour beautiful and the chiaroscuro excellently managed. His many pastoral scenes show him possessed of a keen sense of the picturesque, and he proved himself an admirable draughtsman and figure-painter. Orders poured in upon him from England, France, and Germany. His rank as a master is, however, due to his point-work more than to his brush-work. He etched in a free, spirited, and effective style more than seventy plates, and so skillfully managed the light and shade that many of them have the effect of aquatint. Unlike his Italian contemporaries, he seldom used the graver, but relied on pure line, like Rembrandt and the etchers of the North. Lipmann thinks Castiglione's needle-work was based "on contact with Van Dyck". Benedetto had many imitators, especially his brother Salvatore and his son Francesco, both his pupils. Salvatore's work is often very difficult to distinguish from Castiglione's. Among his noted works are "The Nativity" (his masterpiece), at Genoa; "Adoration of the Shepherds", at the Louvre, Paris; "Noah entering the Ark", at Dresden. Some notable prints are: "Melancholy", "Landscape" (dated 1658), "Animals Entering the Ark".

SOPRANI, *Le Vite de' pittori genovesi* (Genoa, 1768); LAROUSSE, *Dict. Universel* (Paris, 1877); LIPMANN, *Engraving and Etching* (New York, 1906); MABERLY, *The Print Collector* (New York, 1880).

LEIGH HUNT.

Castile and Aragon, the united kingdom which came into existence by the marriage (1469) of Isabella, heiress of Castile, with Ferdinand the Catholic, King of Aragon. Columbus made his voyages of discovery as the agent of "the Catholic Kings" (*los Reyes Católicos*) of this united kingdom, which in the course of history became the Kingdom of Spain—or, more precisely, of the Spains.

CASTILE.—The origin of the name Castile is a matter of dispute, but it is more than probably derived from the fortified castles (*castillos*), built first by the Romans to protect themselves from the Cantabrians whom they had not completely subjugated, and afterwards by the Christians to defend the northern regions which they had conquered from the Moors. At the present time this name is given to the extensive region which forms the central portion of Spain, and is bounded on the north by the Bay of Biscay (the ancient *Sinus Cantabricus*), on the east by the Basque Provinces, and the provinces of Navarre, Aragon, and Valencia, on the south by Andalusia, and on the west by Estremadura, Leon, and the Asturias, and is divided into Old Castile and New Castile.

Old Castile (*Castilla la Vieja*).—It is asserted by some (Fernández Guerra, Cantabria) that Old Castile was called *Vellegia* and afterwards *Vétula*, whence *Vieja*, but the most probable explanation is that it was called *Vieja*, or *Antigua*, to distinguish it from *Castilla la Nueva*—the New Castile formed from the lands which since the eleventh century had been reconquered beyond the mountain chain of the Carpetano-Vetónica. Old Castile is in outline an irregular triangle, the western frontier bordering on the ancient Kingdom of Leon, the south-eastern boundary being the Sierras de Gredos, Guadarrama, and the Moncayo (*Mons Caunus*), and the north-eastern, the river Ebro. In the political division of Spain the ancient province of Cantabria, which is included in Castile, does not belong to it either ethnographically or geographically, but forms a separate district called by those who inhabit it *de Peñas al Mar*, or more commonly *La Montaña*. In the present political division Old Castile comprises a territory of 22,415 square miles, with a population of 1,654,585, and since the division of 1833 it has included the eight provinces of Burgos, Palencia, Valladolid, Avila, Segovia, Soria, Logroño, and Santander. Old Castile forms the highest plateau of Spain, perhaps of Europe, the mean height being 880 feet. The mountain streams of this region feed the river Ebro in the north-east, the Duero, which flows through the centre, and the Pisuerga, which is a tributary of the Duero. Owing to its situation it has the most extreme climate of Spain, both as to cold and heat, and its fertile soil produces wheat and other cereals. The most important cities are: Burgos, population 29,683, famous for its Gothic cathedral, which is one of the most beautiful in the world; Valladolid, population 52,181, which was the capital of Spain until the time of Philip II; Santander, population 41,021, capital of Cantabria, a maritime city with an extensive commerce; Segovia, population 11,318, where the ancient Alcazar and the artillery school are situated; and Avila, population 25,039, the city of St. Teresa.

New Castile.—As has already been said, this name was given to the territory reconquered from the Arabs, from the time of Alfonso VI to that of St. Ferdinand. This region also forms a great table-land, not quite so lofty as that of Old Castile, and is bounded on the north by the mountain chain of the Carpetano-Vetónica, on the south by the Sierra Morena, on the east by the mountains of Cuenca; the mountains of Toledo, which merge into the Sierra de Guadalupe in Estremadura, run through the centre and separate the two great valleys into which New Castile is divided, that of the Tagus to the north, and that of the Guadiana to the south. The river Jucar,

which flows through the south-east, rises in the mountains of Cuenca. The climate is not so cold as that of Old Castile, and the soil not so fertile, there being a scarcity of water, especially in La Mancha. Its present limits comprise an area of 28,017 square miles, with a population of 1,777,506, and is divided into the five provinces of Madrid, Toledo, Ciudad Real, Cuenca, and Guadalajara. The principal cities are: Madrid, population 518,442, the capital of Spain since the time of Philip II, noted for its royal palace, picture gallery, containing specimens of Velasquez, Murillo, etc., and armoury (Museo de la Real Armería); Toledo, population 20,239, ancient capital of the kingdom of the Visigoths, honoured by Charles I with the title of "Imperial", and noted for its cathedral, one of the finest monuments of Spain, and the see of the cardinal primate, as well as for its military school; Guadalajara, which has a military school for engineers; Aranjuez, where one of the favourite country residences of the Spanish royal family is situated; and Alcalá, the seat of the university founded by Cisneros, which has since been transferred to Madrid. The Escorial, near Madrid, contains the famous mausoleum of Philip II, and is one of the historic monuments of New Castile.

History.—(1) *The Countship* (*Condado*) *of Castile.*—The territory of Old Castile began to be reconquered in the time of the first three Alfonsos, who entrusted to several counts the repopulation and defence of these cities; thus Ordoño I entrusted the repopulation of Amaya, on the Pisuerga, to Rodrigo, a Goth by extraction, and his son, Diego Porcellos, fortified and repopulated Burgos under the orders of Alfonso III. Nuño Núñez de Roa, Gonzalo Téllez de Osma, and Fernán González de Sepúlveda appear also in the same rôle. In 910 a Count of Castile, Nuño Fernández, assisted the sons of Alfonso III in their rebellion against their father, and Ordoño II of Leon (924) was defeated by the troops of Abdérraman in Valdejunquera because the Counts of Castile did not come to his assistance; in punishment of their disloyalty, Ordoño had them imprisoned and executed in Leon. Tradition hands down the names of these counts as Nuño Fernández, Abolmondar el Blanco, his son Diego, and Fernando Ansúrez. Further on mention is made of the judges of Castile, Lain Calvo and Nuño Rasura, established to facilitate the administration of justice, but who fostered the spirit of independence. The hero of this movement was Count Fernán González, to whom legendary lore has attributed all manner of heroic achievements. It is, however, known that, after having fought with Ramiro II against the Arabs, and after the battle of Simancas and the retreat of Abdérraman, this count, dissatisfied, as it appears, because the King of Leon distributed his troops in the frontier towns, rose in rebellion against him. He was, however, vanquished and made prisoner. He became reconciled with his sovereign, giving his daughter Urraca in marriage to the king's son, Ordoño, who afterwards became Ordoño III. Notwithstanding this alliance, Fernán González continued to foment trouble and discord in Leon, aiming to secure its independence. He successively aided Sancho against his brother, Ordoño III, and Ordoño, son of Alfonso IV (the Monk), against Sancho the Fat (*el Graso*). After the death of Fernán González (970) there followed the campaigns of Almánzor, in which all the reconquered territory was at stake. In 995 the King of Navarre and García Fernández, the son of Fernán González, made an attempt to oppose him, but were defeated at Alcocer. Sancho García, grandson of Fernán González, took part in the victory of Calatañazor, which put an end to the campaigns of the victorious Moslem *hájib* (1002). This Count Sancho García was called *El de los Fueros* (literally, "He of the Rights", or "of the Charters"), because of the rights or charters which he granted to the various cities. His son, García Sánchez, gave one of his sisters, Elvira, in marriage to Sancho the Great of Navarre, and another, Jimena, to Bermudo III of Leon, and was himself about to marry Sancha, Bermudo's sister, when he was assassinated by the Velas, Counts of Alava. At his death Sancho of Navarre reclaimed the countship of Castile, and took possession of it, notwithstanding the resistance of Bermudo III.

(2) *The Kingdom of Castile.*—Sancho the Great divided his possessions among his sons. Castile, with the title of king, was given to Ferdinand, who had married Sancha, the sister of Bermudo, who was to have married García Sánchez, the last independent count. Ferdinand I, of Castile, united Castile and Leon, the latter having fallen to his wife upon the death of her brother, Bermudo III. Thus reinforced, Ferdinand extended his conquests as far as Coimbra; but he committed the fatal error of dividing his possessions among his three sons and two daughters. Sancho, who inherited the Kingdom of Castile, began encroaching upon the rights of his brothers, but was assassinated at the siege of Zamora, which he was trying to take from his sister Urraca, and was succeeded by Alfonso VI. This monarch began to reunite the estates of his father, and carried the war of reconquest beyond the mountain chain of the Carpentano-Vetónica, capturing Madrid and Toledo, and thus laying the foundations of New Castile. He gave his daughter Teresa in marriage to Henry of Burgundy, forming for them, with the western territory reconquered from the Moors, the Countship of Portugal, which was the beginning of the Portuguese monarchy. His daughter Urraca succeeded him, the first queen to reign in the kingdom where Isabella the Catholic was later to hold the sceptre. Alfonso VII bore the title of emperor, and extended his conquests as far as Almería, but he, also, at his death in 1157, divided his possessions among his children, giving Leon to Ferdinand II, and Castile to Sancho, in whose short reign the Military Order of Alcántara was founded. Alfonso VIII (1158–1214) conquered Cuenca and defeated the Almohades in the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa (1212), which definitively freed New Castile from the Mussulman yoke. This decisive victory is annually commemorated by the Church in Spain on the 16th of July, under the title "El Triumfo de la Santa Cruz" (The Triumph of the Holy Cross). After the brief reigns of Henry I and Doña Berengaria, Castile and Leon were definitively united under St. Ferdinand III (1219–52), who conquered the greater part of Andalusia (Jaen, Cordova, and Seville, 1248), leaving the Mohammedans only the Kingdom of Granada. The cathedral of Burgos occupies the first place among the monuments of his greatness. His successors failed to carry on the reconquest. Alfonso X, "The Wise" (*el Sabio*), was too much taken up with his vain pretensions to the imperial crown of Germany, Sancho the Brave (1248–85) and Ferdinand IV, "the Cited" (*el Emplazado*), with their domestic struggles. In the time of Alfonso X the celebrated defence of Tarifa took place, giving to Alonzo Pérez de Guzmán, to whom it was entrusted, the title of "The Good" (*el Bueno*). Alfonso XI (1310–50) in the battle of Saldado annihilated the last of the Mussulmans who attempted the reconquest of Spain. The irregularity of his private life, however, paved the way for the disorders and cruelties of the reign of his son Pedro, the Cruel, who met death at the hands of his bastard brother, Henry II (1369–79). Bertrand du Guesclin, with his famous companies, was the ally of Henry II. John I attempted to obtain possession of Portugal, but was defeated by the Portuguese at Aljubarrota (1385), and his grandson John II, turned over the government to his favourite, Alvaro de Luna, whom he afterwards caused to be decapitated (1453). Henry IV, "The Impotent",

was the tool of the nobles, who forced him to declare illegitimate his daughter Juana, known as *la Beltraneja* (the daughter of Beltran), and the succession thus passed to his sister Isabella the Catholic (1474).

ARAGON.—Aragon derives its name from the river Aragon, a small tributary of the Ebro near Alfaro, and forms an irregular ellipse, bounded on the north by the Central Pyrenees (Pic du Midi), on the east by Catalonia and Valencia (Provinces of Lérida, Tarragona, and Castellon), on the south by Valencia and New Castile (Provinces of Valencia and Cuenca), and on the west by Navarre and Castile (Provinces of Guadalajara and Soria). It is one of the most mountainous regions of Spain, perhaps of Europe, surrounded as it is on the north by the Pyrenees mountains and the Sierras de la Peña and de Guara, on the west by the Moncayo and the mountains of Cuenca, and on the south by the Montes Universales and the Sierra de Gúdar. From north-west to south-east it is traversed by the River Ebro, of which almost all the rivers of this region are tributaries, the Aragon, Gallego, and Cinca emptying into it from the north, and the Jiloca, the Jalon, and others of lesser importance from the south. The Guadalaviar and the Mijares, however, are fed directly from the mountains of Teruel. These topographical conditions make the soil of Aragon very fertile; the mountains are covered with great forests, and fruits grow abundantly, but, on account of the isolation of the mountains and the scarcity of water on some of the high table-lands, some regions are but thinly populated. According to the modern division of provinces (30 Nov., 1833), Saragossa, Huesca, and Teruel belong to Aragon. The principal cities are Saragossa, famous for its sieges in the War of Independence and for the ancient shrine *del Pilar*, where from very remote times the Blessed Virgin has been venerated, and Huesca (Osca), where Pedro IV established, in 1354, a university to which was given the name of the Sertorio, in memory of Quintus Sertorius, who, in 77 B. C., founded here a school for the sons of native chiefs.

HISTORY.—We must depend principally on legend for information about the origin of the Aragonese monarchy. It is certain that a portion of the Goths driven northward by the Mussulman invasion sought refuge among the mountaineers, who were never completely subjugated by any conqueror (*indoctus juga ferre*—Horace), and there formed certain independent countships, principally those of Sobrarbe, Aragon, and Ribagorza. The legend designates the Montes Uruel or S. Juan de la Peña as the spot where the patriots assembled, and from a cross which appeared over a tree the name, Sobrarbe, and the coat of arms were derived, just as Aragon took its name from the river which flows west of Jaca, which appears to have been its capital. About 724 mention is made of a García Jiménez who was Count of Sobrarbe, and further on we find that García Iñiguez bestowed the Countship of Aragon upon a knight named Aznar, who had obtained possession of Jaca. This countship then embraced the valleys of Canfranc, Aisa, Borao, Aragües, and Hecho. After Aznar (d. 975) we find the names of several Counts of Aragon—Galindo, Jimeno Aznar, Jimeno García Aznar, Fortunio Jiménez, and Urraca, or Andregoto, who married García of Navarre, thus uniting Navarre and Aragon. The Countship of Ribagorza, established under the protection of the Franks, was reconquered by Sancho the Great of Navarre, who at his death left Aragon to his son Ramiro, and Sobrarbe and Ribagorza to his son Gonzalo (1035), but at Gonzalo's death Ramiro was elected to succeed him, the Aragonese monarchy being definitively founded. Sancho Ramírez (1069–94) took a great part of the deep valley of the Cinca from the Moors, with the strongholds of Barbastro and Monzon, and died while besieging Huesca. His son Pedro I, after vanquishing the Moorish auxiliary army in the battle of Alcoraz, took possession of the city. His brother, Alfonso the Fighter (*El Batallador*, 1104–34), who succeeded him, captured Saragossa (1118), but died from the effects of wounds received in the siege of Fraga, willing his estates to the military orders of Jerusalem, thinking that they would be best able to bring the war of reconquest to a successful close. His subjects, however, would not accept this, and obliged his brother Ramiro, who was a monk in the monastery of Saint-Pons de Tomières, to accept the crown. Dispensed by the pope from his vows, he married Agnes of Poitiers, and when the birth of a daughter, whom he married to Raymond Berengar IV, Count of Barcelona, assured the succession, he returned to his cloister. Thus a permanent union was effected between Aragon and Catalonia. Raymond Berengar reconquered Fraga, and his son Alfonso II finished the reconquest of Aragon, adding Teruel. Pedro II, "The Catholic" (*El Católico*, 1196–1213), made his kingdom a dependency of the Holy See, although not with the consent of his subjects, but died in the battle of Muret, in which he took part to aid his kinsman, the Count of Toulouse, in the war against the Albigenses. Jaime the Conqueror (*El Conquistador*) successfully terminated the conquest of Valencia (1238) and Majorca (1228), and aided Alfonso X of Castile to reconquer Murcia, thus accomplishing the reconquest of the western part of the Peninsula. Pedro III, "The Great" (*El Grande*, 1276–85), after the Sicilian Vespers took possession of Sicily as heir of the Hohenstaufen, and the wars and disputes which followed in Italy, and the dissensions of the Aragonese nobles occupied the reigns of Alfonso III (1285–91), Jaime II, Alfonso IV (1327–36), and Pedro IV (1336–87). John I and Martin (1395–1410) dying without heirs, the *Compromiso de Caspe* (a commission of nine members, three from the Cortes of each province) was assembled and gave the crown of Aragon to Ferdinand of Antequera, Infante of Castile. Alfonso V, his son and successor, renewed the wars in Italy. As the adopted son of Joanna of Naples, he laid claim to the throne of Naples, and obtained possession of it (1416–58). John II disturbed the peace of his reign by the unjust persecution of his son the Prince of Viana, and at his death was succeeded by Ferdinand the Catholic, who by his marriage to Isabella the Catholic definitively united the Kingdoms of Castile and Aragon.

RELATIONS BETWEEN CASTILE AND ARAGON.—The will of Sancho the Great of Navarre had in 1035 separated these two kingdoms; in the twelfth century they were temporarily united by the marriage of Doña Urraca to Alfonso I, "The Fighter", but this unhappy marriage caused a war which ended in the separation of the couple (1114), and Alfonso VII was afterwards obliged to recover the strongholds of La Rioja, which had remained in the possession of the Aragonese monarch (1134). At the death of Alfonso I of Aragon Alfonso VII reclaimed and occupied part of his estates, but Alfonso II aided by Alfonso VIII in the siege of Cuenca (1177) obtained for his kingdom freedom from the dependence on Castile, to which it had been subjected since the time of Ramiro the Monk. The two great warriors, St. Ferdinand III and Jaime *el Conquistador*, were contemporaries and lived in harmony. Jaime helped Alfonso X in the conquest of Murcia, which remained to Castile. Later, however, the relations between Castile and Aragon again became involved, on account of the claims for the succession to Alfonso X, which the Infantes of la Cerda, aided by Philip III of France and Alfonso III of Aragon, put forth. The *Compromiso de Caspe* placed the crown of Aragon on the head of an Infante of Castile, Ferdinand of Antequera (1412), and the marriage of Isabella, heiress of Henry IV of

Castile, to Ferdinand, the heir of John II of Aragon, finally united these kingdoms and formed the beginning of the Spanish monarchy.

The linguistic unity of Castile and Aragon is a very notable fact, because although Aragon and Catalonia, united since the twelfth century (1137), possess two very different languages, Castile and Aragon, although they had an entirely independent historical development until the sixteenth century, have the same language with the exception of some minor dialectical differences. After the union the political individuality of Aragon was lost in that of Castile, and in the time of Philip II, on account of the Antonio Pérez incident, the ancient kingdom lost part of its *fueros*, or political liberties. In the War of Succession it sided with the Archduke Charles, and the victory of Philip V served still more to increase its dependence.

Civil and Ecclesiastical Divisions.—It is difficult, on account of the different epochs in which they were formed and the different principles which governed them, to give an exact idea of the relations between the civil and ecclesiastical divisions of Castile and Aragon.

The *Judiciary Divisions* consist of the five district courts of (1) Burgos, (2) Valladolid, (3) Madrid, (4) Albacete-Murcia, and (5) Saragossa, which are subdivided as follows: (1) Provinces of Burgos, Santander, Logroño, and Soria; (2) Valladolid and Palencia; (3) Madrid, Avila, Guadalajara, Segovia, and Toledo; (4) Ciudad Real and Cuenca; (5) Saragossa, Huesca, and Teruel. The Burgos district comprises thirty-seven Courts of First Instance and as many Property Registries; that of Valladolid, seventeen of each; that of Madrid, forty-nine Courts of First Instance and forty-two Property Registries; Albacete-Murcia, eighteen Courts of First Instance and the same number of Property Registries; Saragossa, twenty-one Courts of First Instance and thirty Property Registries.

For Military Purposes there are four districts, subdivided into sixteen provinces, as follows: Old Castile, subdivided into the provinces of Avila, Palencia, and Valladolid; Burgos, with the provinces of Burgos, Logroño, Soria, and Santander; New Castile, with the provinces of Madrid, Segovia, Toledo, Cuenca, Ciudad Real, and Guadalajara; Aragon, with Saragossa, Huesca, and Teruel.

Education.—For university and secondary instruction the four districts are: Old Castile, with the University of Valladolid and four centres of secondary instruction at Valladolid, Burgos, Palencia, and Santander; New Castile, with the University of Madrid, and centres of secondary instruction at Madrid (S. Isidro and Cisneros), Ciudad Real, Guadalajara, Segovia, Toledo, and Cuenca; Aragon, with the University of Saragossa, and centres of secondary instruction at Saragossa, Huesca, Teruel, Logroño, and Soria; Leon, with the University of Salamanca and a centre of secondary instruction at Avila. Primary instruction is under the care of one first-class *inspeccion* at Madrid, the four second-class *inspecciones* of Valladolid, Burgos, Toledo, and Saragossa, and the eleven third-class *inspecciones* of Avila, Ciudad Real, Cuenca, Logroño, Guadalajara, Palencia, Santander, Segovia, Soria, Huesca, and Teruel.

Ecclesiastical Divisions.—This is in many respects not in conformity with the civil, and still subject to the changes made by the Concordat of 1851, which suppressed some sees and transferred others. In Old Castile there are the two Archdioceses of Burgos and Valladolid, the former of which has for its suffragan dioceses Palencia, Santander, Calahorra (Logroño), and Osma (Soria), while the latter has Avila and Segovia. In New Castile the Archdiocese of Toledo has the four suffragan dioceses of Madrid-Alcalá, Cuenca, Sigüenza (Guadalajara), and Ciudad Real. In Aragon the Archdiocese of Saragossa has for its suffragans Jaca, Huesca, Tarazona, Barbastro, and Teruel. The statistics of all these dioceses are given in the following table:—

Diocese	Date of Erection	Deaneries	Parishes	Religious Communities	
				Men	Women
Burgos	988; metropolitan in time of Alfonso VI	47	1220	8	40
Palencia	3rd century	24	345	9	38
Santander	4th century	26	425	6	9
Calahorra	Apostolic origin (?)	47	266	9	28
Osma	Apostolic origin, restored 11th century	28	349	5	13
Valladolid	1595, metropolitan since 1859	9	93	7	37
Segovia	In the time of the Goths, restored by Alfonso VI	15	276	3	26
Toledo	Apostolic origin, metropolitan since 5th century	20	442	2	58
Madrid-Alcalá	1851, Bull of 1885	18	232	11	22
Cuenca	1179	12	326	1	27
Sigüenza	Restored by Alfonso VIII	18	350	1	15
Ciudad Real	1876	11	88	6	30
Saragossa	Apostolic origin, restored 1117, metropolitan since 1138	15	370	12	71
Jaca	As a diocese 1575	8	70		5
Huesca	Apostolic, restored 1086	9	167	1	16
Tarazona	In the time of the Goths, restored in 1115	9	138	6	36
Barbastro	Pedro I, 1094, 1104	10	154	4	9
Teruel	Philip II, 1577	5	96	1	8

Religious Instruction.—There are seminaries in all the dioceses, and besides a number of colleges for youths intended for the priesthood (*colegios de vocaciones eclesiásticas*). There are also numerous colleges under the direction of the Society of Jesus, the Piarists, the Marists, the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and the Salesians. The statistics of these independent schools have never been published.

Charitable Institutions.—Although charitable work is carried on extensively throughout Spain, especially by the religious orders, both of men and women, which devote themselves exclusively to such work, it is difficult to give exact figures, as some are under government control, while others are purely religious, and the statistics are very incomplete. Thus, official statistics, which place the total number of institutions at 356, give to Saragossa only two charitable institutions, whereas the "Anuario Eclesiástico" makes the number twenty-eight.

Historia general de España, por individuos de la Real Academia de la Historia, bajo la dirección de Don Antonio Cánovas del Castillo; Colmeiro, *Reyes Cristianos, en Castilla, Aragón, etc.* (Madrid, 1891); Catalina y García, *Castilla y Léon* (Madrid, 1891); Mariana, *Historia General de España;* Lafuente, *Historia General de España; Reseña geográfica y estadística de España, Dirección general del Instituto geográfico y estadístico* (Madrid, 1888 —); *Anuario Eclesiástico de España* (Madrid, 1904, last ed.). See also Chevalier, *Topo-Bibl.* (Paris, 1894–99), 194 for bibliography of Aragon, and 604–5 for that of Castile.

Ramón Ruiz Amado.

Castillejo, Cristóbal de, Spanish poet, b. in Ciudad Rodrigo (Salamanca), 1491; d. in Vienna, 12 June, 1556. From the age of fifteen he was attached to the person of the younger brother of the Emperor Charles V, the Infante Ferdinand, who subsequently became King of Bohemia and Hungary, and eventually Emperor of Germany. He lived for many years

in Austria as secretary to that prince, and late in life took ecclesiastical orders, retiring to a monastery near Vienna where he passed the remainder of his days. Castillejo was the champion of the old school of Spanish verse as opposed to the Italian measures recently introduced by Boscán, seconded by Garcilasso de la Vega. He vigorously opposed the innovation, maintaining and demonstrating in his writings that the old metres were amply competent for the expression of all sentiments. When he did use the *villancicos, canciones*, and other measures of the new school, it was only to attack and ridicule the innovators.

As a poet he was distinguished for purity of language, grace, fluency, and humour, the latter quality abounding in his "Dialogue between Himself and His Pen". He used satire with simplicity and ease, and, at times, freely and boldly. Some of his satires, notably the "Sermon on Love" and the "Dialogue on the Condition of Women", were so offensive to the clergy that the Inquisition prohibited the publication of his poems until they had been expurgated. Among his other works are the fanciful "Transformation of a Drunkard into a Mosquito" and a satire addressed "To those who give up the Castillian measures and follow the Italian". His poems are divided into three books devoted to love; conversation and pastime; moral and religious verses. In 1573 a collection of the "Works of Castillejo Expurgated by the Inquisition" was published in Madrid, which was one of the first books printed in that city. The most complete edition is that published by Ramón Fernandez (Madrid, 1792).

Biblioteca de autores españoles (Madrid, 1832), XXXII; TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1849); FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1906).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Castner (or KASTNER), CASPAR, a missionary, b. at Munich, Bavaria, 7 October, 1655; d. at Peking, China, 9 November, 1709. He entered the Society of Jesus, 17 September, 1681, and studied theology at Ingolstadt where he finished his studies 22 March, 1694. For a short time he taught logic in the gymnasium at Ratisbon; after this he devoted himself to the work of missions and sailed in 1696 for China at the head of a company of brother Jesuits from Portugal and Genoa. In China he laboured with great success on the island of Shang-chuen (St. John) and in the city of Fatshan, then a competitor of Canton. In 1702 he went with Father Franciscus Noel to Lisbon and Rome in order, as representative of the Bishops of Nanking and Macao, to obtain some settlement of the question of Chinese Rites. In 1706 he returned to China, taking with him a number of missionaries.

Besides the merit of his apostolic labours, Father Castner deserves much praise for his work in the sciences of navigation, astronomy, and cartography. He called the attention of the Portuguese Government to the fact that the voyage to Macao would be much shorter if the vessels followed a direct course from the Cape of Good Hope by way of the Sunda Islands, avoiding Mozambique and Goa, and the result showed that he was right. He did excellent work in the mapping of the Chinese Empire and had so great a reputation as a mathematician that he was made president of the mathematical tribunal and instructor of the heir to the throne. Besides a number of elaborate reports on the question of Chinese Rites which he drew up with the aid of Father Noel, Father Castner also wrote an interesting but rare little work called "Relatio Sepulturæ Magno Orientis Apostolo S. Francisco Xaverio erectæ in Insula Sanciano MDCC". It is an exact description of the island where from 19 March to 2 June, 1700, he had been engaged in erecting, at the command of his superiors, a memorial over the grave of St. Francis Xavier. The book was accompanied by a good map. One of the few copies printed in China is in the so-called "Orban'sche Sammlung" of the library of the University of Munich. A translation was published by Father Joseph Stöcklein in his "Welt-Bott" (Augsburg, 1729), No. 309. The title-page and map are reproduced in the work of Henri Cordier, "L'imprimerie sino-européenne en Chine" (Paris, 1901), 11–15.

FRANCO, *Synopsis annalium Societatis Jesu* (Augsburg, 1726), 398, 424; MEDERER, *Annales Ingolstadienses* (1782), III, 80; ZACH, *Monatliche Correspondenz zur Beförderung der Erd- und Himmelskunde* (Gotha, 1800), I, 589–93; LIPOWSKI, *Gesch. der Jesuiten in Baiern* (Munich, 1816), II, 253; *Kalender für katholische Christen* (Sulzbach, 1889), 123–124; BACKER-SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* (1891), II, 853–54; (1900), IX, 9; MÜNSTERBERG, *Bayern und Asien im XVI., XVII., XVIII. Jahrhundert* in *Zeitschrift des Münchener Alterthums-Vereins* (Munich, 1894), VI, 12 sqq.; HUONDER, *Deutsche Jesuitenmissionäre*, supplement to *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (1899), LXXIV, 189.

OTTO HARTIG.

Castoria, a titular see of Macedonia. Livy (XXXI, XL) mentions a town near a lake in Orestis, called Celetrum, whose inhabitants surrendered to Sulpitius during the Roman war against Philip V (200 B. C.). Procopius (De ædif., vii, 3) tells us that Justinian, finding the town of Diocletianopolis ruined by the barbarians, built a city on the lake of Castoria. Tafel (De Viâ Egnatianâ, 44–46) suggests that Celetrum, Diocletianopolis, and Castoria are three successive names of the same place. Be that as it may, Castoria seems to have replaced Celetrum. There Bohemond camped with his army at Christmas, 1083. The Byzantine chroniclers describe it as a strong fortress. In the tenth century it must have been occupied by the Bulgarians. About 1350 it was given up by the Emperor Joannes Cantacuzene to the King of Servia, and in 1386 it was captured by the Turks. As early at least as the reign of Basil II, Castoria was the first suffragan see of Achrida. Lequien (II, 315) mentions only three bishops: Joasaph in 1564, Hierotheus, who went to Rome about 1650, and Dionysius Mantoucas; this short list of course can be readily completed. The see still exists for the Greeks and has been made a metropolitan. Some ten Latin bishops are known from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. (Lequien, III, 1087; Eubel, I, 179, II, 134.) Castoria is to-day the chief town of a *mutessariflik* in the vilayet of Monastir, with about 10,000 inhabitants—Turks, Greeks, and Bulgarians. It is also the see of a Bulgarian bishopric with 2224 families, 32 priests, and 22 churches.

DU DEZERT, *Géogr. anc. de la Macédoine* (Paris, 1863), 40, 308; DEMITSAS, *Geogr. of Macedonia* (Greek: Athens, 1870), I, 186, sqq.; II, 84–89; VAILHÉ in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v. *Bulgarie.*

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Castracane degli Antelminelli, FRANCESCO, naturalist, b. at Fano, Italy, 19 July, 1817; d. at Rome 27 March, 1899. He was educated at the Jesuits' school at Reggio nell' Emilia, and was ordained priest in 1840. Four years later he was made canon of the cathedral at Fano, and at the same time resumed his studies at the Collegio dei Nobili in Rome. In 1852 he resigned his canonry, and took up his residence at Rome. Castracane had a great love of nature, and during the latter half of his life devoted himself to biological research. He was one of the first to introduce microphotography into the study of biology. His first experiments in applying the camera to the microscope were made as early as 1862 with *diatomaceæ*, and he subsequently made these micro-organisms his chief study. While investigating their structure and physiological functions and, particularly in his last years, their processes of reproduction, he valued the knowledge which they afforded, not merely as an end in itself, but also on account of its bearing on some of the problems of biology, geology, and even hydrography. The extensive collections of *diatomaceæ*

obtained by the Challenger Expedition were entrusted to him for description and classification. He discovered among them three new genera, two hundred and twenty-five new species, and some thirty new varieties. Castracane was a devout priest as well as an enthusiastic investigator. He shrank from preferment and led a simple, regular life. He continued his work to the end, saying Mass even on the day of his death. He was the author of a large number of papers, published chiefly in the proceedings of the *Accademia dei Nuovi Lincei*, over whose meetings he presided for many years.

TONI, *Commemorazione del conte ab. F. Castracane degli Antelminelli* in *Mem. della Pont. Accad. dei Nuovi Lincei* (Rome, 1899), XVI; MENGARINI-TRAUBE, *Castracane degli Antelminelli*, in *Biolog. Centralblatt* (Leipzig, 1900), XX, 401–402, 433–447.

HENRY M. BROCK.

Castro, ALPHONSUS DE, Friar Minor and theologian, b. in 1495 at Zamora, Leon, Spain; d. 11 February, 1558, at Brussels. When fifteen years old he entered a little convent of the Franciscan Order near Salamanca in the province of St. James. He taught theology at the University of Salamanca, and for forty-three years was confessor to Charles V and Philip II, and preacher at the Court of Spain. In 1545 he accompanied Cardinal Grennis as theologian to the Council of Trent, and during the fourth session took an important part in the discussion concerning Holy Scripture. As representative of the cardinal he subscribed to the canons of this session, and suggested that the words "præter hos sacros libros multa alia sunt tenenda quæ scripta non sunt, sed observantur Ecclesiæ auctoritate" be added to the Decree "De Canonicis Scripturis". In succeeding sessions he addressed the council on the advisability of vernacular versions of Sacred Scripture, and on original sin. He accompanied Philip II to England, returned with that monarch to the Continent in 1557, and was appointed to the archiepiscopal See of Compostella, made vacant by the death of Cardinal John Tolenton. His untimely death, however, prevented his consecration. Castro's best-known works include (1) "Adversus omnes hæreses", first published at Cologne in 1539; (2) "De justâ hæreticorum punitione" (Salamanca, 1547). Both these works were published in one edition at Paris (1571–78).

WADDING, *Ann. Min.*, XVIII, 1546, IX–X; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, IV, 1184; THEINER, *Acta Genuina Conc. Trid.*, I, 30, 55, 63; LINGARD, *History of England* (Dublin, 1874), V, 231.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Castro, DIOCESE OF. See ACQUAPENDENTE.

Castro, T. E. RIBEIRO V. See MELIAPUR, DIOCESE OF.

Castro Palao, FERNANDO, Spanish theologian, b. at Leon in 1581; d. at Medina, 1 Dec., 1633. From his earliest youth he gave such proofs of sanctity that he became known as "the saint", "the angel", "the predestined child". At the age of fifteen, in 1596, he entered the Society of Jesus, and here his fame for learning equalled that of his holiness. He taught philososphy at Valladolid, moral theology at Compostella, Scholastic theology at Salamanca, and finally became rector of the College of Medina, and consultor and qualificator of the Holy Inquisition. His death overtook him while he filled these last three offices. He excelled especially as a moral theologian; his classes of moral theology were attended by a greater number of students than were ever known to follow the course at Compostella. His decisions were regarded as oracles, and the most difficult cases were submitted to him for solution. St. Alphonsus numbers him among the principal authorities on moral theology (Dissert. schol. mor., Naples, 1755, c. iv, n. 119), and Gury calls him "a probabilist, a most learned, wise, erudite, and prolific author". His "Opus Morale" comprises seven volumes, and covers in the same number of treatises the whole field of moral theology. It appeared first at Lyons, 1631–51; its fifth edition is dated 1700. A general index to the whole work is found in the fourth volume of this last edition, and also in the third edition, which appeared at Venice in 1721. Immediately after his death (1633) there appeared at Valladolid a meditation book written by him, entitled "Manual del Cristiano de varias consideraciones para el exercicio santo de la oracion". The first part of this work presents meditations on the end of man; the second treats of the life of Christ and of His Blessed Mother; the third considers God in Himself and in His relations to us. An English translation of a letter of Father Castro Palao on the death of Father Thomas White appeared in the "Month" for 1890 (vol. 69, pp. 91–93).

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la c. de J.* (Brussels, 1891), II, col. 867, sq.; MÜLLENDORFF in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1892), I, 363.

A. J. MAAS.

Castro y Bellvis, GUILLÉN DE, Spanish dramatic poet, b. of a noble family at Valencia in 1569; d. at Madrid in 1631. He appears to have been early distinguished in the world of letters, for when a very young man we find him a member of the "Nocturnos", a brilliant Spanish imitation of the "Academies" then fashionable in Italy. In early life he followed a military career. At one time he was a captain of cavalry; at another he had an important command at Naples, through the friendship of the viceroy, Count of Benavente. Returning to Spain, he gained the favour of the powerful Count-Duke Olivares, who gave him several posts that were lucrative as well as honourable. He also gained the friendship of the Duke of Osuna, who settled an annuity upon him. But if his literary ability won for him many influential friends, a haughty and sour temper, a discontented spirit, and great obstinacy soon lost for him whatever advantages he had gained. He was obliged then to turn to the theatre to earn a painful subsistence as a dramatic writer. He died in poverty and was buried by charity. As a lyric and dramatic poet Guillén de Castro had few if any superiors. He wrote some forty comedies, all of which show the inventive genius and patriotism of the author, and they enjoyed great popularity both in and out of Spain. The best known probably are "Las Mocedades del Cid" in two parts, "Engañarse engañando", and "Pagar en propia moneda". To the first mentioned Castro owed his European reputation, for it is from the first part of this play that the French dramatist Corneille gathered the materials for his own brilliant tragedy "Le Cid", which, according to Ticknor, did more than any other drama to determine for two centuries the character of the theatre throughout Europe. His comedies were published in two parts at Valencia, in 1621 and 1625 respectively.

TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1857); FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *History of Spanish Literature* (London), 1907).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Casuistry, the application of general principles of morality to definite and concrete cases of human activity, for the purpose, primarily, of determining what one ought to do, or ought not to do, or what one may do or leave undone as one pleases; and for the purpose, secondarily, of deciding whether and to what extent guilt or immunity from guilt follows on an action already posited.

Being merely a science of application, casuistry must be based on the principles and established conclusions of moral theology and ethics. These normative sciences it presupposes; to them it is ancillary; and strictly speaking it is distinct from them. It does not define objective morality, nor the objective circumstances that modify morality, nor the psy-

chological conditions that fix motive and consent; but, borrowing from the moralist the principles that determine these elements of a volitional act, its inquiry regards the extent of their presence or absence in a given case. Neither does it establish the existence of moral obligation; but, assuming the precepts of morality as already established, its only office is to determine the subjective morality of an individual act. In subordination to the sciences which it subserves, its sphere comprises the whole range of man's free activity. The decisions of the casuist are right or wrong, therefore, in so far as they are or are not in accord with a science of morality, which is itself a right interpretation of the natural or positive laws promulgated by the Supreme Legislator of the universe. They are of no worth, when based on an arbitrary or purely self-sanctioned autonomous philosophy of conduct.

Since the special function of casuistry is to determine practically and in the concrete the presence or absence of a definite moral obligation, it does not fall within its scope to pass judgment on what would be more advisable, or on what may be recommended as a counsel of perfection. It leaves these judgments to the sciences to which they belong, particularly to pastoral and ascetical theology. The prudent director of consciences, however, being more than a casuist, ought in giving advice to make use of these other sciences in so far as they are applicable. Should he fail to do so, the blame cannot be attributed to casuistry.

The necessity of casuistry and its importance are obvious. From the nature of the case, the general principles of any science in their concrete application give rise to problems which trained and expert minds only can solve. This is especially true regarding the application of moral principles and precepts to individual conduct. For, although those principles and precepts are in themselves generally evident, their application calls for the consideration of many complex factors, both objective and subjective. Only those who unite scientific knowledge of morality with practice in its application may be trusted to solve promptly and safely problems of conscience. Personal, social, commercial, and political experience proves this abundantly. Moral education requires long, patient, and delicate training, and few acquire it without the aid of casuistry. The objections that are urged against casuistry arise from misconception of its purpose and scope, or from errors and abuses that have sometimes accompanied its practice. The former are sufficiently disposed of; the latter no more discredit its legitimate use than the corresponding difficulties which may be raised against therapeutics or civil law impair the value of these sciences. Historically considered, casuistry in some form or another is as old as human conscience. Wherever civilization has developed along moral lines, there the casuist has been for the interior forum of conscience what the judge was for the exterior forum of civil legality. The scope of this article, however, is confined to Catholic casuistry. The history of this may be divided into three periods:—

I. From the First to the Thirteenth Century. —During this period, though there are no works treating of casuistry in a formal and scientific way, practical applications of Christian morality to the conduct of life are numerous and continuous; first, in the works of the Fathers and other ecclesiastical writers, in the decisions of popes and bishops, and in the decrees of councils; later, in the Scriptural commentaries, the Books of Sentences, and the Penitential Books.

II. Thirteenth to the Middle of the Sixteenth Century.—After the Fourth Council of Lateran the reduction to a scientific form of the casuistic doctrine, which had been gradually developed and elaborated during the patristic period, began concurrently with an awakening of interest in theological studies and the apostolic activity of the now flourishing mendicant orders. The work of the Dominican, Raymund of Pennafort, entitled "Summa de Pœnitentiâ et Matrimonio", and published about 1235, opened an era in the scientific study of casuistry, and fixed the manner of treatment which the science retained for over two hundred years. Two other books exercised an influence during this period on the formation of scientific casuistry: The "Summa Astesana", published in 1317 by a Franciscan of Asti in Piedmont; and the "Summa Pisana", written by the Dominican Bartholomew of San Concordio, or of Pisa (d. 1347), which treated casuistic subjects alphabetically, and was the first of a long series of similar works. The "Summa Summarum", of Sylvester Prierias, O. P. (d. 1523), practically brings the age of the great "Summists" to a close. St. Antoninus, O. P., of Florence (d. 1459) is notable in this period for his "Summa Confessionalis" and "Summula Confessorum", which were followed by many manuals of a like kind. He was probably the first who treated moral theology as a distinct science, and thus prepared the way for that closer union of treatment between it and casuistry which finally obtained in the following period.

III. Middle of the Sixteenth Century to the Present Time.—The first hundred years of this period are characterized by a splendid development of theological sciences, due to the ecclesiastical reformation begun and carried out by the Council of Trent, to the institution of a new religious order, the Society of Jesus, and to the intellectual activity evoked in defence of the Church against the pseudo-Reformation of Luther and of contemporaneous heresiarchs. In this progress casuistry shared. Besides the various "Summæ Casuum" which were published, the great theologians of the time, in commenting on the second part of the "Summa Theologica" of St. Thomas Aquinas, treated fully and profoundly casuistical questions regarding personal, social, political, and religious duties, regarding the mutual relations of states, and regarding the relative rights of Church and State. During this time moral theology finally attained the dignity of a special science, and became the explicit basis of casuistry. Prominent in bringing about this development were John Azor, S. J. (d. 1603), whose "Institutiones Morales" was printed at Rome in 1600; Paul Laymann, S. J. (d. 1635), who published at Munich in 1625 his "Theologia Moralis"; and Hermann Busembaum (d. 1668), whose "Medulla Theologiæ Moralis" became the text for the celebrated commentaries of Claude La Croix, S. J. (d. 1714), of St. Alphonsus Liguori, and in our time of Anthony Ballerini, S. J. The progress of casuistry was interrupted towards the middle of the seventeenth century by the controversy which arose concerning the doctrine of probabilism. This controversy might have been conducted with scientific calm and finally disposed of by the Holy See, but by the injection into it of Jansenistic fanaticism, sophistry, and satire, real issues were confused, and an embittered strife arose, which for nearly two centuries disturbed Catholic schools. The effects on casuistry were deplorable. Two extreme schools, the Rigorists and the Laxists, came into being, and centred attention upon themselves. The vast body of conservative theologians were practically ignored, or charged with laxity because they did not hold the opinions of a narrow school. The Laxists were taken as typical casuists, and because some of them were Jesuits, Jesuit morality became a byword of reproach. The tenets of both Rigorists and Laxists were repeatedly condemned by ecclesiastical authorities; nevertheless the repute of sane casuistry suffered not only among the enemies of the Church, but even to a degree among Catholics also. So much so, that by the middle of

the eighteenth century the very name of casuistry became a synonym for moral laxity—a signification it yet unfortunately retains in the minds of many whose information on the subject is drawn from prejudiced sources. When Jansenistic rigorism seemed to have attained a permanent triumph, especially in France and Spain, relief was obtained through Alphonsus Maria de Liguori (d. 1787), the saintly founder of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. By recalling casuists to the study of their classic authors he restored casuistry itself to the place its importance and dignity demanded. His first publication was the "Medulla Theologiæ Moralis" of Hermann Busembaum, S. J., with annotations. In eight successive editions this work was enlarged and improved, until it became a synopsis of casuistical literature. The last edition, entitled "Theologia Moralis", was published in 1785, and received the approbation of the Holy See in 1803. In 1871 Pius IX proclaimed the saintly author a Doctor of the Church. The after-history of casuistry is one of peace and development along the lines laid down by St. Alphonsus.

ZACCARIA, *Dissertatio* (an introduction to the Moral Theology of St. Alphonsus); BOUQUILLON, *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis* (Bruges, 1903); HURTER, *Nomenclator Lit.*, apologetic or expository writers; HOGAN, *Clerical Studies* (Boston, 1898); LEHMKUHL, *Die katholische Moraltheologie und das Studium derselben* in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (1901), 11; IDEM, *Die Moraltheologie und die Kritik ihrer Methode*, ibid., 275; BRUNETIÈRE, *Une apologie de la casuistique* in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (January, 1885); MAUSBACH, *Die katholische Moral, ihre Methoden, Grundsätze, und Aufgaben* (2d ed., Cologne, 1902); MEYENBERG, *Die katholische Moral als Angeklagte* (Stanz, 1901); MÜLLER, *Ist die katholische Moraltheologie reformbedürftig?* (Fulda, 1902); HARING, *Die Casuistik in der Moraltheologie* in *Linzer theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift* (1898), 596; URBANY in *Kirchenlexikon*, II, 2035–44; DUBLANCHY in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, especially valuable for its apologetic and bibliographical treatment of the subject; JOSEPH RICKABY, *Political and Moral Essays* (London and New York); HUMPHREY, *Conscience and Law* (London, 1896); SLATER, *A Manual of Moral Theology in English Speaking Countries* (New York, 1908).

TIMOTHY BROSNAHAN.

Casula. See CHASUBLE.

Casus Reservati. See RESERVED CASES.

Caswall, EDWARD, oratorian and poet, b. 15 July, 1814, at Yately, Hampshire, of which place his father, the Rev. R. C. Caswall, was vicar; d. at the Oratory, Birmingham, 2 January, 1878. He was educated at Marlborough Grammar School and at Brasenose College, Oxford, where he was Hulme exhibitioner. Before leaving Oxford he published, under the pseudonym of Scriblerus Redivivus, "The Art of Pluck", in imitation of Aristotle, a witty satire upon the ways of the careless college student, which still has a circulation. To the eighth edition, in 1843, he wrote a special preface of regret for certain passages, now excluded, which, at that later date, he had come to regard as irreverent. In 1838 he was ordained deacon, and in 1839 priest, in the Church of England. In 1840 he became perpetual curate of Stratford-sub-Castle in the diocese of his uncle, Dr. Burgess, Bishop of Salisbury. In 1846 he published "Sermons on the Seen and the Unseen", a volume of thoughtful discourses marked by the same tender and fervent piety found in his well-known hymns, and by a clear leaning to certain elements of Catholic doctrine. Soon afterwards, having come under the influence of Cardinal (then Dr.) Newman and the "Tracts for the Times", he resigned his curacy and, in January, 1847, was received into the Church by Cardinal Acton at Rome. In 1849 Caswall's wife, who had also become a Catholic, died suddenly of cholera, and early in 1850 he became an Oratorian. In 1852 he was ordained priest, and lived at the Oratory until his death. He was buried at Rednal, in the private cemetery of the congregation, near the grave of Cardinal Newman. Besides various manuals of devotion, several of which he translated from the French, his principal works are: "Lyra Catholica", a translation of all the Breviary and Missal hymns with some others (often reprinted; last edition, London, 1884); "The Masque of Mary and other Poems", original poetry, thoughtful, imaginative, tender, and full of zealous faith, a book which drew from Cardinal Newman, in return, a remarkable poem addressed to the author (reprinted several times; last edition, London, 1887); "The Catholic's Latin Instructor in the principal Church offices and devotions" (frequently reprinted; last edition, London, 1897).

Weekly Register, 19 Jan., 1878, p. 38; *Guardian*, 9 Jan., 1878, p. 41; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; *Publisher's Note* to *The Art of Pluck* (1893).

K. M. WARREN.

Catacombs, ROMAN.—This subject will be treated under seven heads: I. Position; II. History; III. Inscriptions; IV. Paintings; V. Sarcophagi; VI. Small Objects Found in the Catacombs; VII. Catacombs outside Rome.

I. POSITION.—The soil on which the city of Rome is built, as well as that of the surrounding district, is of volcanic origin; alluvial deposits are found only on the right bank of the Tiber, on the downward course of the stream, below the Vatican. Wherever the volcanic deposits occur three strata appear, one above the other: the uppermost is the so-called *pozzolano*, earth from which the Romans, by an admixture of lime, prepared their excellent cement; next is a stratum of tufa, made up half of earth and half of stone; the lowest stratum is composed of stone. From the earliest times the lowest layer was worked as a stone quarry, and, both in the lowest and uppermost strata, irregularly hewn galleries are discovered everywhere, as in the Capitoline Hill and in the suburbs of the city.

It was formerly believed that the early Christians used these galleries as places of burial for their dead. But all the catacombs are laid out in the middle stratum of tufa, from which no building-material was obtained. It is only necessary to compare the irregular galleries of the sand-pits and stone-quarries with the narrow straight passages and vertical walls of the catacombs in order to recognize the difference. In some cases an *arenaria*, or sand-pit, forms the starting-point for the laying out of a catacomb; in other spots the catacombs are connected by a gallery with the *arenariæ* so that entrance could be gained into the Christian city of the dead, in times of persecution, without exciting notice. The catacombs are, therefore, entirely of Christian construction. As a rule a stairway leads below the surface to a depth of from thirty-three to forty-nine feet or even more; from this point diverge the galleries, which are from ten to thirteen feet in height, and seldom broader than would be necessary for two grave-diggers, one behind the other, to carry a bier. Side galleries branch off from the main galleries, intersecting other passages. From this level or story steps lead to lower levels where there is a second network of galleries; there are catacombs which have three or even four stories, as, for example, the Catacomb of St. Sebastian. The labyrinth of galleries is incalculable. It has been asserted that if placed in a straight line they would extend the length of Italy. Along the passages burial chambers (*cubicula*) open to the right and left, also hewn out of the tufa rock. In the side walls of the galleries horizontal tiers of graves rise from the floor to the ceiling; the number of graves in the Roman catacombs is estimated at two millions. The graves, or *loculi*, are cut out of the rock sides of the gallery, so that the length of the bodies can be judged from the length of the graves. When the body, wrapped in cloths, without a sarcophagus, was laid in the spot excavated for it, the excavation was closed by a marble slab or sometimes by large tiles set in mortar. For the wealthy and for martyrs there were also more imposing graves, known as *arcosolia*.

An *arcosolium* was a space excavated in the wall above which a semicircular recess was hewn out, in which a sarcophagus was sometimes placed; in the excavation below, the body was laid and covered with a flat marble slab. It was not common to bury the dead beneath the floor of the passages or burial chambers. At the present day the majority of the graves are found open, the slabs which once sealed them having vanished; often nothing remains of the ashes and bones. The rock and broken material loosened by the constant digging in the innumerable passages were piled up in the sand-pits near by, or brought to the surface in baskets, or were heaped up in the passages which were no longer visited because the families of the dead had passed away. In order to obtain light, and above all fresh air, shafts called *luminaria*, somewhat like chimneys, were cut through the soil to the surface of the ground. These *luminaria*, however, are seldom found before the fourth century, when the great numbers of the faithful who attended the religious services in the catacombs on the feast days of the martyrs rendered such precautions for health a necessity. At this date also wider and easier stairways were made, leading from the surface of the ground into the depths below.


Tufa, or volcanic stone, in which the Catacombs were excavated.
Early Christian masonry.
Modern masonry.
Church above Catacomb, on the surface of the ground.
Church Entrance
Arcosolia
Early Chapel

CATACOMB OF ST. SEBASTIAN SHOWING THE GALLERIES OR PASSAGEWAYS WITH THE CUBICULA OR BURIAL CHAMBERS OPENING FROM THEM

The early Christian name for these places of burial was κοιμητήριον, *cœmeterium*, place of rest. When, in the Middle Ages, the recollection of the catacombs passed away, the monks attached to the church of St. Sebastian on the Via Appia kept the *cœmeterium ad catacumbas* on this road accessible for pilgrims. After the rediscovery and opening of the other *cœmeteria*, the name belonging to this one *cœmeterium* was applied to all. The catacombs awaken astonishment on account of the remarkable work of construction which, in the course of three hundred years, the piety of the early Christians and their love for the dead produced. In estimating the enormous sum of money required for the catacombs, it must also be taken into consideration that the early Christians, by voluntary contributions, supported the clergy, aided the poor, widows, and orphans, assisted those sent to prison or the mines on account of their faith, and bought from the executioners at a large price the bodies of the martyrs.

II. HISTORY.—The Romans cremated their dead and deposited the ashes in a family tomb (*sepulcrum, memoria*), or in a vault or common sepulchre (*columbarium*); but the Jews living in Rome retained their native method of burial, and imitated the rock-graves of Palestine by laying out cemeteries in the stone-like stratum of tufa around Rome. In this manner Jewish catacombs were laid out and developed before Christianity appeared in Rome. Connected with the two chief Jewish colonies, one in the quarter of the city across the Tiber, and the other by the Porta Capena, were two large Jewish catacombs, one on the Via Portuensis and one on the Via Appia, as well as some smaller ones; all are recognizable by the seven-branched candlestick, which repeatedly appears on gravestones and lamps.

Until after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (A. D. 70) the Christians were regarded as a sect of the Jews; hence those Jews who were converted by the Apostles at Rome were buried in the catacombs of their fellow-countrymen. The question arises as to where those converted from heathenism by the Apostles found their last resting-place. It is a fact to which Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and other pagan historians bear witness, that as early as the days of the Apostles members of the higher and even of the highest ranks of the nobility had become Christians. These converts of rank from heathenism had their own tombs, and permitted their brethren in the Faith to construct, in connexion with these family tombs, places of burial modelled on the Jewish catacombs. This is the origin of the Christian catacombs. The catacombs of the Apostolic Era are: on the Via Ardeatina, the catacomb of Domitilla, niece of the Emperor Domitian and a member of the Flavian family; on the Via Salaria, that of Priscilla, who was probably the wife of the Consul Acilius Glabrio; on the Via Appia, that of Lucina, a member of the Pomponian family; on the Via Ostiensis, that of Commodilla, connected with the grave of St. Paul. At a later date other catacombs were constructed, nearly all having their origin in a family vault; among them are those of Cæcilia, Prætextatus, Hermes, etc., which still bear the names of their founders. Again, the grave of a venerated martyr would be another nucleus of a catacomb, e. g. that of St. Laurence, St. Valentine, or St. Castulus; such a *cœmeterium* would bear the name of the martyr. *Cœmeteria* occasionally owed their names to some external feature as the one *ad duas lauros* (the two laurel trees); this title is still added to the names of the two martyrs, Peter and Marcellinus, resting there. Thus in the course of three hundred years some fifty catacombs, large and small, formed

a wide circle around the city, the majority being about half an hour's walk from the city-gate.

The question, however, arises as to whether the Christians were able to construct these subterranean cemeteries without molestation from the heathens. Undoubtedly the Romans had knowledge of the spots where the Christians buried their dead; but according to old laws every spot where a body lay was under the protection of Roman law and custom that guaranteed the inviolability of burial places. It is true that the Emperors Decius and Diocletian, at a later date, declared the ground covering the catacombs to be the property of the State, thus making it impossible to enter the catacombs by the ordinary ways. But the successors of Decius and Diocletian repealed these laws as contrary to the entire spirit of the Roman State. Even though the Christians felt themselves secure in the catacombs, yet the laying out of the galleries, the burial of the bodies, the odour of decay, and the pestilential air in summer, made the lives of the *fossores*, or excavators, one of the greatest self-sacrifice, while visiting the graves of the departed became much more difficult for the surviving members of families. Therefore, after the Emperor Constantine had granted freedom to the Church, and had set an example for the erection of churches and chapels over the graves of martyrs by building a basilica over the burial-place of Sts. Peter and Paul, it became customary to lay out cemeteries above ground, preferably in the neighbourhood of such holy spots. At the same time, however, burial in the catacombs did not fall into disuse, especially as the piety of the popes and the faithful of the fourth century led to the adorning of the resting-places of the early martyrs with marbles, paintings, and inscriptions (see Damasus, Saint, Pope). Furthermore, by enlarging the burial chambers, by opening shafts for light, and by the construction of broader stairways, access was made easier for the faithful of Rome and for pilgrims. Just as, in the course of the fourth century, the veneration of the martyrs, especially at their graves and on the anniversaries of their death, became more widespread, so the confidence in their intercession found its expression in the endeavour to secure burial in the vicinity of a martyr's tomb.

Then came that year of misfortune, 410, when the Goths laid siege to Rome for months, devastated the surrounding country, and plundered the city itself. This naturally put an end to burial in the catacombs. In the following centuries Goths, Vandals, and Lombards repeatedly besieged and plundered Rome; plague and pestilence depopulated the region around the city; both the churches over the graves of the martyrs and the catacombs sank into decay, and shepherds of the Campagna even turned the deserted sanctuaries into sheepfolds. For this reason Pope Paul I (757–67) began to transfer the remains of the martyrs to the churches of the city; the work was continued by Paschal I (817–24) and Leo IV (847–55). As a result the catacombs lost their attraction for the faithful, and by the twelfth century they were completely forgotten.

In 1578 a catacomb on the Via Salaria was accidentally rediscovered. It was not, however, until the publication, in 1632, after the author's death, of the "Roma Sotterranea" of Antonio Bosio (q. v.), that attention was once more called to the catacombs. For nearly forty years, from the year 1593, Antonio Bosio had devoted himself to finding and exploring the early Christian cemeteries. The real Columbus of the catacombs, however, is Giovanni Battista de Rossi (q. v.). De Rossi's labours and publications have led to the wide diffusion of a knowledge of archæology and an increased veneration for the catacombs. Among his works are: "Roma Sotterranea" in three volumes; "Inscriptiones christianæ" in two volumes, and numerous scattered pamphlets and articles; he also founded and edited the "Bullettino di archeologia cristiana" (since 1863). The Holy See gives between three and four thousand dollars (18,000 lire) annually for the work in the catacombs, and the excavations are superintended by a special commission (see Archæology, The Commission of Sacred). De Rossi died 20 September, 1894, after devoting nearly fifty years, from his earliest youth, to the exploration of the catacombs and the study of Christian antiquity. His work was and is carried on by his pupils, among them Armellini, Stevenson, Marucchi, Wilpert, and others. The publications annually issued

Cubiculum showing Three Arcosolia, Catacomb of St. Thecla

by Catholic and non-Catholic investigators bear witness to the self-sacrificing zeal and devotion as well as to the sound scholarship with which the science of Christian antiquities is pursued. In addition to this the *Collegium Cultorum Martyrum*, by holding religious services followed by popular addresses on the feast days of the martyrs, in the various catacombs, endeavours to stimulate the reverence of Romans and strangers for these noble memorials of the Early Church and to diffuse the knowledge of them. In all quarters the example of Rome acted as a stimulus to the study of Christian antiquity and led to exploration and excavations; unexpected treasures of the first Christian centuries have been rescued from oblivion in other parts of Italy, in France, Illyria, Greece, North Africa, Egypt, Palestine, and Asia Minor.

At Rome, during the last half-century, excavations were undertaken in the following catacombs on the outskirts of the city; the catacombs of Thecla and Commodilla on the Via Ostiensis; the catacomb of Domitilla on the Via Ardeatina; those of Callistus, Prætextatus, and Sebastian on the Via Appia; Sts. Peter and Marcellinus on the Via Labicana; Laurentius and Hippolytus on the Via Tiburtina; Nicomedes, St. Agnes, and the *cœmeterium majus* on the Via Nomentana; Felicitas, Thraso, and Priscilla on the Via Salaria Nova; Hermes on the Via Salaria Vetus; Valentinus on the Via Flaminia. On the

right bank of the Tiber the catacombs explored were those of Pontianus and Generosa on the Via Portuensis. The most thorough explorations were carried out in the catacombs of Callistus, Domitilla, and Priscilla. In a large number of cases the graves of the martyrs mentioned in the old authorities (martyrologies, itineraries, the "Liber Pontificalis", and



Papal Crypt, III Century, Catacomb of St. Callistus

the legendary accounts of the martyrs) were rediscovered. At the same time there was dug up a treasure, valuable beyond expectation, of early Christian epitaphs and paintings, which gave much unlooked-for information concerning the faith of the early Christians, their concepts of life, hopes of eternity, family relations, and many other matters.

III. Inscriptions.—Although thousands of the inscriptions on the graves of the early Christians have been lost, and many more contain nothing of importance, there is still a valuable remainder that yields more information than any other source concerning the first Christian centuries. That Christianity as early as the days of the Apostles found entrance into distinguished families of the Eternal City, and that, as time went on, it gradually won over the nobility of Rome is evident from the epitaphs containing the titles *clarissimi, clarissimæ* (of senatorial rank), as well as from epitaphs in which appear the names of noted clans (*gentes*). The change wrought by Christianity in the social relations of master and slave is plain from the exceedingly small number of Christian inscriptions containing the words *servus* (slave), or *libertus* (freedman), words which are constantly seen on pagan gravestones; the often recurring expression *alumnus* (foster-child) characterizes the new relation between the owner and the owned. Many of the epitaphs give eloquent voice to the love of married couples, dwelling on the fact that man and wife had lived chastely (*virginius, virginia*) before entering the married state, on the virtues of the dead companion and the faithfulness to the departed observed through long years of solitary life in order that, lying side by side in the same grave, they might rise together at the Resurrection. Others record the love of parents for a dead child and conversely. Reference to the virgin state, which seldom appears in heathen epitaphs, is often met with in the Christian inscriptions; from the fourth century on mention is made of a virginity specially dedicated to God, *virgo Deo dicata, famula Dei.* Besides allusions in the inscriptions to the various ecclesiastical ranks of bishop, priest, deacon, lector, and excavator (*fossor*), there are references to physicians, bakers, smiths, and joiners, often with emblems of the respective implements. Especially interesting are inscriptions which throw light on the religious conceptions of the time, which speak not only of the hope of eternity, but also of the means of grace on which that hope rests—above all, of the faith in the one God, and Christ, His Son. They also dwell on membership in the Church through baptism, and on the relations with the dead through prayer. Naturally, the older the epitaphs referring to dogma the greater their importance.

Next comes the question as to how the age of an inscription can be ascertained. In the first place the inscriptions are limited to the first four centuries of the Christian Era, since, after the invasion of the Goths (410), burial in the catacombs occurred only in isolated instances and soon ceased altogether. The later Roman inscriptions and all the inscriptions of Gaul, Africa, and the Orient, however much additional information they may give in regard to dogma, cannot here be taken into consideration. The most natural and certain method of determining the age of an inscription, i. e. through the reference it usually contains to the annual consul, can scarcely be used a dozen times in the epitaphs of the first two centuries. There are, however, many auxiliary means of determining the question, as: the names, the form of the letters, the style, the place of discovery, the pictorial emblems (varying from the anchor and the fish to the monogram of Christ); these permit, with a reasonable degree of certainty, the assignment of inscriptions to the fourth century, to the time before Constantine, to the beginning of the third or the end of the second century, or even to an earlier period. The Roman gravestones of the first four centuries furnish numerous proofs not only for the fundamental dogmas of the Catholic Church but also for a large additional number of its doctrines and usages, so that the epitaphs could be employed to illustrate and enforce nearly every page of a modern Catholic catechism. Some inscriptions are here given as examples.

Catacomb of Callistus, second century (text somewhat restored):—

ΦΡΟΝΤΩΝ *ἐποίησεν* ΣΕΠΤΙΜΙΟΣ ΠΡΑΙτεξτΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΙΚ-
ιλιάνος
Ο ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΤΟΥ *θεο*Υ ΑΞΙΩΣ ΒΙΩσας
ΟΥ ΜΕΤΕΝΟΗΣΑ ΚΑΝ ΩΔΕ ΣΟΙ ΥΠΕΡΣΤΗΣΑ
ΚΑΙ ΕΥΚΑριστΗΣΩ ΤΩ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙ ΣΟΥ ΠΑρέδωκε
ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧ*ὴν* ΤΩ ΘΕΩ ΤΡΙΑΝΤΑ ΤΡΙΩ*ν ἐτῶν*
. . . . . ΕΞ ΜΗΝΩΝ ΠΕΤΕΙΛΟΣ . . . ΛΑΜΠΡότατος
ΕΤ*ων* . . . *παρέδωκε τὴν ψυχὴν τῷ θεῷ*
ΠΡο . . . *σεπτ*ΕΜΒΡΙΩΝ

This inscription was found in a fragmentary condition along with other inscriptions of the Cæcilian family, near the grave of St. Cecilia. Phronton made the grave. The epitaph mentions two dead, Septimius Prætextatus Cæcilianus and Petilius, the latter with the additional statement Λαμπρότατος, *clarissimus*, signifying one of senatorial rank. Septimius is called a "servant of God" and is then represented as speaking: "If I have lived virtuously I have not

BUST OF CHRIST IN THE CATACOMB OF PONTIANUS (NINTH CENTURY)

repented of it and if I have served Thee [O Lord] I will give thanks to Thy Name." He "gave up his soul to God" at the age of thirty-three years and six months. The same expression, "he gave up his soul to God", is used for Petilius, the date of whose death is given as before 1 September.

Catacomb of Domitilla, second century:—

C. IVLIA. AGRIPPINA
SIMPLICI. DVLCIS IN
ÆTERNVM

—"Sweet Simplicius, live in eternity" is the wish which Caia Julia Agrippina, whose aristocratic name indicates a very early imperial date, sends after the departed.

Catacomb of Domitilla, third century:—

. . . . SPIRITVS
TVVS IN REFRIGERIO

The beginning of the inscription, containing the name, has disappeared, "May thy spirit be in refreshment". The very ancient prayer in the Canon of the Mass entreats for the dead *locum refrigerii, lucis et pacis* (a place of refreshment, light, and peace).

Catacomb of Pontianus, beginning of the fourth century:—

EVTYCHIANO FILIO DVLCISSIMO
EVTYCHIVS PATER ☧ V. A. I. M.
II.D IIII DEI SERVS ☧ IXΘYΣ

i.e. "Eutychius, the father [has erected] the gravestone to his sweetest little son, Eutychianus. The child who lived one year, two months, and four days the servant of God." The Greek monogram of the name of Christ (X=CH, P=R), and the IXΘTΣ scratched on the gravestone, shows that the child had, through baptism, died a Christian and had been received into heaven by "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour". (See Animals in Christian Art.)

Catacomb of Priscilla, third century (in verse):—

VOS PRECOR O FRATRES. ORARE. HVC
QVANDO VENITIS
ET PRECIBVS. TOTIS. PATREM. NATVM-
QVE ROGATIS
SIT. VESTRÆ. MENTIS. AGAPES. CARÆ.
MEMINISSE
VT DEVS. OMNIPOTENS. AGAPEN IN SÆ-
CVLA. SERVET

i. e. "I beg you, brethren, whenever ye come hither [to the service of God] and call in united prayer on the Father and the Son, that ye remember to think on your loved Agape, that Almighty God may preserve Agape in eternity." A second, fragmentary, piece of the inscription recalls the sentence of death pronounced in Paradise, *de terrâ sumptus terræ traderis* (thou wast taken from the earth and unto the earth shalt thou return). Agape lived twenty-seven years; so had it been appointed to her by Christ. The mother, Eucharis, and the father, Pius, erected the gravestone to her.

Catacomb of Commodilla, inscription of A. D. 377:—

CINNAMIVS OPAS LECTOR TITVLI FASCIOLE
AMICVS PAVPERVM
QVI VIXIT ANN. XLVI. MENS. VII. D. VIIII
DEPOSIT
IN PACE KAL MART
GRATIANO IIII ET MEROBAVDE COSS

i. e. Cinnamius Opas, lector of the title [church] of Fasciola, a friend of the poor, who lived forty-six years, seven months, and nine days, and was buried in peace on 1 March, when Gratian was consul for the fourth time and with him Merobaudus.

Catacomb of Commodilla, A. D. 394:—

DEP III IDVS MAII OSIMVS QVI
VIXIT ANNVS XXVIII QVI FECIT
CVM CONPARE SVA ANNVS SEPTE
MENSIS VIIII BENEMERENTI IN PACE. CON
SVLATV NICOMACI. FLABIANI. LOCV MAR
MARARI QVADRISOMVM

i. e. Buried on 13 May, Osimus who lived twenty-eight years, who was united to his wife seven years and nine months. May the well-deserving rest in peace. He died during the consulate of Nicomachus Flavianus. Grave of the stone-mason for four bodies.

Catacomb of Callistus, third century:—

PETRONIÆ AVXENTIÆ. C. F. QVÆ VIXIT
ANN. XXX. LIBERTI. FECERVNT. BENE-
MERENTI. IN. PACE

The freedmen of Petronia Auxentia, the highly born lady (*clarissimæ feminæ*), who died at the age of thirty, made the grave where she rests in peace. She seems to have had neither children, brothers or sisters, nor, at the time of her death, parents.

Catacomb of Callistus, fourth century:—

DASVMIA QVIRIACE BONE FEMINE PA-
LVMBA SENe FELle . . .
QVÆ VIXIT ANNOS LXVI DEPOSITA IIII
KAL MARTIAS IN PACE

Cyriaca, a member of the noble Dasumian family, who died at the age of sixty-six years, is called a "dove without bitterness", a eulogy that is found on other female graves.

From the Tomb of Pope Anterus, III Century

Catacomb of Callistus, about A. D. 300: "With the permission of his Pope Marcellinus (296–304) Severus the Deacon made in the level of the cemetery of Callistus directly under that of the pope a family vault, consisting of a double burial chamber (*cubiculum duplex*) with arched tombs (*arcosolia*) and a shaft for air and light, as a quiet resting-place for himself and his family, where his bones might be preserved in long sleep for his Maker and Judge. The first body to be laid in the new family vault was his sweet little daughter Severa, beloved by her parents and servants. At her birth God had endowed her for this earthly life with wonderful talents. Her body rests here in peace until it shall rise again in God, Who took away her soul, chaste, modest, and ever inviolate in His Holy Spirit; He, the Lord, will reclothe her at some time with spiritual glory. She lived a virgin nine years, eleven months and fifteen days. Thus was she translated out of this world".

Besides the text of the epitaphs, on many of the tombstones the ideas are also conveyed by pictures; in this manner expression is given, above all, to the hope of eternal life for the dead. First come symbolical pictures and signs: the anchor, the palm, the dove with the olive-branch, are allegorical symbols of hope, victory, and everlasting peace; from the third century on appears the fish, the symbol of Christ. The Good Shepherd carrying the lamb on His shoulders, and the Orante, both often depicted together, were well-known and favorite allusions to the joy of heaven. The carving on the tombstone also copied those paintings on the catacombs that represent Biblical scenes, e. g. the awakening of Lazarus, the adoration of the Wise Men. Carvings of an entirely secular character are also found on the tombstones,

namely representations of characteristic tools to indicate the rank in life or trade of the dead, e. g. for a baker, a grain measure; for a joiner, a plane; for a smith, an anvil and hammer. If the dead had borne in life the name of an animal, Leo (lion), Equitius (from *equus*, a horse), a picture of the particular animal was also cut on the tombstone. From the time of Constantine the monogram of Christ was a favourite symbol for use on gravestones.

IV. PAINTINGS.—The paintings of the catacombs conveyed pictorially the same ideas as the incriptions. These frescoes adorn the spaces between the single graves, ornament the arched niches above the *arcosolia*, and are employed to decorate the walls and ceilings of entire burial chambers. It is true that the paintings are not so easily understood as the inscriptions or epitaphs, but while the oldest epitaphs afford little instruction, since they are limited simply to the names of the dead, the paintings, of which the number is very large, give information concerning the beginnings of Christianity. Certain fixed types are repeated in manifold forms, so that one explains another. In the course of time new types of pictures and new conceptions were developed which throw a steadily increasing light on the belief and the hope of the primitive Christians in regard to death.



EARLY CHRISTIAN EPITAPHS WITH MONOGRAMS AND FIGURES, LATERAN MUSEUM

The heathen "who have no hope" might stand disconsolate by the grave of the departed, they might adorn the *æterna domus* (the eternal home) of the dead with gay pictures of ordinary life. The Christians in these paintings of the catacombs conceived the souls of the dead as Oranti, or praying female figures, in the bliss of heaven. The Good Shepherd Who lovingly carries the lamb on His shoulders to the flock that are pastured in Paradise signified to the Christian the reason for his hope of eternity. The representations of baptism and of the miraculous multiplication of the loaves are allusions to the means of grace by which heaven is attained. After favourable judgment is pronounced, the saints, the advocates or intercessors, lead the souls into the joys of heaven. To depict the belief of the early Christians in a future life the art of the catacombs generally chose episodes from the Old and New Testaments, episodes to which many allusions still occur in the prayers for the dying. If death is represented as having entered the world through the sin of Adam and Eve, the escape from death is indicated in pictures from the Old Testament showing the rescue of Noe from the Deluge, the preservation of Isaac from the sacrificial knife of his father Abraham, the rescue of the Three Hebrew Children from the fiery furnace, the escape of Jonas from the belly of the great fish, Susanna's deliverance with the aid of Daniel from false accusation. From the New Testament the raising of Lazarus is used as the type of the resurrection from the dead; the miracles of the Saviour, the healing of the blind, the cure of the palsied man, are all taken as proofs of the omnipotent power of the Son of God over sickness and death. The Wise Men from the East having been the first called out of heathenism, were regarded by the Christians of the catacombs as their predecessors in the Faith, as security for the hope that they too might, at some time, adore the Son of God above. The Mother of God is never separated from the Divine Child; one of the oldest paintings of the catacombs, painted under the eyes of the pupils of the Apostles and found in the cemetery of Priscilla, represents the Virgin holding the Child on her lap, while the Prophet Isaias, who stands before her, points to the star above the head of the Mother and Child. In the frequent pictures of the Wise Men the Virgin is seated on a throne accepting in the name of her Child the gifts which the Magi bring. A fresco of the third century in the cemetery of Priscilla represents the Annunciation; a painting of the fourth century in the *cœmeterium majus* shows the Virgin as an Orante, before her the Divine Child, who is clearly indicated to be Christ by the monogram of the name Christ painted to the right and left of the figure. The enthroned Saviour surrounded by the Apostles, the dead, who are being led by the saints before the Judge to receive a gracious verdict, the Wise Virgins at the heavenly wedding feast, all these form the last links in the chain of heavenly hopes that bind together earth and heaven, time and eternity.

The themes depicted in the purely decorative painting of the burial chambers, especially that of the ceilings, are largely taken from concepts peculiar to Christianity: the dove with the olive-branch of peace, the peacock that in springtime renews its gay plumage, the lamb, taken as a symbol of the soul, all these continually reappear as allusions to the consoling hopes cherished in this place of death. When the artist paints family life, e. g. a picture of a husband, wife, and child, who occupy a common grave, he represents the three as Oranti standing with raised hands absorbed in the contemplation of God. There are some purely secular paintings in the catacombs, e. g. a fresco in the cemetery of Priscilla representing vine-dressers carrying away a large cask; in the cemetery of Domitilla, corn-merchants superintending the unloading of sacks of grain from ships; and in the cemetery of Callistus, a market-woman selling vegetables.

Special reference should be made to the representations of the Eucharist in connexion with the multiplication of the bread when the Lord fed the multitude with the loaves and fishes. Since from the second century the Early Church regarded the five letters of the Greek word for fish ΙΧΘΥΣ (ichthys) as the first letters of the words making up the phrase ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΥΙΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ (Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour), bread and fish, the food with which Christ had fed the multitude, were in themselves an allusion to the Eucharistic meal. Thus in the catacomb of Domitilla a man and his wife are represented reclining on a cushion, before them a small table holding loaves of bread and fish; in the cemetery of Priscilla the presiding officer at the semi-circular table breaks for the guests the round loaves of

bread; the wine-cup with handles stands ready near bread and fish; baskets on either side holding the miraculously multiplied loaves and fishes indicate the deeper meaning of the scene. Both paintings belong to the earliest Christian art. There is in the catacomb of Callistus a painting of a large fish; close before or above the fish is a woven basket on the top of which lie round loaves of bread; the front part of the basket has a square opening in which is seen a glass containing red wine. In the six so-called Chapels of the Sacraments of the same catacomb various representations of the Eucharist appear in combination with pictures of baptism, the raising of Lazarus, a ship, etc. Bread and fish are shown lying on a table; on one side stands Christ, Who stretches a hand in blessing over the food; on the other side is an Orante, the symbol of the soul, which in this meal

there are for the paintings, as for the inscriptions, indications which serve as clues. The artistic value of the pictures increases the closer they approach the golden age of profane art. In the second and third centuries the pictures were lightly sketched and painted in transparent colours on a carefully prepared background of plaster. During this period the artist did not follow set patterns, but was under the necessity at first of devising forms in which to express his new Christian ideas. As secular art fell into decay Christian art experienced the same decline. Another aid in determining the age of a fresco is given by the site in a catacomb where a picture has been painted, whether in the oldest part or in a later addition. As time went on the painter's range of artistic conceptions enlarged; thus in the third and fourth centuries scenes were depicted which were foreign to earlier

Clothing a Virgin dedicated to God. Fresco in the Catacomb of St. Priscilla

receives the pledge of the heavenly one. The opposite picture represents the sacrifice of Isaac. In a third picture, placed between these two, guests sit around a table on which are bread and fish; in the foreground stand the baskets holding the miraculously multiplied loaves. These and similar pictures, all belonging to the first half of the third century, are based upon the thought that the Eucharistic meal has been prepared for us by the Saviour as the pledge and type of the heavenly one.

Catholic writers have at times found a richer dogmatic content in the pictures of the catacombs than a strict examination is able to prove; but Protestant scholars go to the other extreme when they claim that the "dogmatic results" obtained from the early Christian pictures are exceedingly small. Although it is willingly acknowledged that non-Catholic writers have occasionally placed a picture in a proper light, it is nevertheless necessary to protest against the attempt to eliminate from the early Christian memorials all dogmatic proof for the faith of the Catholic Church.

Just as it is of importance to settle the dates of inscriptions, so also it is essential to determine as nearly as possible when paintings were executed; Christian art. When in the fourth century the newly-erected basilicas were ornamented with mosaics, the same form of decoration was also introduced into the catacombs; this is shown in a mosaic depicting as an Orante a person who had died. The ornamentation of the places of interment came to an end with the above-mentioned cessation of burial in the catacombs; in lieu of this the graves of the martyrs were now decorated, generally with pictures of the saints, who are represented grouped around the Saviour. These paintings form a class apart from the other pictures of the catacombs on account of the constant decline in the artistic execution and because of the subjects of the composition. The last pictures painted in the catacombs are some executed in the ninth century in the crypt of St. Cecilia. St. Cecilia herself is represented as an Orante in the garden of heaven; there is also preserved in this crypt a bust-fresco of Christ in a niche, next to which is a picture of Pope St. Urban who buried the martyr, St. Cecilia.

V. Sarcophagi.—In ancient Rome citizens of rank built for themselves family tombs on the great military roads; the structure above ground (*monumentum*) was adorned with statues and inscriptions, while the bodies were deposited in stone coffins

(sarcophagi) or, when cremated, in funerary urns in a subterranean vault or *hypogæum*. The freedmen and clients of the noble family to whom the tomb belonged were buried in graves made in the upper stratum of the earth of the *area monumenti*, or plot of ground or garden in which the tomb stood. These graves were indicated by *stelæ*, or stone slabs, which gave the names of the dead. Those who were first converted from heathenism to Christianity were interred in a similar manner. This is evident both from the *hypogæum* of the Flavian family, which has horizontal niches to the right and left for the sarcophagi, and from the *stelæ* with symbols or inscriptions that are Christian in character, although, as is easily understood, such *stelæ* are not numerous. The example of the Jews, however, led very early to the excavation, in the enclosure of the *area monumenti*, of

Crypt of St. Peter's. Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, Christian Prefect of Rome, died 359. Central Upper Panel: Christ in glory giving the Law to His Apostles. Central Lower Panel: Christ's Entry into Jerusalem

subterranean galleries or passage ways, the walls of which offered ample space for single graves or *loculi*. From the beginning burial in sarcophagi was, on account of the expense, a privilege of the rich and of people of rank; this is also one reason why Christian sculpture developed later than Christian painting. As the Christians were obliged at first to buy sarcophagi from heathen stone-masons they avoided purchasing those with mythological scenes. They preferred such as were ornamented with carvings of scenes from pastoral life, the harvest and vintage; at times they selected sarcophagi merely ornamented on the front with wave lines (*strigili*), as for example, the sarcophagus of Petronilla, a relative of the imperial Flavian family, which was found in the catacomb of Domitilla. The only decoration of this sarcophagus, outside of the wave lines, were figures of lions at the corners; on the upper edge of the sarcophagus was the inscription:—

AVRELIAE. PETRONILLAE. FILIAE. DVLCISSIMAE.

"To Aurelia Petronilla, sweetest daughter". There are still in the catacombs of Priscilla, Domitilla, and Prætextatus a number of sarcophagi, the most ancient of which show no Christian sculpture.

It was not until towards the end of the third century that Christian sarcophagi were ornamented with sculpture; at first the carvings were small figures of the Good Shepherd or an Orante placed where the *strigili* came together, or else Christian symbols were carved on the *tabella inscriptionis*, i. e. the flat slab closing the grave in which the epitaph was cut. A Christian stone-mason, probably, cut these Christian emblems on sarcophagi made in heathen workshops. The oldest sarcophagus showing Christian emblems carved in relief is one found in the Vatican quarter and now in the Lateran Museum; it has in excellent work, between two scenes of family life, an Orante, symbolical of the person buried, and the Good Shepherd. Another sarcophagus, also belonging to the time before Constantine and in the same museum, has as its chief decoration the story of Jonas; around this scene are grouped representations of Noe, the raising of Lazarus, Moses smiting the rock in the wilderness, a pastoral scene, and purely secular fishing scenes.

Christian sculpture on sarcophagi was not fully developed until about the middle of the fourth century; two sarcophagi of this period, that of Junius Bassus in the crypt of St. Peter's, and another similar in style, in the Lateran Museum, are the finest examples of early Christian carving. When it became customary, in the vicinity of the great basilicas, to build mausoleums or mortuary chapels, in which the sarcophagi were either sunk in the ground or exposed along the walls, sculpture as a Christian art developed rapidly. The growth was perhaps too rapid, for the comparatively small number of Christian sculptors could only meet the constantly increasing demand by over-hasty or half-finished work. To this period which extended from the second half of the fourth into the first decades of the fifth century belong by far the greater part of the sarcophagi found, most of which are in the Lateran Museum. The terrible misfortunes that befell Rome after it had been conquered and plundered by the Goths in 410 checked and finally put an end to carved decoration on Christian sarcophagi.

Naturally, the reliefs of the sarcophagi show the same fundamental ideas as are expressed in the paintings of the catacombs, and they are conveyed by the presentation of the same Biblical scenes. Plastic art, however, followed its own course in the development of the themes. This is evident from the large number of figures employed for the scenes,

and still more from the great variety of new subjects which were introduced into the domain of Christian art. When Adam and Eve are shown, it is not, as in the frescoes, merely with the tree and the serpent; in sculpture the second Adam, Christ, is represented standing between the first pair, offering to Adam a sheaf of grain and to Eve a goat, symbols of labour in the field and household occupations. While in the frescoes Moses stands alone when he smites the rock with his staff that the water may gush out, the sculptured relief includes the Jews quenching their thirst. The same difference is evident in the representation of the raising of Lazarus; whereas in sculpture the two sisters and some witnesses of the miracle fill out the scene, in the frescoes the figures are limited to the chief personages. The range of subjects is increased by the addition of other incidents from the Old Testament, e. g. the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, symbolic of baptism, and the gram of Christ enclosed in a victor's wreath; or Christ is represented seated on the throne of His heavenly glory in the midst of scenes from His Passion. The subjects chosen from the Passion are the prediction of the denial of Peter, the washing of the feet, the crowning with thorns, Pilate's judgment, the carrying of the Cross; of these scenes the one most frequently selected was Pilate's judgment, with the Old Testament prototype of the sacrifice of Isaac as contrasting relief. The manner in which the Church of the fourth century regarded the office of Peter is plain from the preference shown for representations of the *traditio legis* in which Peter, as the Moses of the New Covenant, receives from the hand of Christ (*Dominus legem dat*), the New Testament, the *Lex* or law that he was to proclaim and explain to Christians. The different scenes of the reliefs were separated from one another by arcades, or perhaps by trees, or, frequently they followed one another



Bronze Medallions of Sts. Peter and Paul
1. Second or Third Century. 2. Fourth Century

vision of Ezechiel, intended as an allusion to the resurrection of the body; more especially, however, by fresh scenes from the life of Christ. The carvings representing the manger, the scenes from the Passion, and the prominence given to the position and office of Peter in the Christian scheme of salvation, have no parallel in the paintings of the catacombs. Only once in the catacombs is the birth of Christ taken as the subject of a painting, and this is a fresco of a very late date in the catacomb of St. Sebastian. The reliefs on the sarcophagi show the little Child lying in the manger with the Virgin sitting near by on a knoll; behind her stands Joseph while the ox and ass are placed to one side, and above shines the star that guides the Wise Men. The Virgin is often represented sitting on a throne and holding the Child forward on her hands to receive the adoration of the Magi. As regards scenes from the Passion, Christians preferred, during the centuries of persecution, to represent the Saviour as the Son of God, full of miraculous power, as the conqueror of death and surrounded by His heavenly glory, rather than in His sufferings and death on the Cross. As Christianity advanced, however, in its conquest of heathenism, the faithful turned their attention more to the sufferings of Christ. Still, although sculpture ventured to present scenes from Christ's Passion, His humiliation was always accompanied by an allusion to His glory; at the foot of the empty Cross sleep the watchers by the grave, above the Cross is the monodirectly; the numerous incidents carved on large sarcophagi were often arranged in two rows, one over the other. In this disposition plastic art followed the model set by the mosaics in the great basilicas.

Although single scenes carved on the sarcophagi are not difficult to explain, yet where the composition is more complicated it is often not easy to discover the leading thought, as the artist was apt to run scenes together. An example will make this clear. On a sarcophagus in the Lateran Museum the following scenes succeed one another from left to right: the sacrifices of Cain and Abel; Peter led to execution; the triumph of the Cross; the beheading of Paul; Job. The question arises as to why the figures are thus arranged. In the death of Abel the judgment pronounced on the whole human race in Paradise was executed for the first time, while Job is the great herald of the Resurrection: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God" (xix, 25). The fulfilment of this hope is shown by the two Apostles and the glory of the risen Saviour. On many of the sarcophagi, however, especially those belonging to the period of the decline of Rome, the compositions lack a central thought and are arranged either according to the fancy of the sculptor or according to the command and desire of the purchaser.

Outside of the sarcophagi the most important early Christian sculpture is the life-size statue of St. Hip-

polytus, bishop and martyr, in the Lateran Museum, which was dug up near the catacomb bearing his name. The statue, of which only the lower half has been preserved, belongs to the middle of the third century. The figure of the Good Shepherd, also in the Lateran Museum, belongs probably to the time before Constantine; there are, besides, some other statuettes of the Good Shepherd, which are assigned to the second half of the fourth century. Of the work of the stone-masons and sculptors in the *cubicula* of the martyrs, and in the ornamentation of the altars, choir-screens, pulpits, Easter candlesticks, etc., of the great basilicas only scanty remains have been preserved. Early Christian sculpture reached its zenith in the first half of the fourth century when it joined in the triumph of the Christian religion as it emerged from the catacombs. Sculpture was employed at this period chiefly to ornament Christian graves with symbols of religious hope in the risen Christ.

VI. Small Objects Found in the Catacombs.—The ornaments which the early Christians put in the graves, the lamps and perfume bottles that they placed outside, the coins, pieces of glass, and rings, that were pressed, to distinguish the spot, into the fresh plaster that sealed the opening, all these remains of early Christianity are often of artistic and scientific value. Both the coins and the factory stamps on the tiles that sealed the grave are in many instances important clues to the age of a gallery in a catacomb, as well as to the date of the inscriptions and paintings that may be found in it.

Earthen lamps were set in the fresh plaster sealing the slab which closed the grave, or were placed on projecting mouldings in the *cubicula*, and these lamps in the early period were very simple. It was not before the middle of the fourth century that Christian potters began to ornament lamps with Christian pictures and symbols; these consisted mainly of the Biblical scenes already noted in the frescoes, e. g. Jonas, the Good Shepherd, Oranti, the Three Hebrew Children in the fiery furnace. In addition to these, other Biblical characters were introduced, e. g. Josue and Caleb carrying the great bunch of grapes, the three angels visiting Abraham, Christ carrying the Cross and adored by angels. A large number of the lamps of this period are ornamented with pictures of animals (the lion, peacock, cock, hare, fish), shells, trees, geometrical designs, for both Christian and heathen potters chose ornaments without a religious character in order to offend neither Christian nor pagan customers. A number of bronze lamps have also been preserved, many with three small chains for hanging; but metal lamps were more used in the homes than in the catacombs. The most important group of these small objects of early Christian times is that of the so-called "gilded glasses", or the bases of glass drinking-vessels with Biblical incidents, pictures of saints, or family scenes, designed in gold-leaf and laid between two layers of glass; most of these glasses belong to the fourth century. Such drinking-cups or glass mugs were popular as presents at baptisms and wedding anniversaries; they were also probably used at the love-feasts or *agapæ*, which, on the great feast days of the saints, were spread for the poor in the porticoes of the churches. This explains the great number of gilded glasses ornamented with the portraits of the two chief Apostles. The designs shown by such glasses vary greatly; they throw valuable light on the paintings, the ornamentation of the lamps, the carvings of the sarcophagi, and in many ways are of dogmatic importance. Thus the design of Moses smiting the rock in the wilderness and the water gushing forth bears the inscription "Petrus", a proof that the early Christians saw in the leader of the Israelites the prototype of Peter, who in this case is regarded as the mediator for the Christian springs of grace, and in the pictures of the Transmission of the Law (*Dominus legem dat*), as the mediator of the truths of salvation. When these gilded glass mugs or cups were broken, the bases containing in gold-leaf the religious pictures were set in the mortar sealing the grave. No whole glasses have been preserved, and these bases are only found in the catacombs.

Carving on a Sarcophagus in Museum of the German Campo Santo. The Nativity with the Magi bringing their Gifts

Much discussion has arisen over the ampullæ said to contain blood. These are small earthen pots or phials and vessels of glass containing a reddish-brown deposit on the inner side, that have been found secured in the outer surface of the mortar seal of large numbers of graves. This incrustation was held to be the blood of the martyrs, and each grave where such a phial was found was believed to be the burial place of a martyr; accordingly in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the bones discovered in these graves were presented, as the remains of martyrs, to the churches of Italy and beyond the Alps. This assumption was not shaken by the fact that many of these vessels were found on the graves of children, and that the statements as to the consul given in the epitaphs showed dates at the end of the fourth century when martyrdom was no longer suffered. It is now universally held by scholars that these vessels contained pungent essences intended to counteract the odour of the decay perceptible in the galleries of the catacombs. In the same way folded linen has been found inside the graves, which when burned still gives out a strong and agreeable scent; this linen must have been soaked with essences to attain the same end, i. e. to overcome the smell of decay.

1. FRACTIO PANIS, BEGINNING OF THIRD CENTURY
2. ORANTE (MOSAIC)
3. STATUETTE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD
4. GLASS BOWL, MOSES SMITING THE ROCK
5. CRYPT OF ST. CECILIA, CATACOMB OF ST. CALLISTUS

While in the last few decades the places of Christian burial of the fifth and sixth centuries in Egypt have yielded a large amount of well-preserved materials and woven fabrics, the garments and cloths in which the bodies in the Roman catacombs were wrapped have all mouldered away. It is only where the dead were enveloped in cloth worked with gold threads that the threads have been partially preserved, as in the case of St. Hyacinth. De Rossi found a body in the catacomb of Prætextatus, and one in the catacomb of St. Callistus that had been wrapped in cloth with gold threads. Within recent years a grave was discovered in the catacomb of Priscilla where the cloths are still preserved in which the bones lie, but it is rightly feared that they will fall to dust when brought into the air. Once a year

LAMPS FROM CATACOMBS, ONE SHOWING PEACOCK, SYMBOL OF THE SOUL, DRINKING FROM A CHALICE WITH HANDLES

at St. Peter's a large carpet is exhibited that has sewn into it the so-called *coltre*, or cloth, in which, it is supposed, martyrs were buried. Taking its genuineness for granted, this cloth is the only woven fabric now existing at Rome which has been preserved from the time of the primitive Roman Church.

VII. CATACOMBS OUTSIDE OF ROME.—It was impossible to lay out subterranean passages in the Mons Vaticanus because the soil there is not of volcanic formation, but consists of alluvial deposits. Consequently there is no catacomb around the grave of St. Peter; the faithful who wished to have their last resting-place near the tomb of the Apostle were buried close to the surface of the ground. Such cemeteries were probably laid out wherever the formation was not suitable for the excavation of subterranean passages, at the same time such *areæ* or cemeteries of the Christians had no protection against desecration by a maddened mob. Where the soil allowed it, therefore, underground cemeteries were excavated. A number of small catacombs lay at a short distance from Rome, e. g. those of St. Alexander on the Via Nomentana, and St. Senator at Albano; the former has some importance on account of its epitaphs, the latter on account of its paintings. The town of Chiusi in central Italy has a catacomb called St. Mustiola, Bolsena that of St. Christina. At Naples the catacombs of St. Januarius preserve paintings, e. g. of Adam and Eve, belonging to the best period of early Christian art. Sicily has numerous catacombs, especially in the neighbourhood of Syracuse; the museum of Syracuse, besides epitaphs, lamps, and other objects, contains a very beautiful early Christian sarcophagus. There are also several small catacombs on the Island of Malta, and others in Sardinia, the latter having beautiful frescoes of the fourth century. In 1905 a large catacomb was discovered in North Africa near Hadrumetum in which the graves as a rule had not been opened, but they are poor in epitaphs, paintings, and small objects. Lamps are most frequently found. The Greek monogram of Christ, often found on the Roman lamps of the fourth century, is also met on the lamps outside Rome, and in some places is the only sure proof of the Christian character of the burial-place.

For bibliography see CEMETERY, under *Early Roman Christian Cemeteries*.

ANTON DE WAAL.

Catafalque, derived from the Italian word *catafalco*, literally means a scaffold or elevation, but in its strictly liturgical sense the word is employed to designate the cenotaph-like erection which is used at the exequial offices of the Church, and takes the place of the bier whenever the remains are not present. It is covered with a black cloth or pall, on which there is a cross either of white or some other colour (De Herdt, Praxis Sac. Lit., II, 328). The catafalque is usually placed immediately outside the sanctuary, and is the centre of the ceremonies of that part of the exequial office known as the absolution, receiving the same attention as the corpse would if present. Hence it is that lights burn around the catafalque during the function, and it is aspersed with holy water and incensed. During the absolution at the catafalque the cross-bearer should always stand between it and the door of the church, the celebrant or officiant being at the other end, between it and the sanctuary. When it is not possible for any reason to have a catafalque, its place may be supplied by a square piece of black cloth (*pannus niger*), which should be laid in front of the lowest step of the altar, and be sprinkled with holy water and incensed at the proper time by the officiant. Formerly the word was used to designate the bier or structure on which the corpse rested. No flowers should be used in connexion with it, but it is allowable in the case of deceased prelates to mount their insignia to show the dignity, and in the case of nobles to display the family coat of arms, together with coronets, orders, and other insignia, to show the rank of the deceased. A very notable monument of this kind was that erected to the memory of Michelangelo by his brother artists on the occasion of his funeral in the Church of Santa Croce, Florence.

Cæremoniale Episcoporum (Rome, 1902), 197; VAN DER STAPPEN, *Cæremoniale* (Mechlin, 1901): VAVASSEUR, *Le cérémonial romain* (Paris, 1876), I, 500 seq.: DE HERDT, *Praxis Sacræ Liturgiæ* (Mechlin, 1900), II, s.v. *Absolutio Def.*

PATRICK MORRISROE.

Catalani (CATALANO, CATALANUS), GIUSEPPE, a Roman liturgist of the eighteenth century, member of the Oratory of San Girolamo della Carità (Hieronymite), famous for his correct editions of the chief liturgical books of the Roman Church, which are still in habitual use, and which he enriched with scholarly commentaries illustrative of the history, rubrics, and canon law of the Roman Liturgy. Among these are the "Pontificale Romanum" (3 vols. in fol., Rome, 1738–40, reprinted at Paris, 1850; re-edited by Mühlbauer, Augsburg, 1878), with a learned introduction and notes, and based on the best manuscripts; "Cæremoniale episcoporum" (2 vols. in fol., Rome, 1747, with copperplate engravings; reprinted at Paris, 1860); "Sacrarum Cæremoniarum sive rituum ecclesiasticorum S. R. Ecclesiæ libri tres" etc. (1 vol. in fol., Rome, 1750–51); "Rituale Romanum Benedicti XIV jussu editum et auctum" etc. (Rome, 1757, 2 vols. in fol.). Catalani is also the author of works on the history, series, duties, and privileges of two important curial offices: "De Magistro Sacri Palatii libri duo" (Rome, 1751) and "De Secretario S. Congreg. Indicis libri duo" (Rome, 1751). We owe him also annotated editions of two works much used for the spiritual formation of the Catholic

clergy: the letter of St. Jerome "ad Nepotianum suum" (Rome, 1740) and St. John Chrysostom's work on the priesthood (De Sacerdotio, Rome, 1740). His (rare) historical treatise on the reading of the Gospels at Mass, its origin, ancient usages, etc. ("De codice Evangelii", Rome, 1733; see "Acta erudit. Lips.", 1735, 497–99) is yet highly appreciated by all liturgists. He belongs also among the best historians of the œcumenical councils by reason of his edition of their decrees, which Father Hurter calls a very learned (*plane docta*) work, "Sacrosancta concilia œcumenica commentariis illustrata" (Rome, 1736–49). Finally, he offers no slight interest to the ecclesiastical scholars of the New World because of his new edition (Rome, 1753, 6 vols. in fol.) of Cardinal d'Aguirre's "Collectio maxima conciliorum Hispaniæ et Novi Orbis", i. e Mexico and South America (first published at Rome, in 1693).

HURTER, *Nomenclator;* THALHOFER, *Liturgik*, (Freiburg, 1883), I, 102; BUCHBERGER, *Kirchl. Handlex.* (Munich, 1906), s. v.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Catalonia, a principality within the Spanish Monarchy, occupying an area of 12,414 square miles in the north-east corner of the Iberian Peninsula. The name is derived either from the compound *Goth-Alania*, referring to the occupation of that region by the Goths and Alans, or from *Gothaland*, or from *Catalanos*, supposed to have been the name of an indigenous people identical with Ptolemy's *Catalauni*, or, according to others again, from Otger Catalo, a hero of the Eastern Pyrenees who vanquished the Saracens about the year 756. The principality forms a right-angled triangle, of which the least side lies along the Eastern Pyrenees, the greater leg of the right angle forming the boundary of Aragon, while the hypotenuse of the triangle is represented by the Mediterranean coastline. Thus Catalonia is bounded on the north by France (the ancient province of Roussillon) and the little independent republic of Andorra, on the west by Aragon, on the south-west by Valencia, and on the east by the Mediterranean. Its surface slopes gently from the Pyrenees down to the sea-coast on the one side and the basin of the Mediterranean on the other, the eastern portion being drained directly into the Mediterranean by the Ter and Llobregat rivers, the western by the Noguera and Segre into the Ebro. Of these rivers, only the Ebro is really navigable in any part of its course, though the Segre is used as a waterway for timber and the produce of the upland country.

According to the census of 1900, Catalonia had a population of 1,960,620—an average of about 157.25 to the square mile. Its climate, somewhat cold in the north-east, is generally very temperate, the olive and fig being cultivated throughout, and the orange in the maritime regions, which compare in beauty with the most celebrated portions of Greece and Italy.

HISTORY.—Peopled, according to the most probable opinion, by Iberian races, Catalonia was from the earliest ages invaded by foreign settlers, the Greeks in particular founding the colonies of Rhodon (Rosas) and Emporion (Ampurias) on the beautiful Gulf of Rosas. The Carthaginians left no traces of their presence in Catalonia, although Hannibal marched across it; but the Romans, conquerors of Carthage, making themselves masters of the country, founded its civilization and its language. The Catalan language, a neo-Latin dialect, differs from Castilian chiefly in the absence of doubled vowels and in the suppression of the unaccented syllables which follow an accent (e. g. *temps*, for Castilian *tiempo*, "time"; *foc* for *fuego*, "fire"). Catalonia forms part of the Roman *Hispania Tarraconensis* and *Citerior*, and the country is still full of Roman remains. It next formed the first State established by the Goths in Spain, Astolfo having set up his court at Barcelona. When the Arabs took possession of Spain the lot of the Catalans was particularly hard, since their country, lying directly in the path which the Emirs followed on their victorious expeditions into Gaul, found it impossible to begin such a struggle for independence as the Asturians and the Aragonese had begun. But after the conquest of the Mohammedans by Charles Martel, and their expulsion from Gallia Narbonensis, the Catalans could lift up their heads among the recesses of the Pyrenees, where they gathered under the leadership of Quintillian, an independent chief in the district of Montgrony. Soon Charlemagne began his expeditions into Catalonia (778), conquering Gerona, Barcelona, Ausona (the modern Vich), and Urgel. Louis the Pious, son and successor of Charlemagne, formally undertook the conquest of Catalonia, which, under the name of Marca Hispanica (the Spanish March), he entrusted to Borrel. This district was ruled by dependent counts from 801 to 877, and in the latter year this dignity was made hereditary by the Diet of Quercy, Wilfrid the Hairy beginning a dynasty of counts who in a short time became independent. Wilfrid set the boundaries of his dominions at the rivers Segre and Llobregat, and founded the monasteries of Ripoll and Montserrat, the two centres of Catalan national life.

Wilfrid was succeeded by Borrel I, Suñer, and Borrel II, in whose time Almansor took and sacked Barcelona (985). In this period we find Catalonia divided into various countships—Barcelona, Ausona, Urgel, Ampurdán, Perelada, Besalú, Gerona, etc.—now united, now separated, until the time of Berenger III. Ramón Berenger I, the Old (1035–1076), published the *Usatges* (Customs), the first civil code of the Reconquest (1071), and left the throne to his two sons, of whom Ramón Berenger II, called the Fratricide, because he was believed to have put his brother to death, was vanquished in an ordeal by combat, and journeyed to the Holy Land in penance for his crime. Ramón Berenger III, the Great, married Dulcia, heiress of Provence, united the two countships, and entered upon the Aragonese policy of intervention in Italian affairs. Ramón Berenger IV, the Saint, married Petronilla, daughter and heiress of Ramiro the Monk, thus bringing about the union (1137) of Aragon and Catalonia (see CASTILE AND ARAGON); he also finished the reconquest of Catalonia, capturing the cities of Tortosa and Lerida. After Alfonso-Ramón, who succeeded to the kingdom and the countship in 1162, the histories of Catalonia and of Aragon are one. Especially worthy of note here are the conquests of Valencia (1238) and the Balearic Isles (1229), won chiefly by Jaimé the Conqueror. The latter were peopled mostly with Catalans, as the island dialects prove, the Majorcan still preserving a base of archaic Catalan, while in the Valencian there is an influx of Aragonese. The Order of Mercy, for the redemption of captives, originally an order of knighthood, was founded on Catalan soil, in 1223, by St. Peter Nolasco and St. Raymund of Peñafort. In 1225, Philip the Bold, King of France, laid siege to Gerona and was defeated on the Coll de les Panises. An expedition of Catalan and Aragonese allies, summoned to the Levant by the Byzantine Emperor Andronicus Palæologus, and commanded by Roger de Flor, founded, in 1313, the Latin Duchies of Athens and Neo Patra. Lastly, it was with Catalan sailors and fleets that the kings of Aragon, intervening in the affairs of Italy, possessed themselves of the Kingdom of Sicily (1282) and Naples (1420).

Castilian influence began to make itself felt in Catalonia from the time when the Castilian dynasty, in the person of Fernando I, of Antequera, ascended the throne of Aragon. The first important collision between Catalonia and her Castilian rulers had its origin in the persecution which Juan II, the husband of Doña Juana Enriquez, carried on against his son,

the Prince of Viana, who was generally beloved by the Catalans. From this resulted a war lasting twelve years. The marriage of Fernando (Ferdinand) II of Aragon with Isabel of Castile established Spanish unity and Castilian preponderance, to which, also, the discovery of America in the name of Castile, together with the diversion of commerce from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and the consequently diminishing economic importance of Barcelona and other ports on that coast, largely contributed. Catalonia no doubt played an important part in the direction of Spanish policies in Italy, and the principality lived in a state of contentment under the first three Austrian monarchs. But the misgovernment of Philip IV provoked an uprising in Catalonia (Feast of Corpus Christi, 1640), and the insurgents named Louis XIII of France Count of Barcelona. This insurrection, however, was suppressed by the Castilians. In the War of the Succession Catalonia embraced the cause of the Archduke of Austria against Philip V, who punished the Catalans (1713) by abolishing their ancient *fueros*, or constitutional rights. Catalonia was the first region of Spain to rise against the Napoleonic tyranny, and overthrew the French in 1808.

The Catalan Renascence.—A revival of the local spirit, beginning with the cultivation of the Catalan language, resulted in the birth of a considerable literature during the nineteenth century. In 1859 the Floral Games were revived, and, thanks to this institution, the study of Catalan history and literature has been so fostered as to arouse, first among the literary classes and then among the masses of the people, new aspirations for a Catalan autonomy within the Spanish monarchy. The literary movement has, indeed, developed into a political, and the Catalans, bound together by one common aspiration, are demanding of the Spanish monarchy the restitution of their ancient rights.

Actual Conditions.—What was anciently the Countship of Barcelona is now the Principality of Catalonia, divided into the four provinces of Barcelona, Tarragona, Lerida, and Gerona.

The Province of Barcelona, with an area of 2965 square miles, includes 327 municipalities. Its principal city, Barcelona (pop. 525,977), beautifully situated between the sea and a chain of verdant mountains, possesses a port which is considered one of the best on the Mediterranean, both by nature and by its recent improvements. The city combines the attractions of a great modern metropolis with the interesting associations of a long history, the presence of so many magnificent old buildings seeming to stimulate modern enterprise in the same direction. (See Barcelona.) Many smaller cities—e. g. Sabadell, Tarrasa, Manresa (see Ignatius Loyola, Saint), Reus—depend industrially on Barcelona, and the banks of the Llobregat and the Ter are bordered with paper-, spinning-, and other mills, which utilize the motive power of the numerous waterfalls.

The 184 municipalities of Tarragona aggregate 2503 square miles in area. The province produces wine, vinegar, and fruits in great abundance. Its capital, Tarragona (pop. 25,000), was selected by the Romans for its exceptionally fine situation upon a slight eminence, the sea on one side, and a very fertile fruit-producing district on the other; in spite of the excellence of its harbour, its importance has decreased through the transfer of industries to Reus and of commerce to Salou, a little farther south. Historically, Tarragona is one of the world's most interesting cities. Tortosa, an ancient episcopal see, is also commercially famous for its vinegar.

Lerida, the largest, but the least wealthy, province of Catalonia, has an area of 4685 square miles, divided into 324 municipal districts. Its resources are agricultural, chiefly fruits and timber. Besides Lerida, the capital (the ancient *Ilerda*), the most important cities of this province are: Cervera, in ancient times the seat of a university celebrated for its theological faculty, Seo de Urgel, and Solsona.

The Province of Gerona (the ancient *Marca Hispanica*), with an area of 2261 square miles, divided into 249 municipal districts, has a generally mountainous surface, which produces large quantities of cork of the best quality. Its long coastline, with numerous small harbours, is excellently adapted for both fishing and navigation. Its principal cities are: Gerona, the capital (pop. about 15,000), a city of great historical importance, famous for its remarkable variety of mineral waters; Figueras, with its once redoubtable fortress; Olot, situated in a volcanic region abounding in springs.

In the judiciary department of its government Catalonia is served by a single district court (*audiencia*), that of Barcelona, with criminal tribunals in the four provincial capitals, Barcelona having seventeen courts of first instance (five of them in the capital itself), Tarragona eight, Lerida eight, and Gerona six. In the military administration, the Captaincy-General of Catalonia is one of the fourteen military districts of Spain, and is divided into four military governments. It belongs to the naval department of Cartagena, and has stations at Barcelona, Tarragona, Tortosa, Mataró, and Palamós. It has only one university, that of Barcelona, with four provincial and two local institutes (Figueras and Reus).

Ecclesiastical Divisions.—The principality of Catalonia forms the ecclesiastical province of Tarragona, the archiepiscopal see of which is, according to tradition, one of the most ancient in Spain, dating from the first century of Christianity. The suffragan dioceses are Barcelona (a see claiming Apostolic origin), Gerona, Lerida, Solsona, Tortosa, Urgel, and Vich. The following table gives briefly the most complete statistics obtainable of religious communities in the Province of Tarragona:—

Dioceses	Religious Communities				
	Men	*Women*			
		Cloistered	Not cloistered		
			Colleges	Houses	Benevolent institutions
Tarragona	2	9	..	..	2
Barcelona	19	8	..	39	12
Gerona	2	7	..	..	..
Lerida	5	6	..	..	13
Solsona	8	..	19	24	10
Tortosa	5	13	19	6	12
Urgel	6	3	28	33	4
Vich	8	..	..	5	..

(See also separate articles on Tarragona, Barcelona, Gerona, and the other dioceses.)

Bofarull, *Historia crítica y eclesiástica de Cataluña* (Barcelona); Barroso, *Anuario eclesiástico de España* (Madrid, 1904); *Reseña geográfica . . . por la dirección general del Instituto Geográfico y Estadístico* (Madrid, 1888); *El Principado de Cataluña* in *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, XL, 261.

Ramón Ruiz Amado.

Catania, Archdiocese of (Catanensis). Catania, a seaport and capital of the province of the same name in Sicily, is situated on the eastern side of Mount Etna in a very fertile region. It was known to the ancients as Catana or Catina. Founded (c. 730 B. C.) by Chalcidian emigrants from Naxos, Catania was soon a flourishing city. Hiero I, King of Syracuse, in 476 B. C. transported these first settlers to Leontini (now Lentini) and filled Catania with Syracusans and Peloponnesians. The former inhabitants attempted to regain possession of the city, but were driven back by Dionysius and Agathocles. Catania accepted the Roman yoke during the First Punic War, and after the fall of the Roman Empire shared the

fate of Sicily. The city has suffered much from the eruptions of Etna. Most of its old monuments are buried under the lava. According to legend the Faith was first preached there by St. Beryllus, an immediate Disciple of Christ. During the persecution of Decius the virgin St. Agatha suffered martyrdom. At the same period or a little later the Bishop of Catania was St. Everus mentioned in the acts of the martyrs of Leontini (303). This same year is marked by the martyrdom of the Deacon Euplius and others. Domninus, Bishop of Catania, was present at the Council of Ephesus (431); another bishop, Fortunatus, was twice sent with Ennodius by Pope Hormisdas to Emperor Anastasius I to effect the union of the Eastern Churches with Rome (514, 516). Bishops Leo and Junius appear in the correspondence of St. Gregory the Great. In 730 Bishop Jacobus suffered martyrdom for his defence of images. Another bishop, St. Leo I, was known as a wonder-worker (*thaumaturgus*). Bishop Euthymius was at first an adherent of Photius, but in the Eighth Gen-

CATHEDRAL, CATANIA

eral Council approved the restoration of Ignatius as patriarch. Among other bishops of Catania may be noted, Giuliano della Rovere, later pope under the name of Julius II. The cathedral was destroyed by the earthquake of 22 January, 1693, in which thousands of people met their death. The church *del Santo Carcere* contains beautiful sculptures of the eleventh century and a fine painting of St. Agatha by Bernardino Negro. The church of San Nicolò possesses fine paintings and a magnificent organ of 2916 pipes, built under Abbot Donato del Piano. The adjoining Benedictine monastery is famous for its cloister, library, and rich collection of paintings. In the ninth century, while still a Greek city, Catania became suffragan to Monreale. In 1860 it was made an archiepiscopal see, immediately subject to the Holy See. The archdiocese contains 295,300 inhabitants, with 43 parishes, 16 religious houses of men and 17 of women, and 47 educational institutions.

The University of Catania was founded by Pope Eugenius IV in 1444 with the co-operation of Alfonso, King of Aragon and Sicily. The papal Bull of erection, besides establishing the usual faculties on the model of Bologna, authorized the teaching of Greek and Latin. Funds for the endowment were provided by the municipality of Catania and by royal grants. The privileges of the university were confirmed in 1458 and 1494. It comprises at present the Faculties of Law, Medicine, Natural Sciences, Philosophy and Letters, with 105 professors and 1100 students. The library, founded in 1755 by the Benedictine abbot, Vito Amico, contains 120,000 volumes.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 633–42; FERRARA, *Storia di Catania sino alla fine del secolo XVIII* (ibid., 1829); *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), s. v.

U. BENIGNI.

Catanzaro (CATACIUM), DIOCESE OF, suffragan of Reggio. Catanzaro is the capital of the province of Calabria, Italy. The date of the erection of the see is uncertain; it may have been 1122, when Callistus II transferred to Catanzaro the See of Taverna. The diocese has a population of 85,000, with 48 parishes, 97 churches and chapels, 116 secular and 4 regular priests, 1 religious house of men, and 5 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 181; VINCENZO AMATO, *Memorie storiche di Catanzaro* (Naples, 1670).

U. BENIGNI.

Cataphrygians. See MONTANISTS.

Catechetics. See DOCTRINE, CHRISTIAN.

Catechisms. See DOCTRINE, CHRISTIAN.

Catechumen, in the early Church, was the name applied to one who had not yet been initiated into the sacred mysteries, but was undergoing a course of preparation for that purpose. The word occurs in Gal., vi, 6: "Let him that is instructed in the word [ὁ κατηχούμενος, *is qui catechizatur*] communicate to him that instructeth him [τῷ κατηχοῦντι, *ei qui catechizat*] in all good things". Other parts of the verb κατηχεῖν occur in I Cor., xiv, 19; Luke, i, 4; Acts, xviii, 24.

I.—As the acceptance of Christianity involved belief in a body of doctrine and the observance of the Divine law ("teach, make disciples, scholars of them" "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you", Matt., xxviii, 20), it is clear that some sort of preliminary instruction must always have been given to the converts. In Apostolic times this would vary according as these were Jews or pagans, and was naturally simple in character and short in duration. When, however, the churches came to be organized, the instruction and probation would be longer and more elaborate. Thus, as early as the date of the Epistle to the Galatians (56-57?) we meet with the mention of catechist and catechumen; but we cannot infer from this that the full regulations were already in force. It was rather the danger of apostasy, or even betrayal in time of persecution which gave rise to special precautions as to admission into the Church. To avert this danger a careful intellectual and moral preparation was needed: intellectual, to guard against the arguments of the pagan philosophers; moral, to give strength against the torments of the persecutors. This is the "trial of faith, more precious than gold which is tried by the fire" of which St. Peter speaks (I Pet. i, 7). Hence we find in St. Justin's first Apology (c. lxi, P. G., VI, 420), distinct reference to the twofold preparation and also to the more elaborate rites of initiation: "Those who are persuaded and believe in the truth of our teachings [διδασκόμενα] and sayings undertake to live accordingly; they are taught to ask, with fasting, the remission of their sins; we also praying and fasting with them. Then they are led by us to a place where there is water, and they are regenerated in the same way as we have been regenerated" etc. By the end of the second century we find the catechumenate in force in all its main lines. Tertullian reproaches the heretics with disregarding it; among them, he says, "one does not know which is the catechumen and which the faithful, all alike come [to the Mysteries], all hear the same discourses, and say the same prayers" (*quis catechumenus, quis fidelis incertum est; pariter adeunt, pariter audiunt, pariter orant*); "Catechumens are initiated before they are instructed" (*ante sunt perfecti catechumeni quam edocti.*—"De Præscr.", xli, P. L., II, 56). A little later we read of Origen being in charge of the catechetical school (τοῦ τῆς κατηχήσεως διδασκαλείου) at Alexandria (Euseb., Hist., Eccl., VI, iii). It is not necessary to quote further authorities for the third and fourth centuries, the age in which the catechumenate flourished in its full form. During the years of persecution the necessity of the institution was realized, and in the

intervals of peace the arrangements were more and more elaborated. When, however, Christianity finally triumphed over paganism, the reasons for retaining the catechumenate became less urgent. The majority were born of Christian families, and so were brought up in the Faith, and were in no danger of falling into paganism. Moreover, with the increasing development of the doctrine of grace and original sin, the practice of early baptism became the rule. Further, the conversion of the barbarians precluded the possibility of submitting them to any prolonged period of preparation. Hence the catechumenate gradually fell into disuse, and has merely left traces in the existing rites of baptism and reception in the Church. Still, even now, an informal species of the old regulations should be observed in the case of grown up converts.

II.—The catechumens were divided into mere inquirers (*audientes*, ἀκροώμενοι) and catechumens properly so-called; and in each stage there was a threefold preparation—catechetical, ascetical, and liturgical.

(1) If a pagan wished to become a Christian he was given some elementary instruction in the fundamental doctrines and practices of the Church (see DOCTRINE, CHRISTIAN). He had to show by his conduct that he was in earnest as to the step he was about to take. So far, he was only in the stage of inquiry, and was not counted as a Christian at all. He was allowed to be present at the first part of the Mass, but he was dismissed immediately after the sermon.

(2) As soon as his instructors were satisfied that he was likely to persevere, the inquirer was promoted to the rank of catechumen. He was now entitled to be called a Christian, though he was not looked upon as one of the "faithful". "Ask a man, 'Are you a Christian?' He answers, 'No', if he is a pagan or a Jew. But if he says, 'Yes', ask him again, 'Are you a Catechumen or one of the Faithful?'" (St. Aug., "In Joan.", xliv, 2, P. L., XXXV, 1714).

In the early ages the rites of admission to the catechumenate were quite simple, but in the course of time they became more elaborate. At first the candidates were merely signed on the forehead with the sign of the cross, or hands were imposed on them with suitable prayers; and sometimes both ceremonies were used. Thus St. Augustine, in his model of an instruction to an inquirer, says: "He should be asked whether he believes what he has heard, and is ready to observe it. If he answers in the affirmative, he should be solemnly signed and treated according to the custom of the Church" (*solemniter signandus est et ecclesiæ more tractandus.*—De Cat. Rud., xxvi, P. L., XL, 344). Eusebius mentions the imposition of hands and prayer (Vita Constantini, iv. 61, P. G., XX, 1213). Among the Latins, and especially at Rome, breathing, accompanied with a form of exorcism and placing in the mouth a little exorcised salt, was employed in addition to the signing with the cross and imposition of hands. Other rites were the opening of the ears (Mark, vii, 34) and anointing. See Martène, "De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus" (Rouen, 1700), I, where several *ordines ad faciendum Christianum*, or *catechumenum*, are given; Chardon, "Hist. des Sacrements", in Migne's "Theol. Cursus Completus", Paris, 1874, XX, 31 sqq., 149 sqq.

Catechumens when present at Mass were not dismissed with the inquirers, but were detained while a special prayer was recited over them. They then also withdrew before the Mass of the Faithful began. The instruction which they received is described in the article DOCTRINE, CHRISTIAN. As to their manner of living, they had to abstain from all immoral and pagan practices, and give proof by their virtue and works of penance that they were worthy to begin a more immediate preparation for baptism. The duration of this stage was not fixed. In general it lasted long enough to test thoroughly the dispositions of the catechumen. The Council of Elvira alludes to the custom of making it last two years, and the civil law fixed it at this (Justinian, Novel. cxliv). But the causes which ultimately led to the abolition of the catechumenate (see above) tended also to shorten it. Thus the Council of Agde (506) allowed even Jews (with regard to whom special caution was required) to receive baptism after eight months' preparation; and later on, St. Gregory reduced the term to forty days. On the other hand the duration of the catechumenate might be extended, and the catechumen might be reduced to the ranks of the *audientes*, if he was guilty of grave crimes (fifth canon of Neocæsarea; fourteenth canon of Nicæa). What seems extraordinary to our modern notions is that the catechumens themselves put off their baptism for many years, sometimes even till their last illness. Constantine the Great is an example of this extreme delay. St. Ambrose, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. John Chrysostom were not baptized till after their thirtieth year. A question much discussed was the fate of those who died in this stage. As we have seen, they were looked upon as Christians, but not as belonging to the "faithful", because the cleansing waters of baptism had not been poured over their souls. St. Gregory describes his terror during a storm at sea lest he might be taken away unbaptized (Carmen de Vitâ Suâ, 324 sqq., P. G., XXXVII, 994). However, St. Ambrose has no doubt about the salvation of Valentinian the Younger, who had asked for baptism, but had died before the saint could reach him ("De obitu Valentini.", n. 51, P. L., XVI, 1374). Hence the common teaching was that the defect of baptism might be supplied by desire. This was especially held with regard to those who were in the later stage of immediate preparation, to be described presently. On this whole question see Franzelin, "De Ecclesiâ" (Rome, 1887), 414 sqq.

(3) When the catechumens had completed this stage of preparation and trial, their names were inscribed among the *competentes*, i. e. those seeking to be baptized. The Greeks called them φωτιζόμενοι. This might mean that they were being enlightened in the mysteries of the faith; or, more probably, that they were being baptized, for the Greeks commonly spoke of baptism as "light" (cf. Heb., vi, 4; x, 32). In this advanced stage they were sometimes called *fideles* by anticipation (e. g. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat., I, 4; V, 1; P. G., XXXIII, 373, 505). Lent was the time when the threefold preparation—instructive, ascetical, and liturgical—was carried on. The ascetical preparation was severe. Prayer and fasting naturally formed part of it; but the *competentes* were also exhorted to keep silence as far as possible and, if they were married, to observe continence (St. Justin, "Apol.", lxi, P. G., VI, 420; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat., i, sub fin., P. G., XXXIII, col. 376; St. August., "De Fide et Op.", ix, P. L., XL, 205). Confession was also enjoined (Tertullian, "De Bapt.", xx, P. L., I, 1222 where he quotes Matt., iii, 6: "they were baptized, confessing their sins". See also St. Cyril, ib.; Eusebius, "Vita Const.", iv, 61). The instruction given at this time is described in the article DOCTRINE, CHRISTIAN, where an account of St. Cyril's "catecheses" will be found.

The rites connected with this stage were elaborate. There are considerable survivals of them in the first part of the order of baptism and also traces in the Lenten Masses, especially the Mass of the Wednesday of the fourth week. The assemblies were called "scrutinies" (examination and presentation of the candidates), and were seven in number. At the first scrutiny the candidates gave in their names. After the collect of the Mass, and before the lessons, the ceremony of exorcism was performed over them. This was done at all the scrutinies except the last, by

the exorcists, and then the priest signed them with the Cross and laid hands upon them. It is interesting to note that the words at present used in baptism "Ergo, maledicte diabole" etc. belonged to the exorcism, and the words "Æternam ac justissimam pietatem" etc. belonged to the laying on of hands. The third scrutiny was of a specially solemn character, for it was then that the candidates received the Gospel, the Symbol (Creed), and the Our Father. Each of these was accompanied by a short explanation. For example, St. Augustine has left four sermons (lvi-lix) "De Oratione Dominicâ ad competentes" (P. L., XXXVIII, 377 sqq.), and three on the delivery of the Symbol (ibid., 1058 sqq.). In our present Missal the Mass of the Wednesday of the fourth week in Lent has a lesson in addition to the ordinary Epistle, or rather lesson. The former is taken from the thirty-sixth chapter of Ezechiel, the latter from the fiftieth of Isaias; and both (together with the Introit and the two Graduals, and the Gospel, the healing of the man born blind, John, ix) have obvious reference to the "great scrutiny". The seventh scrutiny took place on Holy Saturday, apart from the Mass, as indeed there was formerly no Mass for that day. The priest himself performed the exorcism and the ceremony of the Ephphetha (Mark, vii). Then followed the anointing on the breast and back. The candidates pronounced the threefold renunciation of Satan, and recited the Creed. The actual initiation (baptism, confirmation, and Communion) took place at the Paschal Mass, at which the neophytes assisted for the first time, being now no longer mere catechumens. But until the Sunday after Easter they were considered as "infants", receiving further instruction especially on the sacraments which had lately been conferred upon them (see DOCTRINE, CHRISTIAN). Finally, on Low Sunday (*Dominica in Albis depositis*) when the Introit of the Mass speaks of the "new-born babes" (I Pet., ii, 2), they put off their white garments, and were henceforth counted among the regular "faithful".

FUNK (ed.), *Didache* (Tübingen, 1887); ST. JUSTIN, *Apol. I*, in *P. G.*, VI, 328 sqq.; TERTULLIAN, *De Baptismo*, *P. L.*, I, 1197 sqq.; ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catecheses*, *P. G.*, XXXIII, 369 sqq.; ST. AUGUSTINE, *De Catech. Rudibus*, *P. L.*, XL, 309; *Sermones ad Competentes*, lvi–lix, *P. L.*, XXXVIII, 377 sqq.; *In Traditione et Redditione Symboli*, *P. L.*, XXXVIII, 1058 sqq.; MARTÈNE, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus* (Rouen, 1700), tom. I, 29 sqq.; CHARDON, *Hist. des Sacrements* in MIGNE, *Cursus Theologiæ Completus*, XX; DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1898), IX; THURSTON, *Lent and Holy Week* (London, 1904), 169 sqq.; KÜPPER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Katechumenat;* BAREILLE in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v. *Catechumenat.*

T. B. SCANNELL.

Categorical Imperative, a term which originated in Immanuel Kant's ethics. It expresses the moral law as ultimately enacted by reason and demanding obedience from mere respect for reason. Kant in his ethics takes his point of departure from the concept of a good will: "Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world or out of it that can be called good without qualification except a good will." But that will alone is good which acts not only conformably to duty, but also from duty. And again the will acts from duty when it is determined merely by respect for the law, independently of inclination, and without regard to the agreeableness or the consequences of the action prescribed. Therefore the first fundamental principle of morality is: "Let the law be the sole ground or motive of thy will." Kant further finds that the law is capable of inspiring respect by reason of its universality and necessity, and hence lays down the following general formula of the moral law: "Act so that the maxim [determining motive of the will] may be capable of becoming a universal law for all rational beings." Necessity and universality, he declares, cannot be derived from experience, whose subject matter is always particular and contingent, but from the mind alone, from the cognitive forms innate in it. Hence the moral law originates in pure reason and is enunciated by a synthetical judgment a priori—a priori because it has its reason, not in experience, but in the mind itself; synthetical, because it is formed not by the analysis of a conception, but by an extension of it. Reason, dictating the moral law, determines man's actions. Yet it may do so in a twofold manner. It either controls conduct infallibly, its dictates being actually responded to without conflict or friction—and in this case there is no obligation necessary or conceivable, because the will is of itself so constituted as to be in harmony with the rational order—or it is resisted and disobeyed, or obeyed only reluctantly, owing to contrary impulses coming from sensibility. In this case determination by the law of reason has the nature of a command or imperative, not of a *hypothetical* imperative, which enjoins actions only as a means to an end and implies a merely conditional necessity, but of a *categorical* imperative, which enjoins actions for their own sake and hence involves absolute necessity. While for God, Whose will is perfectly holy, the moral law cannot be obligatory, it is for man, who is subject to sensuous impulses, an imperative command. Accordingly, the categorical imperative is the moral law enacted by practical reason, obligatory for man, whose sensibility is discordant from the rational order, and demanding obedience from respect for its universality and necessity.

Kant essays to prove the existence of a categorical imperative a priori from the idea of the will of a rational being. Will is conceived as a faculty determining itself to action according to certain laws. Now it is only an end that serves as an objective principle for the self-determination of the will, and only an end in itself that serves as a universal principle holding for all rational beings. But man, and indeed every rational being, is an end in himself, a person, and must in all actions, whether they regard self or others, be respected as such. Thus arises a supreme practical principle, objective and universal, derived not from experience, but from human nature itself; a principle from which, as the highest practical ground, all laws of the will are capable of being derived. This, then, is the categorical imperative, to be enunciated in the following terms: *Act so as to use humanity, whether in your own person or in others, always as an end, and never merely as a means.*

Hence Kant infers, first, that the will of every rational being, by commanding respect for humanity as an end in itself, lays down a universal law, and is therefore a law unto itself, autonomous, and subject to no external lawgiver; secondly, that morality consists in obedience to the law of our own reason, and immorality, on the contrary, in heteronomy, that is, in obedience to any, even Divine, authority distinct from our own reason, or in action from any other motive than respect for our reason as a law.

The merits of Kant's categorical imperative are said to consist in this: that it firmly establishes the reign of reason; elevates the dignity of man by subjecting in him sensibility to reason and making rational nature free, supreme, and independent; overcomes egoism by forbidding action from self-interest; and upholds morality by the highest authority. But the theist philosopher and the Christian theologian must needs take another view. Man is not an end in himself, but is essentially subordinate to God as his ultimate end and supreme good; nor is he autonomous, but is necessarily subject to God as his supreme Lord and lawgiver. Man, conceived as a law unto himself and an end in himself, is emancipated from God as his master and separated from Him as his supreme good; conceived, moreover, as autonomous and independent of any higher authority, he is deified. This is not building up true and lofty morality, but is its

complete overthrow; for the basis of morality is God as the ultimate end, highest good, and supreme lawgiver. Kant utterly ignores the nature of both intellect and will. Human reason does not enact the moral law, but only voices and proclaims it as the enactment of a higher power above man, and it is not from the proclaiming voice that the law derives its binding force, but from the majesty above that intimates it to us through our conscience.

Nor do the universality and necessity of a law determine the will. What really attracts the will, and stirs it as a motive to action, is the goodness of the object presented by the intellect; for the rational appetite is by its nature an inclination to good. Hence it is that the desire of perfect happiness necessarily results from rational nature, and that the supreme good, clearly apprehended by the mind, cannot but be desired and embraced by the will. Hence, too, a law is not presented as obligatory, unless its observance is known to be necessarily connected with the attainment of the supreme good. It is, therefore, wrong to denounce the pursuit of happiness as immoral or repugnant to human nature. On the contrary, a paralysis of all human energy and utter despair would result from bidding man to act only from the motive of stern necessity inherent in law, or forbidding him ever to have his own good in view or to hope for blessedness.

The theory of the categorical imperative is, moreover, inconsistent. According to it the human will is the highest lawgiving authority, and yet subject to precepts enjoined on it; it is absolutely commanding what is objectively right, and at the same time reluctant to observe the right order. Again, the categorical imperative, as also the autonomy of reason and the freedom of the will, belongs to the intelligible world, and is, therefore, according to the "Critique of Pure Reason", absolutely unknowable and contradicted by all laws of experience; nevertheless in Kantian ethics it is characterized as commanding with unmistakable precision and demanding obedience with absolute authority. Such a contradiction between Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" and his "Ethics", between theoretical and practical reason, induces in morals a necessity which resembles fatalism.

Kant sets forth the categorical imperative in his "Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals" (1785) and his "Critique of Practical Reason" (1788).

PORTER, *Kant's Ethics* (Chicago, 1886); WATSON, *The Philosophy of Kant* (New York, 1888); ABBOT, *Tr. of Kant's Critique of Practical Reason and other Works on the Theory of Ethics* (London, 1896); PAULSEN, *Immanuel Kant, His Life and Doctrine* (German ed., Stuttgart, 1898); tr. by CREIGHTON AND LEFEVRE (New York, 1902).

JOHN J. MING.

Category (Greek *κατεγορία*, accusation, attribution).—The term was transferred by Aristotle from its forensic meaning (procedure in legal accusation) to its logical use as attribution of a subject. The Latin equivalent, *prædicamentum*, given it by Boethius, aptly suggests its technical significance. The categories or predicaments are the most widely generic classes or groups of predicates applicable to an individual subject—*summa genera prædicatorum*. Whether Aristotle originally intended them as aspects and divisions of words, of ideas, or of things is a debated question. Nevertheless they lend themselves readily to each of these subjects. They are divisions: (a) of ideas in as much as they are the widest generalizations under which all other more restricted ideas may be subsumed; (b) of words in that they are the oral terms answering to those supreme notions; (c) of things in the sense that they are aspects which the mind abstracts from the objects falling under experience. In the first acceptation they belong to logic, where they stand as the ultimate classification of strictly universal ideas; in the second to grammar, where they represent the parts of speech; in the third to ontology, where they are the ultimate classes of real (finite) being. In this latter sense they will be here considered.

Since it is the business of philosophy to reduce the world of real beings—the self included—to its simplest terms or aspects and their orderly relations, the task of discovering and defining the corresponding categories has been attempted by every philosopher of note. The results, however, have been by no means identical. Thus we find the Indian sage, Kanada, the reputed founder of the Vaiseshika philosophy, reducing all things to substance, quality, action, generality, particularity, co-inherence, and non-existence, while the Greek (supposed) author of the word philosophy, Pythagoras, discovers twenty ultimate groups, ten of which he calls good and the opposite ten bad. Plato in turn subsumes all things under being, identity, diversity, change. In modern times Descartes and Leibniz arranged seven categories: mind (spirit), matter (body), measure, shape, rest, motion, position, while Kant, basing his division on the varieties of judgment, invented twelve categories or forms under which he makes the intellect (*Verstand*) judge of all objects of experience. Aristotle's classification of ten categories which was taken up into Scholasticism, and still holds its place in the logic and ontology of Catholic philosophy, is thus set forth in the fourth chapter of the "Organon": "Of things incomplex enunciated (i. e. simple predicates), each signifies either substance or quantity or quality or relation or where (place) or when (time) or position or possession or action or passion. But substance is to speak generally as 'man', 'horse'; quantity as 'two' or 'three cubits'; quality as 'white'; relation as 'greater'; where as 'in the Forum'; when as 'yesterday'; position as 'he sits'; possession as 'he is shod'; action as 'he cuts'; passion as 'he burns'".

Of these groups substance, quantity, quality, and relation are obviously the principal; the remaining six are reducible to some form of relation, for it should be noted that between some of the categories a real distinction is not required; a virtual, i. e. an objectively founded mental distinction suffices, as, e. g., between action and passion. The object or thing divided into the categories is: (a) real being i. e. not the mere being expressed by the copulative verb (*ens copulæ*); nor conceptual being (*entia rationis*); nor, at least according to many Aristoteleans, being as explicitly actual (*ens participium*); but substantive or essential being—reality—the object matter of ontology (*ens essentiæ, non ens existentiæ*); (b) being *per se*, i. e. being having an essential not merely accidental unity—such as an artificial or a random construction—(*ens per se, non per accidens*), or concrete adjectives which include a subject; (c) complete being, not the abstract *differentiæ* or the parts of things; (d) finite being; the Infinite of course transcends all categories. Though the privilege of categorization is thus limited, a method has been devised whereby accommodation may be secured for any (finite) reality whatsoever. For (a) some beings enter a category directly (*in linea recta*), as do genera, species, and individuals; (b) others indirectly (*a latere*), as do specific and individual *differentiæ*; or (c) others come in by reduction as do the parts of things and things having only an accidental unity (*entia per accidens*), and even, by analogy, mental fictions (*entia rationis*). Thus for instance family and hand are reduced to the category of substance; intensity of heat to quality; a point to quantity and so on. It should be noted, however, that being itself as such (*ens transcendentale*) cannot be confined to a category since it is not a univocal, but only an analogous attribute of the supreme divisions of reality (e. g. substance and accident), and is not therefore a genus as is each category. For the same reason accident is not a genus by itself under which the nine classes

mentioned above are subsumed as species. If the foregoing restrictions are taken into account it will be found that the Aristotelean classification answers its purpose—the simplification of the world of finite reality for the sake of investigation—and that on the whole no more workable scheme has thus far been devised.

BALDWIN, *Dict. of Phil.* (New York, 1901); LADD, *Theory of Reality* (New York, 1899); MAHER, *Psychology* (New York, 1903); BLANC, *Dict. de Philosophie* (Paris, 1906); EISLER, *Wörterbuch der phil. Begriffe* (Berlin, 1904); PESCH, *Institutiones Log.* (Freiburg, 1890), III.

F. P. SIEGFRIED.

Catenæ (Lat. *catena*, a chain), collections of excerpts from the writings of Biblical commentators, especially the Fathers and early ecclesiastical writers, strung together like the links of a chain, and in this way exhibiting a continuous and connected interpretation of a given text of Scripture. It has been well said that they are exegetical anthologies. These fragments of patristic commentaries are not only quite valuable for the literal sense of Scripture, since their text frequently represents the evidence of very ancient (now lost) manuscripts; they are also serviceable to the theologian (dogmatic and mystical), to the ecclesiastical historian, and to the patrologist, for they often exhibit the only remains of important patristic writings (see MAI, PITRA; cf. Holl, Fragmente vornikänischer Kirchenväter, Leipzig, 1899). With the disappearance of the great Scriptural theologians, investigators, and commentators of the fourth and fifth centuries, there arose a class of Scriptural compilers, comparable to Boethius and Isidore of Seville in the provinces of philosophy, church history, and general culture. The very antiquity of the patristic commentators, so close to the origin of the Sacred Books, and the supreme value set by Catholic theology on the unanimous consent of the Fathers in the exposition of Scripture, naturally led, in an age of theological decadence, to such compilations. The earliest Greek catena is ascribed to Procopius of Gaza, in the first part of the sixth century, but Ehrhardt (see Krumbacher, 211) points to Eusebius of Cæsarea (d. about 340) as the pioneer in this branch of Scriptural exegesis. Between the seventh and the tenth centuries appear Andreas Presbyter and Johannes Drungarios as compilers of catenæ to various Books of Scripture, and towards the end of the eleventh century Nicetas of Serræ, perhaps the best representative of Byzantine scholarship in this respect. Both before and after, however, the makers of catenæ were numerous in the Greek Orient, mostly anonymous, and offering no other indication of their personality than the manuscripts of their excerpts. Similar compilations were also made in the Syriac and Coptic Churches (Wright, de Lagarde, Martin, in Krumbacher, 216).

In the West, Primasius of Adrumetum in Africa (sixth century) compiled the first catena from Latin commentators. He was imitated by Rhabanus Maurus (d. 865), Paschasius Radbertus, and Walafrid Strabo, later by Remigius of Auxerre (d. 900), and by Lanfranc of Canterbury (d. 1089). The Western catenæ, it must be noted, have not the importance attached to the Greek compilations. The most famous of the medieval Latin compilations of this kind is that of St. Thomas Aquinas, generally known as the "Catena Aurea" (Golden Catena) and containing excerpts from some eighty Greek and Latin commentators on the Gospels (ed. J. Nicolai, Paris, 1869, 3 vols.). Since the sixteenth century much industry has been expended in collecting, collating, and editing these exegetical remains of the early Christian Fathers, fully one-half of whose commentaries, Faulhaber asserts (see bibliography), have reached us in this way. Among the modern editors of Greek catenæ much credit is due to the Jesuit Bartholomew Cordier, who published (1628–47) important collections of Greek patristic commentaries on St. John and St. Luke and, in conjunction with his confrère Possin, on St. Matthew; the latter scholar edited also (1673) similar collections of patristic excerpts on St. Mark and Job. The voluminous catenæ known as Biblia Magna (Paris, 1643) and Biblia Maxima (Paris, 1660), edited by J. de la Haye, were followed by the nine volumes of well-known "Critici Sacri, sive clarissimorum virorum annotationes atque tractatus in biblia" (edited by Pearson, London, 1660; Amsterdam, 1695–1701), containing selections, not only from Catholic but also from Protestant commentators. An important modern collection of the Greek catenæ on the New Testament is that of J. A. Cramer (Oxford, 1638–44). See also the twenty-eight volumes of the Migne commentary in his "Scripturæ sacræ cursus completus" (Paris, 1840–45).

Similar collections of Greek patristic utterances were constructed for dogmatic purposes. They were used at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, at the Fifth General Council in 533, also apropos of Iconoclasm in the Seventh General Council in 787; and among the Greeks such compilations, like the exegetical catenæ, did not cease until late in the Middle Ages. The oldest of these dogmatic compilations, attributed to the latter part of the seventh century, is the "Antiquorum Patrum doctrina de Verbi incarnatione" (edited by Cardinal Mai in Scriptor. Vet. nova collectio, Rome, 1833, VII, i, 1–73; cf. Loofs, Leontius von Byzanz, Leipzig, 1887). Finally, in response to homiletic and practical needs, there appeared, previous to the tenth century, a number of collections of moral sentences and parænetic fragments, partly from Scripture and partly from the more famous ecclesiastical writers; sometimes one writer (e. g. Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great, especially St. John Chrysostom whom all the catenæ-makers pillage freely) furnishes the material. Such collections are not so numerous as the Scriptural or even the dogmatic catenæ. They seem all to depend on an ancient Christian "Florilegium" of the sixth century, that treated, in three books, of God, Man, the Virtues and Vices, and was known as τὰ ἱερά (Sacred Things). Ere long its material was recast in strict alphabetical order; took the name of τὰ ἱερὰ παράλληλα, "Sacra Parallela" (because in the third book a virtue and a vice had been regularly opposed to one another); and was attributed widely to the great Greek theologian of the eighth century, St. John Damascene (Migne, P.G., XCV, 1040–1586; XCVI, 9–544), whose authorship has lately been defended with much learning (against Loofs, Wendland, and Cohn) by K. Holl in the abovementioned "Fragmente vornikänischer Kirchenväter" (Leipzig, 1899), though the Damascene probably based his work on the "Capita theologica" of Maximus Confessor. The text of these ancient compilations is often in a dubious state, the authors of most of them are unknown, and many are still unedited; one of the principal difficulties in their use is the uncertainty concerning the correctness of the names to which the excerpts are attributed. The carelessness of copyists, the use of "sigla", contractions for proper names, and the frequency of transcription, led naturally to much confusion. For the Byzantine collections of ethical sentences and proverbs (Stobæus, Maximus Confessor, Antonius Melissa, Johannes Georgides, Macarius, Michael Apostolios) partly from Christian and partly from pagan sources, see Krumbacher, 600–4, also A. Elter, De Gnomologiorum Græcorum historiâ atque origine (Bonn, 1893).

The best modern treatise on the catenæ is that of EHRHARDT, in KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. d. byzant inischen Literatur* (2nd ed., Munich, 1897), 206–18—bibliography and manuscript indications. Among the older works cf. ITTIG, *De Catenis et bibliothecis* (Leipzig, 1707), and FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Græca*, VIII, 639–700. A very full list of catenæ is given in HARNACK, *Gesch. d. altchristlich. Literatur* (Leipzig, 1893), I, 835–42. For the catenæ manuscripts in the Vatican, see PITRA, *Analecta*

Sacra, II, 350, 359, 405, and FAULHABER, *Die Propheten-Catenen nach den römischen Handschriften* (Freiburg, 1899); *Catholic University Bulletin* (Washington, D. C., 1899), V, 368; (1900), VI, 94.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Cathari (from the Greek καθαρός, pure), literally "puritans", a name specifically applied to, or used by, several sects at various periods. The Novatians of the third century were frequently known as Cathari, and the term was also used by the Manichæans. In its more usual sense, Cathari was a general designation for the dualistic sects of the later Middle Ages. Numerous other names were in vogue to denominate these heretics. Without speaking of the corrupted forms of "Cazzari", "Gazzari", in Italy, and "Ketzer" in Germany, we find the following appellations: "Piphili", "Piphles", in Northern France and Flanders; "Arians", "Manichæans", and "Patareni", owing to real or alleged doctrinal similarity; "Tesserants", "Textores" (Weavers), from the trade which many of the members followed. Sometimes they were erroneously styled "Waldenses" by their contemporaries. From the demagogue Arnold of Brescia and the heretical bishop Robert de Sperone, they were called "Arnoldistæ" and "Speronistæ". To their geographical distribution they owed the names of "Cathari of Desenzano" or "Albanenses" (from Desenzano, between Brescia and Verona, or from Alba in Piedmont, Albano, or perhaps from the province of Albania); "Bajolenses" or "Bagnolenses" (from Bagnolo in Italy); "Concorrezenses" (probably from Concorrezo in Lombardy); "Tolosani" (from Toulouse); and especially "Albigenses" (from Albi). The designations "Pauliciani", of which "Publicani", "Poplicani", were probably corruptions, and "Bulgari", "Bugri", "Bougres", point to their probable Oriental origin. Among recent historians there is a pronounced tendency to look upon the Cathari as the lineal descendants of the Manichæans. The doctrine, organization, and liturgy of the former, in many points, reproduce the doctrine, organization, and liturgy of the early disciples of Manes. The successive appearance of the Priscillianists, the Paulicians, and the Bogomili, representatives to some extent of similar principles, fairly establishes the historical continuity between the two extreme links of the chain—the Manichæans of the third, and the Cathari of the eleventh, century. In the present state of our knowledge, however, conclusive proofs in favour of the genetical dependence of the Cathari on the Manichæans are lacking. Some differences between the two religious systems are too radical to find a sufficient explanation in the appeal to the evolution of human thought. Among the Cathari we look in vain for that astronomical mythology, that pagan symbolism, and the worship of the memory of Manes, which were important characteristics of Manichæism. However attractive it may be to trace the origin of the Cathari to the first centuries of Christianity, we must be cautious not to accept as a certain historical fact what, up to the present, is only a probable conclusion.

I. CATHARIST PRINCIPLES.—The essential characteristic of the Catharist faith was Dualism, i. e. the belief in a good and an evil principle, of whom the former created the invisible and spiritual universe, while the latter was the author of the material world. A difference of opinion existed as to the nature of these two principles. Their perfect equality was admitted by the absolute Dualists, whereas in the mitigated form of Dualism the beneficent principle alone was eternal and supreme, the evil principle being inferior to him and a mere creature. In the East and the West these two different interpretations of Dualism coexisted. The Bogomili in the East professed it in its modified form. In the West, the Albanenses in Italy and almost all the non-Italian Cathari were rigid Dualists; mitigated Dualism prevailed among the Bagnolenses and Concorrezenses, who were more numerous than the Albanenses in Italy, though but little represented abroad. (For an exposition of absolute Dualism, see ALBIGENSES; on the mitigated form, see BOGOMILI.) Not only were the Albanenses and Concorrezenses opposed to each other to the extent of indulging in mutual condemnations, but there was division among the Albanenses themselves. John of Lugio, or of Bergamo, introduced innovations into the traditional doctrinal system, which was defended by his (perhaps only spiritual) father Balasinansa, or Belesmagra, the Catharist Bishop of Verona. Towards the year 1230 John became the leader of a new party composed of the younger and more independent elements of the sect. In the two coeternal principles of good and evil he sees two contending gods, who limit each other's liberty. Infinite perfection is no attribute even of the good principle; owing to the genius of evil infused into all its creatures, it can produce only imperfect beings. The Bagnolenses and Concorrezenses also differed on some doctrinal questions. The former maintained that human souls were created and had sinned before the world was formed. The Concorrezenses taught that Satan infused into the body of the first man, his handiwork, an angel who had been guilty of a slight transgression and from whom, by way of generation, all human souls are derived. The moral system, organization, and liturgy of absolute and mitigated Dualism exhibit no substantial difference, and have been treated in the article on the Albigenses.

II. HISTORY.—*France, Belgium, and Spain.*—Although there is no historical foundation for the legend that the Manichæan Fontanus, one of St. Augustine's opponents, came to the castle of Montwimer (Montaimé in the Diocese of Châlons-sur-Marne) and there spread dualistic principles, yet Montwimer was perhaps the oldest Catharist centre in France and certainly the principal one in the country north of the Loire. It is in the central part of France that we come upon the first important manifestation of Catharism. At a council held in 1022 at Orléans in presence of King Robert the Pious, thirteen Cathari were condemned to be burned. Ten of these were canons of the church of the Holy Cross and another had been confessor to Queen Constance. About the same time (1025), heretics of similar tenets, who acknowledged that they were disciples of the Italian Gundulf, appeared at Liège and Arras. Upon their recantation, perhaps more apparent than real, they were left unmolested. The sectarians appeared again at Châlons under Bishop Roger II (1043–65), who in 1045 applied to his fellow-bishop, Wazo of Liège, for advice regarding their treatment. The latter advised indulgence. No manifestation of the heresy in North France is recorded during the second half of the eleventh century; its secret existence, however, cannot be doubted.

A new outbreak of the evil occurred in the twelfth century both in France and Belgium. In 1114 several heretics who had been captured in the Diocese of Soissons were seized and burned by the populace while their case was under discussion at the Council of Beauvais. Others were either threatened with, or actually met a similar fate at Liège in 1144; some of them were spared owing only to the energetic intervention of the local bishop, Adalbero II. During the rest of the twelfth century, Cathari appeared in rapid succession in different places. In 1162 Henry, Archbishop of Reims, while on a visit to Flanders, found them widely spread in that part of his ecclesiastical province. Upon his refusal of a bribe of six hundred marks, which they are said to have offered him for toleration, the heretics appealed to the pope, Alexander III, who was inclined to mercy in spite of

King Louis VII's advocacy of rigorous measures. At Vézelay in Burgundy seven heretics were burned in 1167. Towards the end of the century the Count of Flanders, Philip I, was remarkable for his severity towards them, and the Archbishop of Reims, Guillaume de Champagne (1176–1202), vigorously seconded his efforts. Confiscation, exile, and death were the penalties inflicted upon them by Hugues, Bishop of Auxerre (1183–1206). The execution of about one hundred and eighty heretics at Montwimer in May, 1239, was the death-blow of Catharism in those countries. Southern France, where its adherents were known as Albigenses, was its principal stronghold in Western Europe. Thence the Cathari penetrated into the northern provinces of Spain: Catalonia, Aragon, Navarre, and Leon. Partisans of the heresy existed in the peninsula about 1159. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, King Pedro II of Aragon personally led his troops to the assistance of Raymond VI of Toulouse against the Catholic Crusaders, and fell at the battle of Muret in 1213. During that century a few sporadic manifestations of the heresy took place, at Castelbo in 1225 and again in 1234, at Leon in 1232. The Cathari however never gained a firm foothold in the country and are not mentioned after 1292.

Italy.—Upper Italy was, after Southern France, the principal seat of the heresy. Between 1030–1040 an important Catharist community was discovered at the castle of Monteforte near Asti in Piedmont. Some of the members were seized by the Bishop of Asti and a number of noblemen of the neighbourhood, and, on their refusal to retract, were burned. Others, by order of the Archbishop of Milan, Eriberto, were brought to his archiepiscopal city, where he hoped to convert them. They answered his fruitless efforts by attempts to make proselytes; whereupon the civil magistrates gave them the choice between the Cross and the stake. For the most part, they preferred death to conversion. In the twelfth century, when, after prolonged silence, historical records again speak of Catharism, it exhibits itself as strongly organized. We find it very powerful in 1125 at Orvieto, a city of the Papal States, which, in spite of the stringent measures taken to suppress the heresy, was for many subsequent years deeply infected. Milan was the great heretical capital; but there was hardly a part of Italy where the heresy was not represented. It penetrated into Calabria, Sicily, and Sardinia, and appeared even in Rome. The prohibitions and penalties enacted by the civil and ecclesiastical rulers of the thirteenth century could not crush the evil, although the merciless Frederick II occupied the imperial throne and Popes Innocent III, Honorius III, and Gregory IX were not remiss in their efforts to suppress it. To prevent the enforcement of the punishment decreed against them, the members of the sect, on a few occasions, resorted to assassination, as is proved by the deaths of St. Peter Parenzo (1199) and St. Peter of Verona (1252); or, like Pungilovo, who after his death (1269) was temporarily honoured as a saint by the local Catholic population, they outwardly observed Catholic practices while remaining faithful Catharists. According to the Dominican inquisitor, Rainier Sacconi, himself a former adherent of the heresy, there were in the middle of the thirteenth century about 4000 perfected Cathari in the world. Of these there were in Lombardy and the Marches, 500 of the Albanensian sect, about 200 Bagnolenses, 1500 Concorrezenses, and 150 French refugees; at Vicenza 100, and as many at Florence and Spoleto. Although the increase in the number of "Believers" was very probably not proportionate to that of the "Perfecti", in consequence of the arrival of refugees from France, yet the Cathari of the northern half of Italy formed at this time over three-fifths of the total membership. The heresy, however, could not hold its own during the second half of the thirteenth century, and although it continued in existence in the fourteenth, it gradually disappeared from the cities and took refuge in less accessible places. St. Vincent Ferrer still discovered and converted some Cathari in 1403 in Lombardy and also in Piedmont, where in 1412 several of them, already deceased, were executed in effigy. No definite reference to their existence is found at a subsequent date.

Germany and England.—Catharism was comparatively unimportant in Germany and England. In Germany it appeared principally in the Rhine lands. Some members were apprehended in 1052 at Goslar in Hanover and hanged by order of the emperor, Henry III. About 1110 some heretics, probably Cathari, and among them two priests, appeared at Trier, but do not seem to have been subjected to any penalty. Some years later (c. 1143) Cathari were discovered at Cologne. Some of them retracted; but the bishop of the sect and his *socius* (companion), not so ready to change their faith, were cited before an ecclesiastico-lay tribunal. During the trial they were, against the will of the judges, carried off by the people and burned. The heretical Church must have been completely organized in this part of Germany, as the presence of the bishop seems to prove. To these events we owe the refutation of the heresy written by St. Bernard at the request of Everwin, Abbot of Steinfeld. In 1163 the Rhenish city witnessed another execution, and a similar scene was almost simultaneously enacted at Bonn. Other districts, Bavaria, Suabia, and Switzerland, were infected, but the heresy did not gain a firm foothold. It disappeared almost completely in the thirteenth century.

About 1159, thirty Cathari, German in race and speech, left an unknown place, perhaps Flanders, to seek refuge in England. Their proselytizing efforts were rewarded by the temporary conversion of one woman. They were detected in 1166 and handed over to the secular power by the bishops of the Council of Oxford. Henry II ordered them to be scourged, branded on the forehead, and cast adrift in the cold of winter, and forbade any of his subjects to shelter or succour them. They all perished from hunger or exposure.

The Balkan States.—Eastern Europe seems to have been, in point of date, the first country in which Catharism manifested itself, and it certainly was the last to be freed from it. The Bogomili, who were representatives of the heresy in its milder dualistic form, perhaps existed as early as the tenth century and, at a later date, were found in large numbers in Bulgaria. Bosnia was another Catharist centre. Some recent writers make no distinction between the heretics found there and the Bogomili, whereas others rank them with the rigid Dualists. In the Western contemporary documents they are usually called "Patareni", the designation then applied to the Cathari in Italy. At the end of the twelfth century, Kulin, the *ban* or civil ruler of Bosnia (1168–1204), embraced the heresy, and 10,000 of his subjects followed his example. The efforts made on the Catholic side, under the direction of Popes Innocent III, Honorius III, and Gregory IX, to eradicate the evil, were not productive of any permanent success. Noble work was accomplished by Franciscan missionaries sent to Bosnia by Pope Nicholas IV (1288–92). But though arms and persuasion were used against the heresy, it continued to flourish. As the country was for a long time a Hungarian dependency, Hungary was conspicuous in its resistance to the new faith. This situation developed into a source of weakness on the Catholic side, as the Cathari identified their religious cause with that of national independence. When, in the fifteenth century, the Bosnian king, Thomas, was converted to the Catholic Faith, the severe edicts which he issued

against his former coreligionists were powerless against the evil. The Cathari, 40,000 in number, left Bosnia and passed into Herzegovina (1446). The heresy disappeared only after the conquest of these provinces by the Turks in the second half of the fifteenth century. Several thousand of its members joined the Orthodox Church, while many more embraced Islam.

III. The Cathari and the Catholic Church.—The Catharist system was a simultaneous attack upon the Catholic Church and the then existing State. The Church was directly assailed in its doctrine and hierarchy. The denial of the value of oaths, and the suppression, at least in theory, of the right to punish, undermined the basis of the Christian State. But the worst danger was that the triumph of the heretical principles meant the extinction of the human race. This annihilation was the direct consequence of the Catharist doctrine, that all intercourse between the sexes ought to be avoided and that suicide or the *Endura*, under certain circumstances, is not only lawful but commendable. The assertion of some writers, like Charles Molinier, that Catholic and Catharist teaching respecting marriage are identical, is an erroneous interpretation of Catholic doctrine and practice. Among Catholics, the priest is forbidden to marry, but the faithful can merit eternal happiness in the married state. For the Cathari, no salvation was possible without previous renunciation of marriage. Mr. H. C. Lea, who cannot be suspected of partiality towards the Catholic Church, writes: "However much we may deprecate the means used for its [Catharism] suppression and commiserate those who suffered for conscience' sake, we cannot but admit that the cause of orthodoxy was in this case the cause of progress and civilization. Had Catharism become dominant, or even had it been allowed to exist on equal terms, its influence could not have failed to prove disastrous." (See Lea, Inquisition, I, 106.)

Eberhard of Béthune, *Antihæresis*, in *Biblioth. Max. Patr.* *XXIV*, 1525-84; St. Bernard, *Sermones in Cantica*, in *P. L.*, CLXXXIII, 1088–1102; Bern. Guidonis, *Practica Inquisitionis hæreticæ pravitatis*, ed. Douais (Paris, 1886); Bonacursus, *Vita hæreticorum*, in *P. L.*, CCIV, 775–92; Moneta, *Adv. Catharos et Waldenses*, ed. Ricchini (Rome, 1743); Rainier Sacconi, *Summa de Catharistis et Leonistis*, in Martène and Durand, *Thesaurus nov. Anecdot.* (Paris, 1717), V; Ecbert of Schönau, *Sermones contra Catharos*, in *P. L.*, CVC, 11–98; Fredericq, *Corpus documentorum Inquisitionis hæreticæ pravitatis Neerlandicæ* (Ghent, 1889, sqq.); Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengesch. des M. A.* (Munich, 1890); Schmidt, *Histoire et doct de la secte des Cathares* (Paris, 1849); Douais, *Les Albigeois* (Paris, 1879); Lea, *Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (New York, s. d.), I, 89–208, 563–83; II, 290–315, 569–87, and passim; Tanon, *Tribunaux de l'inquisition en France* (Paris, 1893); Alphandéry, *Les idées morales chez les hétérodoxes latins au début du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1903), 34–99; Guiraud, *Questions d'hist.* (Paris, 1906), 1–149; Palmieri, *Les Bogomiles en Bosnie-Herzég.* in *Dict. théol. cath.* (Paris, 1905), II, 1042–45; Vacandard, *L'inquisition* (Paris, 1907), 81–123 and passim; Davison, *Some Forerunners of St. Francis of Assisi* (s. C. 1907), 16 sqq. Molinier, *L'Eglise et la société Cathares*, in *Rev. hist.*, XCIV, 225 sqq. (1907), and XCV, 1–22, 263–94 (1907). For further bibliographical indications see Molinier, *Sources de l'histoire de France* (Paris, 1903), Part I, III, 54–77.

N. A. Weber.

Cathedra, (1) the chair or throne (*θρόνος*) of a bishop in his cathedral church, on which he presides at solemn functions. Originally the bishop's cathedra stood in the centre of the apse, flanked on either side, though on a lower plane, by the benches of the assisting priests. A good idea of the arrangement may be had from the catacomb frescoes representing Christ seated on a throne surrounded by the Apostles, whom He is instructing in their future duties, and in the fourth-century mosaic in the apse of St. Pudenziana. The earliest type of bishop's throne consisted of a high-backed arm-chair, rounded at the top, made out of a single block of marble. The stone seats in the Roman catacombs of similar form were probably used by the bishop in the occasional services of the subterranean chapels. Wooden episcopal chairs were in use in Africa. The marble chair supporting the famous statue of St. Hippolytus (third century) is an excellent example of an ancient cathedra; the back has less than half the elevation of the thrones of the fourth and fifth centuries. In several Roman basilicas, e. g. St. Petronilla, St. Balbina, and Sts. Nereus and Achilleus, a niche for the bishop's cathedra was constructed in the wall of the apse, but this arrangement was exceptional. An example of a cathedra with a perforated seat, like those used in the Roman baths, is preserved at Monte Cassino. The form and decoration of the most ancient of episcopal cathedræ were borrowed from paganism; one side of the chair of St. Hippolytus, however, is engraved with the saint's computation of the paschal cycle from the year 222 to 334.



Ivory Chair of Bishop Maximian (Ravenna, Sixth Century)

During the early centuries of Christianity it was customary for the bishop to deliver his sermon or homily while seated in his chair facing the congregation, but in the great basilicas of the Constantinian era, as well as subsequently, this arrangement became impracticable; it would have been extremely difficult in a large church to be heard from this location, particularly in a church where the altar was surmounted by a ciborium. St. John Chrysostom was accustomed to address his great audience from the better-adapted lector's ambon in front of the altar. It appears probable also that in some instances the episcopal cathedra was movable, and thus could be placed near the chancel while the bishop addressed the congregation. This inference is suggested by the famous chair of Bishop Maximianus at Ravenna, the back of which, as well as the sides, contains sculptured ornamentation; if the chair was to remain stationary against the wall of the apse, the adornment of the back would have been superfluous. In a church ornamented with an iconostasis, a movable episcopal chair became especially necessary if the bishop wished to preach from his throne, for otherwise he would be almost wholly shut out from view of the congregation. The two most famous ancient cathedræ still preserved are the chair of Maximianus mentioned above and the chair of St. Peter. The latter, a movable chair, stood in the time of Ennodius of Pavia (d. 521), who alludes to it, in the baptistery of St. Peter's. During the pontificate of Alexander VII (1655–1667) it was encased in the bronze throne in the apse of the new St. Peter's, where it remained invisible till 1867. It was then, on the occasion of the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of Sts. Peter and Paul, by order of Pius IX, removed from its bronze enclosure and exposed to the gaze of the faithful. De Rossi took advantage of the moment, and gave a description of the chair in his "Bullettino" (1867, 33 sqq.). The oak framework, in which four large rings are fastened, is regarded as

of much greater antiquity than the other parts of the cathedra; the presence of the rings suggests the inference that originally the chair was one of the "sedes gestatoriæ", which came into fashion in the reign of Claudius (41–54). The wear and tear of time, and the zeal of the relic-hunter, made extensive repairs necessary at a later period, perhaps in the reign of Charlemagne. The oak frame was reinforced by the insertion of pieces of acacia, and new panels of the same wood were made for the front and sides. The front panel is adorned with square slabs of ivory, disposed in three rows of six each, representing the labours of Hercules. Some of these slabs are placed upside down and were not, apparently, made for the places they occupy. The ivory ornaments of the back, on the contrary, are well adapted to the form of the chair; they represent the combats of animals, of centaurs and of men. In the centre of the horizontal bar of the tympanum is the figure of an emperor, between two angels, variously supposed to represent Charlemagne, Charles the Bald, or an emperor of the seventeenth century. The ivories of the front panel are attributed to the fifth century. The beautiful ivory chair of Bishop Maximianus (so called from the monogram in front, "Maximianos ep.") preserved in the sacristy of the cathedral of Ravenna is an excellent specimen of fifth- or sixth-century ivory carving. Until recently it was attributed to the pontificate of Bishop Maximianus of Ravenna (d. 556), but Venturi (Storia dell' Arte Ital., I, 466) attributes it rather to Maximianus of Constantinople (d. 431). The back is engraved with twenty-four scenes from the life of Christ and the Blessed Virgin, the front represents St. John the Baptist with the four Evangelists, while on the sides the story of Joseph, in ten scenes, is depicted. Occasionally the cathedra was covered by a baldacchino, e. g. at Torcello and Grado. The marble cathedra of St. Mark, in his church at Venice, is of great antiquity (Secchi, La catedra di San Marco, Venice, 1853).

(2)—The term cathedra was applied also to the see of a bishop. The earliest use of the word in this sense occurs in Tertullian, who speaks (De præscriptione, XXXVI) of "cathedræ Apostolorum" in allusion to Apostolic succession in episcopal sees. In the councils and ecclesiastical writings of the early Middle Ages such expressions as "cathedræ viduatæ", "cathedræ principales", "cathedræ matrices" have a similar signification. For the feast of the "chair" or "cathedra" of St. Peter at Rome and at Antioch, see CHAIR OF PETER.

(3)—Canon 41 of the Council of Aachen, held in 789, refers to the cathedral church as distinguished from the other churches of a diocese as "principalis cathedra"; the term for the official seat of the bishop is thus employed for the bishop's church. By a definition "ex cathedra" is meant a formal infallible decision of the pope, obligatory on all the faithful. See also, FALDSTOOL.

HADDAN in *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, s. v. (London, 1875), I; LOWRIE, *Monuments of the Early Church* (New York, 1901); VENTURI, *Storia dell' Arte Italiana* (Milan, 1901); KRAUS, *Gesch. der christl. Kunst* (Freiburg, 1896); KAUFMANN, *Christl. Archäologie* (Paderborn, 1905); DE FLEURY, *La Messe*, II, 147 sqq.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Cathedral, the chief church of a diocese, in which the bishop has his throne (*cathedra*) and close to which is his residence; it is, properly speaking, the bishop's church wherein he presides, teaches, and conducts worship for the whole Christian community. The word is derived from the Gr. *καθέδρα* through the Lat. *cathedra*, throne, elevated seat. In early ecclesiastical literature it always conveyed the idea of authority. Christ Himself spoke of the scribes and Pharisees as seated on the chair of Moses (Matt., xxiii, 2), and it suffices to recall the two feasts of the Chair of St. Peter (at Antioch and Rome) to show that, in the language of the Fathers as well as among the monuments of antiquity, the *cathedra* was the principal symbol of authority. (Martigny, Dict. des antiq. chrét., Paris, 1877, s. v. Chaire.) In the Latin Church the official name is *ecclesia cathedralis;* nevertheless, this expression is not wholly identical with that of *ecclesia episcopalis*, also an official title, which indicates the church of one who is only a bishop, while the churches of higher-ranking prelates take their names from the dignity of their incumbents: *ecclesiæ archiepiscopales, metropolitanæ, primatiales, patriarchales.* In the East the word *cathedral* does not exist, the episcopal church being known simply as "the church" or "the great church". (L. Clugnet, Dictionnaire grec-français des noms liturgiques en usage dans l'Eglise grecque, Paris, 1895, s. v. Ἐκκλεσία.) What seems to predominate is the name of the city; at the consecration of a bishop it is simply said that he is destined for the Church of God in a given city. In popular usage the cathedral is variously named. In France, England, and English-speaking countries, the word cathedral is general; occasionally it gives way to the expression, metropolitan church (*la métropole*). In Lyons it is known as the primatial church, in reference to the special dignity of the archbishop. In Spain it is called *la seo* or *la seu* (the see). In one instance the city itself is thus known, Urgel being called la Seo d'Urgel or simply la Seo. In Italy the cathedral is called *il duomo*, and in some parts of Germany, especially in the ecclesiastical province of Cologne, *der Dom* (whence the German term *Domherr*, canon), the episcopal church being looked on as preeminently the house of God or of the saint from whom it was named (Du Cange, Glossar., med. et inf. latin., s. vv. *Ecclesia, domo,* and *domus*). At Strasburg and elsewhere in Germany the cathedral is called *Münster* (*monasterium*), because some cathedrals were served by monks, or, rather, were the abode of canons living in community, the church being thus converted into a sort of monastery, especially where the reform of St. Chrodegang (d. 766) had been adopted. (Du Cange, Glossar., s. v. Monasterium). Medieval writers and documents offer other names for the cathedral church. The following are found in the above-mentioned work of Du Cange (s. v. Ecclesia): *ecclesia major, ecclesia mater, ecclesia principalis, ecclesia senior,* more frequently *ecclesia matrix.* The last appellation was current in Northern Africa (Fulgentius Ferrandus, Breviatio canonum, nos. 11, 17, 38, in Migne, P. L., LXVII, 950) and has been consecrated by the canon law; Innocent III says quite explicitly (c. Venerabili, 12, de verb. signif.): *Per matricem ecclesiam cathedralem intelligi volumus.*

Hence the juridical character or standing of the cathedral does not depend on the form, dimensions, or magnificence of the edifice, since, without undergoing any change, a church may become a cathedral, especially when a new diocese is founded. What properly constitutes a cathedral is its assignment by competent authority as the residence of the bishop in his hierarchical capacity, and the principal church of a diocese is naturally best adapted to this purpose. Such official designation is known as canonical erection and necessarily accompanies the formation of a new diocese. At present, and for a long time past, new dioceses are formed by the division (*dismembratio*) of older ones. Erection and division being what are known in canon law as important affairs (*causæ majores*) are reserved to the sovereign pontiff, and the erection of cathedrals likewise belongs to him. Very often the Apostolic Letters by which a new diocese is created expressly designate the cathedral church; again, however (and such is usual in the United States), the episcopal city being named, the bishop is left free to select his church (III Conc. Balt., n. 35). The transfer of a cathedral can occur in two ways:

First, the episcopal residence may be moved from one city to another within the same diocese, in which event the cathedral also would have to be changed; such a transfer would require the intervention of the Holy See, since it created the diocese and assigned the bishop to his first residence. Second, the cathedral may be transferred from one church to another within the same city, either to a church already in use or one built specially for the purpose. As the mere act of rebuilding does not necessitate a removal to another city and hence a change of episcopal title, this second kind of transfer requires no papal authorization. The consent of the bishop and the clergy of the cathedral would therefore regularly suffice, presupposing, of course, reasonable motives, e. g. inadequate size of the church, unhealthy or inconvenient location, etc. (Pallottini, Collect. resolut. S. Cong. Conc., s. v. Ecclesia cathedralis, § II, n. 1 sq.). In both of the above methods it is necessary to transfer with the cathedral all that is characteristic of it or essential to it as such: first the name and the pre-eminence of cathedral, then the chapter and clergy, and finally the title in all movables and real estate, except what belongs to the former cathedral in its capacity of parish church. The suppression of a cathedral follows that of a diocese—just as its establishment follows the creation of a diocese—but does not do away with the church itself as a place of worship.

Ecclesiastical law, based on the constitution of the Church, provides that there shall be but one bishop of each diocese. The bishop, of course, is at home in all the churches of his diocese, and in any or all of them he is at liberty to erect a temporary throne or seat (*cathedra*) symbolic of his episcopal jurisdiction, but there is only one cathedral. This unity of residence is implied by the unity of headship and direction, and canonists add that the unity of the mystical marriage of the bishop with his church signifies the unity of his spiritual spouse. To this rule of residence there are two so-called exceptions. The first deals with two or even three dioceses united *æque principaliter*, i. e. without forfeiting their existence or rights as dioceses, and yet having but one bishop. Such cases are not uncommon in Italy, e. g. the three united Dioceses of Terracina, Sezze, and Piperno. This combining of dioceses was authorized by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, c. xiii, de ref.) to meet the insufficiency of resources in certain cases. But while in this case the same bishop has several cathedrals, yet there is but one in each diocese. The following passage relative to a seminary in the Diocese of Piperno clearly establishes the legitimate existence of these cathedrals of united dioceses (Privernen., Aperitionis seminarii, 16 March, 1771, in Pallottini, loc. cit., n. 17, 18): "The union on an equal level of dignity does not affect the internal status of the particular dioceses so united; each continues to hold its rights, privileges, etc., as before. The union is really only a personal one, inasmuch as henceforth one bishop is charged with the government of all the sees thus united." The second apparent exception is in regard to ancient churches which, for one reason or another, have ceased to be cathedrals, yet preserve their ancient title, retain a certain degree of pre-eminence, and occasionally enjoy some honorary privileges. One of the oldest examples is that of the ancient cathedral on Mount Sion at Jerusalem, which ceased to be a cathedral when the bishop's see was transferred to the great Constantinian church erected on Calvary (Duchesne, Christian Worship, tr. London, 1903, 491–92). Sometimes an episcopal see was transferred to another city of the diocese without losing its first title: thus the See of Perpignan still preserves the ancient title of the city of Elne. Several of the ancient French episcopal titles, suppressed by the Concordat of 1801 and never re-established, have been revived in memory of the past and added to the titles of existing sees; thus the Archdiocese of Aix carries with it the titles of the suppressed Archdioceses of Arles and Embrun. But such honorary survivals of ancient cathedrals in no wise conflict with the unity of the real cathedral.

Formerly a solemn consecration or dedication was requisite to set apart churches for purposes of worship. But for many centuries it has sufficed, at least for churches of minor importance, that they be blessed according to the form prescribed in the Ritual. The obligation, however, of consecrating cathedrals has always been maintained in the liturgical books of the Roman Church, and was formally renewed for the ecclesiastical province of Rome by the Roman provincial council of 1725 under Benedict XIII (tit. XXV, c. i). Moreover, the Congregation of Sacred Rites acknowledged this as a general law when (7 August, 1875) it replied as follows to the Bishop of Cuneo in Piedmont: "Incumbere debent episcopi ut ecclesiæ saltem cathedrales et parochiales solemniter consecrentur" (Cuneen., ad I; n. 3364)—i. e. the bishops should see to it that at least the cathedral and the parish churches (strictly so-called) be consecrated. This is all the more imperative for the cathedral because the anniversary of its dedication must be celebrated by all the clergy of the diocese. Canon law does not specify the form and dimensions of the cathedral; nevertheless, it supposes the edifice sufficiently spacious to accommodate a large assemblage of the faithful on the occasion of elaborate pontifical ceremonies. If possible, the sanctuary, choir, and nave should be of suitable proportions, and besides the altar and general equipment necessary in other churches, the cathedral should have a permanent episcopal seat. The word *cathedra*, so expressive in the language of antiquity, has gradually been replaced, even in liturgical usage, by throne (*thronus*) or seat (*sedes*). According to the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" (I, c. xiii) the throne should be a fixture and placed either at the extreme end of the apse—when, as in the ancient basilicas, the altar is in the middle of the church and the celebrant faces the people—or else to the front of the altar on the Gospel side, when the altar is placed, as is usual, against the rear wall, and the celebrant turns his back to the people. In either case the throne should have an approach of three steps and be surmounted by a canopy as a sign of honour. When the bishop pontificates, the steps of the throne should be carpeted and both the throne proper and the canopy decorated with costly materials. The *thronos* of the Greek bishop is the same, except that its very high back is surmounted by an icon, or sacred image. The cathedral should also have its baptismal fonts (q. v.) or, if it be desirable to conform to the ancient custom, a separate baptistery (q. v.). Finally, not only should it have an ample supply of the sacerdotal vestments and sacred vessels required in all churches, but also of the vestments and pontifical insignia used by the bishop in solemn ceremonies.

As personnel or staff, ecclesiastical law requires that the cathedral should have a chapter (q. v.), taking the place of the ancient *presbyterium* and constituting, as it were, the senate of the church and the bishop's council. The chief obligation of the chapter is daily to celebrate the Divine Office and Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in the name of the entire Christian community. Its members, dignitaries, and canons escort and assist the bishop when he pontificates; even when he merely presides at the services they form an entourage of honour for him. In the United States there are no chapters, properly so called, these being to a certain extent replaced by "consultors" (III Conc. Balt., *passim*). The solemnity of the ceremonies also calls for a greater or lesser number of ecclesiastics of lower rank; there exists, however, no definite legislation on this head. It is sometimes asked whether the cathedral can be a parish church. As the bishop is unquestionably the first pastor of the diocese he might,

in a certain sense, be said to be its first parish priest were it not that this title implies jurisdiction of an inferior kind and confined to a portion of the diocesan territory. Moreover, the bishop does not personally and immediately exercise the duties of the parochial cure of souls (*cura animarum*). Originally, the cathedral was the only parish church for the entire diocese, and later, after the establishment of rural parishes, for the episcopal city. In Christian antiquity it was only in large cities like Rome that certain ministerial functions were habitually discharged in presbyterial churches; these *tituli* or "titles", however, were always dependent on the bishop (see PARISH, CARDINAL). But in a general way, the division of cities into distinct and independent parishes does not date beyond the eleventh century (M. Lupi, De parochis ante annum millesimum, 1788). Once this division was made it was quite natural that the cathedral should retain as parish territory the district immediately surrounding it. Indeed, there are very few cathedrals that are not at the same time parish churches, although in this regard the law prescribes nothing. The cure of souls does not, then, devolve on the bishop, but on the chapter, which exercises it through a vicar chosen either from its own number or from outside. A chapel in the cathedral church is frequently set apart for parochial ministrations, this custom being very general in Spain and Italy. But the ancient Christian discipline has not entirely disappeared, and it is interesting to observe how, in many places, certain ceremonies are reserved to the cathedral, especially the administration of baptism. In Florence, Siena, Pisa, and other cities, the parish churches have no baptismal fonts, and all children, unless in urgent cases, must be baptized in the cathedral, or, rather, in the baptistery. It is to be noted that the revenues, accounts, and administration of the cathedral parish are entirely distinct from those of the cathedral as such. As the principal church of the diocese and the residence of the chief pastor, the cathedral is pre-eminent among all the other churches of the diocese—no matter what their privileges in other respects—even over those that may have received from Rome the title of minor basilica; hence it is that the clergy of the cathedral church when walking in large processions take precedence of those of all the other churches of the city and diocese, collegiate churches included.

Canonists compare to a spiritual marriage the union of a bishop with his church, and although this expression may be truer with respect to the Church as understood in the moral sense than to the cathedral, it is nevertheless not inappropriate. They say that the bishop should love his cathedral, adorn and embellish it, and never neglect it. Metaphors apart, the bishop receives his cathedral as his "title" (*titulus*) or right; he is its governor (*rector*) and its head. He should take possession of it by a solemn entrance into his episcopal city and by the ceremony of enthronement (*inthronisatio*) as prescribed in the Roman Pontifical and the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" (I, c. ii) in so far, at least, as custom will permit. Except when the visitation of his diocese or some other just cause necessitates his absence, he should reside near his cathedral, attend services there, pontificate (i. e. perform the more solemn services) on the days specified in the above-mentioned "Cæremoniale Episcoporum", preach and teach Divine truth, and find there a last resting-place. Theoretically, the diocesan clergy are the clergy of the cathedral delegated by the bishop to minister in his stead to the distant members of his flock. Hence the clergy of the diocese should feel at home in their cathedral and in its sanctuary find by right their place whenever occasion arises. There is much, indeed, to bind the diocesan clergy to their mother church, since it is there that the general ordinations regularly take place, that by Tridentine law the *theologalis* should expound the Holy Scripture for the benefit of all the clergy (Conc. Trid., Sess. V, c. i, de ref.), and that the seminarians participate in the services of the Church feasts and learn the ecclesiastical ceremonies (Sess. XXIII, c. xviii, de ref.). In order that all the clergy may, in a way, belong to the cathedral, the obligation is imposed upon them of celebrating the two feasts proper to the cathedral, its patronal feast and the anniversary of its dedication, just as they would observe these feasts for their own particular churches. The patronal feast of the cathedral, i. e. the commemoration of the religious mystery or the saint for whom it has been named—or indeed of its two patrons, if it have two, *æque principales*—must be duly solemnized as a first-class double with octave, the regular clergy only being dispensed from the octave. Although the observance of the anniversary of the dedication is also of obligation for all the clergy, there is this difference: the priests of the episcopal city celebrate it as a second-class double with octave, while only those regulars who reside in the episcopal city are obliged to celebrate it, and they observe it as a second-class double without octave (General Decree of 9 July, 1895, in Decret. authent. S. Cong. Rit., n. 3863).

A cathedral cannot subsist without resources, i. e. without temporal possessions. Canonically speaking, these are provided by the establishment of a fund (*dotatio*) for the support of the cathedral. Strictly speaking, the latter should not be established unless sufficient resources are assured for the performance of Divine worship and the maintenance of the cathedral clergy (III, tit. 48, de eccles. ædificandis vel reparandis). The same law applies to all other churches. In the thirteenth century, when the decretal legislation arose, the endowment of a church, benefice, or monastery was not conceivable except by an allotment of land, whose fruits or revenues constituted the necessary means of support for the institution or persons in question. To-day such endowment, when not maintained by the State or municipality, is in the form of personal estate and is seldom adequate, so that both cathedral and parochial churches depend largely on the annual contributions of the faithful. The repairs, renovation, and rebuilding of cathedrals are the object of many decisions of the Sacred Congregation of the Council. The cathedral property either belongs to the Church in full right or is claimed by the State, the municipality, etc. In the first case the cost of the repairs falls principally on the bishop, but not on him alone. First, the income of the *Fabrica*, i. e. the funds destined to the support of the edifice, like the *Fabbrica* of St. Peter's or the *Opera* at Siena and elsewhere, is used to defray these expenses; second, the episcopal revenue properly speaking (*mensa episcopalis*) is drawn upon, i. e. when it is large enough to suffer a drain without undue inconvenience to the bishop; third, the canons and other beneficed ecclesiastics of the cathedral are assessed proportionately to the amount of their income; an assessment may then be levied upon the diocesan clergy, and finally an ecclesiastical tax may be imposed upon the faithful. When these different means are either impracticable or insufficient, foundations for Masses may be temporarily suspended (Pallottini, op. cit., § I, per totum; Benedict XIV, Inst. eccl., C.). The aforesaid measures, however, suppose an organization of ecclesiastical benefices which are now about extinct; at present the practical method is an appeal to the generosity of the clergy and the faithful. It may be, however, that the cathedral is held to be property of the State or city, in which case, if either has pledged itself to care for the building, the responsibility of the bishop or clergy ensues only in default of the former (Permaneder-Riedl, Die kirchliche Baulast, Munich, 1890). The question sometimes arises as to whether the bishop has any claim upon the tem-

poral possessions of the cathedral. According to the letter of the law, provision should be made for the personal support of the bishop at the same time that it is made for the revenue of the cathedral; this endowment of the episcopal office (*mensa episcopalis*) should be totally distinct from the endowment of the cathedral; in this event, the bishop should come to the assistance of his cathedral rather than take from its income. Like the cathedral clergy, however, the bishop can with all propriety claim the adventitious revenues of foundations in proportion as he discharges the duties involved. But there are many countries in which the system of ecclesiastical benefices does not exist. In such countries the Apostolic Letters that create the diocese assign the bishop a suitable support (*cathedraticum*) instead of the canonical revenue. In the collection of this cathedraticum the bishop may assess the cathedral for as much as (even more than) he asks from the other churches of the diocese. He may even consider himself the real pastor of his cathedral church and apply to himself the diocesan rule whereby a pastor is assigned an appropriate salary out of the income of his church.

Finally, as regards the temporal administration of the cathedral, local customs, quite variable as a rule, are to be duly considered. It will suffice if we mention here the common ecclesiastical law according to which the administration of the cathedral belongs conjointly to the bishop and the chapter. It is not only the bishop's right and duty to control the administration of the cathedral by exacting financial reports, as in the case of all the churches and ecclesiastical institutions of the diocese; in the administration of the cathedral he participates personally and intervenes directly. He assists either in person or by his vicar-general at the deliberations of the chapter or administrative council, whatever its name and composition, being rightfully its first member and president, and he alone is qualified to sanction measures for the use of the funds and revenues of all kinds belonging to the cathedral. See: BISHOP; DIOCESE; CATHEDRATICUM; BUILDINGS, ECCLESIASTICAL; CANON.

MICH. ANT. FRANCES, *De ecclesiis cathedralibus eorumque privilegiis et prærogativis* (Lyons, 1668); *The Canonists*, in tit., *De ecclesiis ædificandis vel reparandis*, lib. III, tit. 48; *Decreta authentica S. C. Rituum* (Rome, 1901), s. vv. *Ecclesia, Cathedralis Ecclesia, Episcopus*; TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1906), 134; E. W. BENSON (Anglican), *The Cathedral*, (London, 1878).

A. BOUDINHON.

Cathedral Chapter. See CHAPTER.

Cathedraticum (Lat., *cathedra*, episcopal seat or throne), a certain sum of money to be contributed annually for the support of the bishop, as a mark of honour and in sign of subjection to the cathedral church, hence its name. In the early ages of the Church, contributions for the support of the bishop were tendered rather through custom than by law. The earliest legislation on the subject seems to be a canon of the Second Council of Braga (572). According to the decree of this council, only parish churches and chapters were obliged to pay the cathedraticum (Can. Placuit, 10, qu. 3). The reason given for this limitation is that at the time of the Council of Braga the sacraments were administered to the faithful in parochial churches only. When in the course of time, many other ecclesiastical edifices were built and endowed, it was judged proper that these also should pay the cathedraticum. Hence Pope Honorius III made a universal law (cap. Conquerente, de Off. Ordin.) that not only chapters and parish churches, but also endowed chapels and benefices should be subject to the same tax (Rota coram Tan. decis, 228). This sum was to be paid to the bishop on the occasion of his annual visitation of his diocese. The amount of the cathedraticum was fixed in ancient times at two *solidi;* a solidus was one seventy-second part of a pound of gold. According to canonists, this remains the obligatory amount of the tax, unless custom establishes a different sum. If a smaller amount than the original tax becomes customary in a diocese, the bishop must be content with this reduced pension, nor can he command a return to the higher sum (S. C. C. in Amalph., 1705). In general it is presumed that the quantity of the cathedraticum will be determined by reasonable custom according to the exigencies of various dioceses and countries. Where custom has not fixed the sum, the S. Congregation of the Council declared that either the amount paid by a neighbouring diocese or the equivalent of the original two *solidi* must be taken as the proper tax (In Albin., 1644).

The regular clergy are not obliged to pay the cathedraticum for their monasteries and conventual churches, as is expressly stated in the "Corpus Juris" (cap. Inter cætera, viii, caus. 10). The reason is found in the very idea of the cathedraticum, which is given by a church or benefice in sign of subjection to the jurisdiction of the bishop. As exempt regulars are immediately subject to the Holy See, there is no obligation on them to pay the cathedraticum. In the case, however, that regulars administer parish churches or secular benefices, they are subject to the tax, inasmuch as such institutions fall under diocesan law. It has also been declared that confraternities which have no churches in the strict sense of the word, but only chapels, are exempt from this episcopal tax ("In Firmana, Cathedr."). As the cathedraticum pertains to episcopal rights, it is privileged and consequently no prescription can totally abrogate it. This is expressly declared by the S. Congregation of the Council (In Amalph., 1707), when it decrees that no contrary custom, even of immemorial antiquity, can exempt from the payment of this tax. It is also to be noted that, according to the common law, the cathedraticum is to be uniform for all institutions in a diocese, without regard to the opulence or poverty of the benefices.

Owing to the phraseology of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, cap. ii), a controversy arose as to whether this council had abrogated the cathedraticum. The S. Congregation of the Council gave the following interpretation: "The Council did not abolish the cathedraticum; but desired that it be paid, not at the time of the episcopal visitation, but rather at the diocesan synod." It is owing to the custom of paying this tax at the synod that the name *synodaticum* has been given to it. By law, however, there is, strictly speaking, no fixed time for making this payment. For although as a rule it is customary to do so in the synod, yet custom or agreement can place it at another time. In fact the S. Congregation of the Council has declared that the cathedraticum must be paid, even in those years in which no diocesan synod is celebrated (In Perus., Cathedr., 1735). As the cathedraticum is a mark of subjection to the cathedral church, the bishop cannot exempt any benefice from this tax. On the other hand he cannot demand it from clerics or priests who have no benefices, even though he plead ancient custom to the contrary (S. C. Ep. In Compsan., 1694). He can require it, however, from the diocesan seminary if benefices have been incorporated with it. In like manner he can demand the cathedraticum from monasteries with which secular churches and benefices have been united. An exception to this law was made, however, for the Order of St. John of Jerusalem in 1630.

All this concerns the laws on the cathedraticum where the Church is canonically established. Obviously, in so-called missionary countries, where benefices are practically unknown, such laws cannot apply. As, however, it is only equitable that the diocese should support its bishop, especially as he has no episcopal benefice, a pension which retains

the canonical name of cathedraticum is usually paid to the bishop in most missionary countries. There is no uniform law on the subject. The question necessarily occupied the attention of various synods and the conclusion was unanimous that a tax analogous to the cathedraticum should be imposed on dioceses for the support of their bishops. Thus the Eighth Provincial Council of Baltimore (see BALTIMORE, PROVINCIAL COUNCILS OF), held in 1855, declares in its seventh decree: "As it is just that the bishop who watches over the salvation of all, should receive from all the faithful of the diocese whatever is necessary for his proper support and for enabling him to execute his office, we decree that he may demand for this purpose a part of the revenues of all churches in which the care of souls is exercised". The Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, writing to the bishops of the Province of Cincinnati in 1857, says: "The right of the bishop to receive support from his diocese has been recognized; nevertheless, the application and determination of the means of support can best be treated of in diocesan synods, because cognizance can then be taken of the state and condition of each diocese". The Provincial Council of New Orleans in 1856 calls this subsidy the "right of cathedraticum, either to sustain the bishop or to provide for various necessities of the diocese". It states that each bishop of the province should determine the amount in a diocesan synod. In Canada, the Provincial Council of Halifax in 1857 declares: "As the bishop is constituted not for one part but for all parts of his diocese, and as he labours and watches for all alike, all are obliged to contribute for his proper sustenance". The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866, likewise states that "it is evidently equitable and just that all the faithful of each diocese should contribute to the support of their bishop, who bears the solicitude for all".

As to the determination of the quantity of the cathedraticum, we find the First Provincial Council of Cincinnati requesting Propaganda to sanction some uniform method, but the latter preferred to commit this to the diocesan synods. In the acts of the First Provincial Council of Quebec in 1851, we find the following scheme "proposed" to Propaganda. It is there said to be similar to that already sanctioned for some bishops in Canada and Ireland: each bishop is to receive a third of the revenues of one or two parishes; or the fourth or fifth part of three or four parishes; or the tenth part of practically all the parishes in his diocese, having regard to the circumstances of each parish. Propaganda sanctioned the employment of the last-named provision in 1852. In the Province of Halifax, Canada, it was decreed in 1857 that a collection be taken up annually in October for the support of the bishops. In England, the Third Provincial Council of Westminster in 1859 placed the amount of the cathedraticum at one half pound sterling. It declared that the liability to pay this tax was obligatory on each cathedral chapter; on priests ordained for the mission, who receive salaries from churches or oratories; on those who have the cure of souls; and on all who preside over churches and public oratories unless they can prove a special exemption.

In the United States, the Eighth Provincial Council of Baltimore, when vindicating the right of the bishop to part of the revenues of the churches, enumerates as such revenues, the renting of pews, the collections taken up during Mass, and the offerings made at baptisms and marriages. An identical decree was adopted by the Second Council of the Province of Australia in 1869, but Propaganda did not sanction it and declared that the matter should preferably be determined by the various diocesan synods. This was likewise the opinion of the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866. As a consequence, different methods of computing the cathedraticum prevail throughout the United States. In one prominent diocese, for example, the rector of each church must pay one-fifth of his revenue if it exceed one thousand dollars, or one-third if it be less. The revenue in question is declared to be made up of the pew rents, the collections during Divine service and the funeral stipends. Finally the diocesan arrangement for the cathedraticum has been declared by Propaganda (as in 1872) to be a binding law on those whom it concerns.

Acta et Decreta Conc. Recent. Coll. Lacensis (Freiburg im Br., 1875), III; FERRARIS, *Bibl. Jur. Can.* (Rome, 1886), II, s. v.; SMITH, *Notes on II Conc. Balt.* (New York, 1874); BENEDICT, XIV, *De Synodo diœcesanâ*, V, 67; TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1906), s. v.

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Catherick, EDMUND, VENERABLE, English priest and martyr, b. probably in Lancashire about 1605; executed at York, 13 April, 1642. He was descended from the old family of Catherick of Carlton and Stanwick, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, known for its loyalty to the Faith. Educated at Douai College, he was ordained in the same institution, and about 1635 went out to the English mission where he began his seven years' ministry which closed with his death. During this time he was known under the *alias* Huddleston, which was probably his mother's maiden name.

Apprehended in the North Riding, near Watlas, Catherick was brought by pursuivants before Justice Dodsworth, a connexion by marriage—possibly an uncle. Gillow states (IV, 310) that it was through admissions made to Dodsworth, under the guise of friendship, that Catherick was convicted. He was arraigned at York and condemned to death together with Father John Lockwood. The execution was stayed by the king for a short time, but he finally signed the warrant and it was carried out during his presence at The Manor in York. Catherick and Lockwood were dragged through the streets of York on a hurdle to the place of execution and hanged, drawn, and quartered. Catherick's head was placed on Micklegate Bar, and what fragments remained, after the hangman's butchery, were buried at Toft Green. The "body" is now at St. Gregory's Monastery, Downside, and the skull, said to have been found at Hazlewood Castle, was carefully examined by Lingard in 1845.

GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, I, 432; CHALLONER, *Memoirs*, II; DE MARSYS, *Hist. de la persécution présente des cath.*, III.

E. F. SAXTON.

Catherine, MONASTERY OF SAINT, situated on Mount Sinai, at an altitude of 4854 feet, in a picturesque gorge below the Jebel-Musa, the reputed Mountain of the Law. This Byzantine convent, perhaps the most interesting of the Christian Orient, is under the Rule of St. Basil, and is well-known for its hospitality. It is chiefly famous, however, on account of its library, in which was discovered the Codex Sinaiticus, a valuable Biblical manuscript dating from the fourth century. Although now in a state of decay, the Monastery of St. Catherine is still held in great veneration by the Orthodox Greeks, both because it is believed to contain the remains of the famous virgin of Alexandria, and because of its intimate connexion with some of the most sublime events recorded in Holy Scripture. In a little oratory where a lamp is kept always burning, and which is only to be entered unshod, the monks show the supposed location of the Burning Bush. The earliest known historical fact is the erection of a church by Emperor Justinian about A. D. 550. A Byzantine mosaic, which is still in existence, shows that this was formerly called the church of the Transfiguration; here were gathered the hermits who had previously lived in separate cells and caves among the rocks of Mount Sinai. It is not known when or how the monastery obtained possession of the remains of St. Catherine of Alexandria and adopted her name.

According to legend her body was transported thither by the hands of angels. The name, however, does not appear in literature before the tenth century. To protect the monks and pilgrims against the Saracens the monastery was fortified like a castle, the exterior wall of which forms a quadrangle resting on solid rock. The fact that a castle presupposes a military force accounts for the mention some authors make of a military order of St. Catherine, founded in 1063, which would thus antedate any other military order. No trace has been found, however, of the rule of any such order, or of a list of its grand masters. From the Crusades the monastery of St. Catherine attracted many Latin pilgrims, who gradually formed a brotherhood, the members of which pretended to the knighthood. In return for a vague promise to protect sacred shrines and pilgrims, they were granted the coveted St. Catherine's Cross, a cross inserted in the wheel of St. Catherine. See CATHERINE OF ALEXANDRIA; SINAI; MSS. OF THE BIBLE.

PALMER, *Sinai to the Present Day* (London, 1878); WILSON AND PALMER, *Ordnance Survey of Sinai* (London, 1872); ROEHRICHTS AND MEISNER, *Deutsche Pilgerreise nach dem heiligen Lande* (Berlin, 1880); STANLEY, *Sinai and Palestine* (London, 1882); JULIAN, *Sinaï et Syrie* (Lille, 1903).

CH. MOELLER.

Catherine de' Medici, b. 13 April, 1519; d. 5 Jan., 1589; she was the daughter of Lorenzo de' Medici (II), Duke of Urbino, and Madeleine de la Tour d'Auvergne who, by her mother, Catherine of Bourbon, was related to the royal house of France. Left an orphan when only a few weeks old, Catherine had barely reached the age of thirteen when Francis I, King of France, eager to thwart the projects of the Emperor Charles V and to court the friendship of Clement VII, Catherine's uncle, arranged a marriage between Catherine and his second son Henry, Clement VII coming to Marseilles in October, 1533, for the ceremony. The death, however, of the pontiff during the ensuing year prevented Francis I from realizing the political advantages he had hoped for from this union. Having brought to the French court only 100,000 *écus* and a few poor appanages, Catherine was relegated to the background, where she remained even when, on the death of her husband's elder brother, she attained the dignity of Dauphiness. Obliged to continue in this comparative obscurity for ten years because of being childless, her entire policy meanwhile consisted in trying to retain the favour of Diane de Poitiers, her husband's mistress, and of the Duchesse d'Etampes, mistress of Francis I. On the accession of Henry II, 31 March, 1547, Catherine became Queen of France, but she still remained inconspicuous, except during Henry's short campaign in Lorraine, when she acted as regent, and even then showed her political abilities.

It was only on Henry II's death, 10 July, 1559, that Catherine's political career really began. Her son Francis II, husband of Mary Stuart, was king, and the Guises, Mary Stuart's uncles, were in power, a condition that overtaxed Catherine's patience. The Huguenots relied on her because everyone knew that the psalms of Marot had always delighted her, and that she had recently promised the Prince de Condé and the Admiral de Coligny, who were Huguenot leaders, liberty and security for their followers. But the intriguing Huguenots developed a State within the State in France, and Castelnau tells us that at their synods they were urged to adopt "all means of self-defence and attack, of furnishing money to military men and making attempts upon cities and fortresses". Catherine was obliged to allow the Guises to quell the conspiracy of Amboise, March, 1560, and for a few months to exercise a sort of Catholic dictatorship. Then, to check and paralyze their power, she appointed Michel de l'Hôpital chancellor, a man whose wife and children were Calvinists, and convoked an assembly of notables at Fontainebleau (August, 1560) at which it was decided that the punishment of heretics should be suspended, and that the States-General, from which religious peace was looked for, were to meet at Orléans in December. Meanwhile Francis II died, 5 December, 1560.

Catherine's policy remained just what it had been during Francis' brief reign. She continued to oscillate between the Catholics and Protestants in order to establish the dominion of the royal family, and was forever manœuvring between Protestant England, whose queen, Elizabeth, she sought at certain times as a daughter-in-law, and Catholic Spain, whose king, Philip II, was her son-in-law. Thus did Catherine strive to insure the independence and political self-government of French royalty. As Charles IX, Catherine's second son and the successor of Francis II, was scarcely ten years old, Catherine was regent and virtually sovereign. She named Anthony of Bourbon, King of Navarre and a Protestant, lieutenant-general of the kingdom, increased l'Hôpital's power, inflicted upon the Guises a sort of political defeat by imposing an obstacle to the marriage of Mary Stuart with Don Carlos, son of Philip II, and convoked the conference of Poissy in an endeavour to bring about a theological understanding between Catholics and Huguenots. "It is impossible", she wrote to Rome, "to reduce either by arms or law those who are separated from the Roman Church, so large is their number". She also opposed her son-in-law, Philip II of Spain, who demanded severity against the Huguenots, and the edict of January, 1562, insured them toleration. The political interests that helped to set the religious factions at variance did not abate: the arrogance of the Huguenots exasperated the Catholics, and the Vassy massacre (March, 1562) opened the first religious war, which fact alone was a victory for the Guise policy and a defeat for that of the regent. At one time Catherine thought of taking sides with Condé against the Guises, and accordingly wrote him four letters, which the Huguenots subsequently claimed to have contained her orders to Condé to take up arms, but which Catherine declared had been altered. Events then occurred in rapid succession, and she had the humiliation of seeing Guise bring Charles IX back to Paris.

Thenceforth Catherine fluctuated between the Catholic and Huguenot forces. She negotiated and watched the intrigues of Spain when it would interfere in behalf of the Catholics; of England when it would interest itself in the Huguenots; and of the emperor who took advantage of French anarchy to reclaim the three bishoprics recently conquered by Henry II. The assassination of Guise by the Huguenot, Poltrot de Méré (18 February, 1563), hastened the hour of peace, and when the treaty of Amboise (12 March, 1563) had granted certain liberties to Protestants, Catherine, to show Europe that discord no longer existed in France, sent both Catholics and Protestants to recover Le Havre (28 July, 1563), which Admiral de Coligny had yielded to the English. It was indeed a great period in Catherine's life: Charles IX who had attained his majority on the 27th of June solemnly declared to her that she should govern more than ever; the treaty with England, 11 April, 1564, assured Calais to France; and Catherine and the young king made a tour of the provinces. The Bayonne interview between Catherine and the Duke of Alba (June, 1565) caused a renewal of trouble; the Protestants spread the rumour that the queen-mother had conspired against them with the King of Spain, and a serious resort to arms was under way. For Catherine's growing hatred of Coligny; her fear lest Charles IX, susceptible to certain Huguenot influence, should ally himself with the Prince of Orange and wage war against Spain; her order for the murder of Coligny that she might regain her control over Charles IX;

and, finally, for the connexion of Coligny's murder with the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day and Catherine's responsibility in the matter—see the article ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY.

Charles IX died 30 May, 1574, and Henry, Duke of Anjou, whom Catherine had but lately made King of Poland, became King of France. She was very fond of this third son, but had only a limited influence over him. The concessions which he made to Protestants in the treaty known as the "Peace of Monsieur" (5 May, 1576) brought about the formation of the Holy League for the protection of Catholic interests. For twelve years the power of the Guises in France was constantly on the increase, the relentless warfare against the Huguenots serving only to fortify it, and as a consequence Catherine suffered cruelly. Surrounded by his favourites, Henry III let his dynasty fall into disrepute. Francis of Valois, Catherine's youngest son, died 10 June, 1584, and Henry III being without issue, Henry of Bourbon, a Protestant (the future Henry IV), fell heir to the crown of France. And now the discouraged queen-mother and the childless king saw France become the bone of contention between the League and the Huguenot party; the royal family of Valois, doomed to extinction, watched the struggle as would supernumeraries assisting at a theatrical performance. Catherine, ever ambitious, laid claim to the crown of Portugal for a member of her family, and dreamed in vain of giving the crown of France to her daughter's son, the Marquis de Pont à Mousson; but the matter rested between the Guises and the Bourbons. At the close of 1587 the real master of Paris was no longer Henry III, but the Duke of Guise, and on the "Day of the Barricades" (12 May, 1588) Catherine saved her son's honour by going in person to negotiate with Guise who received her as would a conqueror. She thus gained time for Henry III to fly secretly from Paris, and then she provisionally reconciled Henry III and Henry of Guise by the "Edict of Union" (July, 1588). This intriguing woman, who used these means to prolong the wearing of the crown by a Valois, was at Blois with her son, Henry III, for the meeting of the States-General, when she learned, on 23 December, 1588, that through assassination Henry III had rid himself of Guise. Her surprise was tragic. "You have cut out, my son, but you must sew together", she exclaimed upon hearing the news, and thirteen days later she died in despair at leaving her son in this critical situation. It was soon ended, however, when, on 1 August, 1589, the dagger of Jacques Clément cut short Henry's earthly existence. Catherine had always placed the interests of her children and her family first, and she died oppressed with anxiety whether this last representative would remain king of France until his death.

Dictatorial, unscrupulous, calculating, and crafty, the subtlety of her policy harassed all parties concerned and perhaps contributed to the aggravation of discord, although Catherine herself was peaceably inclined. Moreover, being intensely superstitious, she surrounded herself with astrologers. But she was sadly wanting in strong religious faith, and acted in favour of Catholicism only because in so doing she saw some advantage to her crown. There was never any joint interest between the Catholic Church and Catherine's religious policy. Indeed her methods were so essentially egotistical as to border on cynicism, and it was because the interests of France and of royalty were at that time identical that Catherine, in working for her children, incidentally rendered direct political service to France and, for thirty years, prevented foreigners from interfering with, or exploiting, its religious discords. Despite her many cares she found leisure in which to enrich the Bibliothèque Royale, to have Philibert Delorme erect the Tuileries, and Pierre Lescot build the Hôtel de Soissons. In a word she was a woman of the Renaissance, a disciple of Machiavelli, and the objective point of her policy may be perceived when we remember that she was a mother, crowned.

DE RUMONT, *La jeunesse de Catherine de Médicis*, tr. BASCUET (Paris, 1864); CHÉRUEL, *Marie Stuart et Catherine de Médicis* (Paris, 1858); ZELLER, *Le mouvement guisard en 1588: Catherine de Médicis et la Journée des Barricades* in *Revue Historique* (1889); *Lettres de Catherine de Médicis*, ed. DE LA FERRIÈRE, I–VI, and DE PUCHESSE, VII (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale); DE LACOMBE, *Les débuts des guerres de religion: Catherine de Médicis entre Guise et Condé* (Paris, 1899); BOUCHOT, *Catherine de Médicis* (Paris, 1899); SICHEL, *Catherine de Médicis and the French Reformation* (London, 1905).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Catherine de' Ricci, SAINT (in baptism, ALESSANDRA LUCREZIA ROMOLA), a Dominican nun, of the Third Order, though enclosed, b. in Florence, 23 April, 1522; d. 2 February, 1590. She is chiefly known to the world for her highly mystical and miraculous life, and especially as the subject of a marvellous, but fully and most carefully authenticated ecstasy, into which she was rapt every week, from Thursday at noon till 4 p.m. on Friday, for several years. In this state she went through all the stages of Our Lord's Passion, actually realizing, and showing forth to others with wonderful vividness, all that His Blessed Mother suffered in witnessing it. Her father, Pier Francesco de' Ricci, was one of an old and respected family of bankers and merchants. Her mother—of the Ricasoli family—died when she was a small child, and she was brought up by a devoted stepmother, Fiammetta da Diacceto. The latter soon observed the child's unusual tendency to holiness—particularly to solitary prayer—and did her utmost to foster and develop it. Whilst still a child, Alessandra resolved to join some strictly observant religious order; but the state of relaxation just then was so universal that it was long before she could find what she desired. Her vocation was finally decided during a stay at Prato, where she made acquaintance with the Dominican Convent of San Vincenzio, founded in 1503 by nine ladies who had been devoted followers of Savonarola. Alessandra there found the spirit of religious fervour high enough to satisfy even her ideal; and, after some difficulties with her father, she entered the novitiate, was clothed in 1535 (taking the name of Catherine), and professed in 1536.

Both during her novitiate and for four or five years after profession, she was subjected to humiliating trials from the community, owing to their misunderstanding of some of the high supernatural favours she received; but her holiness and humility eventually triumphed. She was then appointed to one important office after another, finally remaining prioress or sub-prioress till her death. During all these years, whilst conscientiously fulfilling every religious duty, she was feeling and showing keen interest in all her relations—especially her brothers—and in numerous friends and "spiritual children". The great "Ecstasy of the Passion", above referred to, happened for the first time in February, 1542, and was renewed every week afterwards for twelve years, when it ceased in answer to the prayers of Catherine herself and the community. The fame of it was bringing so many people of every rank and calling to Prato that the peace and strict observance of the convent were suffering. Catherine de' Ricci lived in an age of great saints; among her contemporaries were St. Charles Borromeo, St. Philip Neri, and St. M. Magdalen de Pazzi. With the two last-named she is said to have held, in different ways, miraculous intercourse, never having met them in a natural way. She was beatified in 1732 by Clement XII, after many delays in the process, and canonized by Benedict XIV in 1746—on both occasions amid great rejoicings at Prato, where her memory is always kept fresh. The lineal descendants of her community still inhabit the convent of San Vincenzio (now commonly called Santa

Caterina), and there her body still reposes. Her feast is kept on the 13th of February.

For the original sources see the *Letters* of Catherine de' Ricci, ed. GHERARDI (Florence, 1890); also two old Italian lives by RAZZI and GUIDI with documents mentioned. A number of her letters with full details of her life may be found in CAPES, *Life of St. Catherine de' Ricci* (London, 1905).

F. M. CAPES.

Catherine of Alexandria, SAINT, a virgin and martyr whose feast is celebrated in the Latin Church and in the various oriental churches on 25 November, and who for almost six centuries was the object of a very popular devotion. Of noble birth and learned in the sciences, when only eighteen years old, Catherine presented herself to the Emperor Maximinus

MARRIAGE OF ST. CATHERINE (Luini, Milan)

who was violently persecuting the Christians, upbraided him for his cruelty and endeavoured to prove how iniquitous was the worship of false gods. Astounded at the young girl's audacity, but incompetent to vie with her in point of learning the tyrant detained her in his palace and summoned numerous scholars whom he commanded to use all their skill in specious reasoning that thereby Catherine might be led to apostatize. But she emerged from the debate victorious. Several of her adversaries, conquered by her eloquence, declared themselves Christians and were at once put to death. Furious at being baffled, Maximinus had Catherine scourged and then imprisoned. Meanwhile the empress, eager to see so extraordinary a young woman, went with Porphyry, the head of the troops, to visit her in her dungeon, when they in turn yielded to Catherine's exhortations, believed, were baptized, and immediately won the martyr's crown. Soon afterwards the saint, who far from forsaking her Faith, effected so many conversions, was condemned to die on the wheel, but, at her touch, this instrument of torture was miraculously destroyed. The emperor, enraged beyond control, then had her beheaded and angels carried her body to Mount Sinai where later a church and monastery were built in her honour. So far the Acts of St. Catherine.

Unfortunately we have not these acts in their original form, but transformed and distorted by fantastic and diffuse descriptions which are entirely due to the imagination of the narrators who cared less to state authentic facts than to charm their readers by recitals of the marvellous. The importance attached throughout the Middle Ages to the legend of this martyr accounts for the eagerness and care with which in modern times the ancient Greek, Latin and Arabic texts containing it have been perused and studied, and concerning which critics have long since expressed their opinion, one which, in all likelihood, they will never have to retract. Several centuries ago when devotion to the saints was stimulated by the reading of extraordinary hagiographical narrations, the historical value of which no one was qualified to question, St. Catherine was invested by Catholic peoples with a halo of charming poetry and miraculous power.

Ranked with St. Margaret and St. Barbara as one of the fourteen most helpful saints in heaven, she was unceasingly praised by preachers and sung by poets. It is a well known fact that Bossuet dedicated to her one of his most beautiful panegyrics and that Adam of Saint-Victor wrote a magnificent poem in her honour: "Vox sonora nostri chori", etc. In many places her feast was celebrated with the utmost solemnity, servile work being suppressed and the devotions being attended by great numbers of people. In several dioceses of France it was observed as a Holy Day of obligation up to the beginning of the seventeenth century, the splendour of its ceremonial eclipsing that of the feasts of some of the Apostles. Numberless chapels were placed under her patronage and her statue was found in nearly all churches, representing her according to medieval iconography with a wheel, her instrument of torture. Whilst, owing to several circumstances in his life, St. Nicholas of Myra was considered the patron of young bachelors and students, St. Catherine became the patroness of young maidens and female students. Looked upon as the holiest and most illustrious of the virgins of Christ, it was but natural that she, of all others, should be worthy to watch over the virgins of the cloister and the young women of the world.

The spiked wheel having become emblematic of the saint, wheelwrights and mechanics placed themselves under her patronage. Finally, as according to tradition, she not only remained a virgin by governing her passions and conquered her executioners by wearying their patience, but triumphed in science by closing the mouths of sophists, her intercession was implored by theologians, apologists, pulpit orators, and philosophers. Before studying, writing, or preaching, they besought her to illumine their minds, guide their pens, and impart eloquence to their words. This devotion to St. Catherine which assumed such vast proportions in Europe after the Crusades, received additional éclat in France in the beginning of the fifteenth century, when it was rumoured that she had appeared to Joan of Arc and, together with St. Margaret, had been divinely appointed Joan's adviser.

Although contemporary hagiographers look upon the authenticity of the various texts containing the legend of St. Catherine as more than doubtful, it is not therefore meant to cast even the shadow of a doubt around the existence of the saint. But the conclusion reached when these texts have been carefully studied is that, if the principal facts forming the outline are to be accepted as true, the multitude of details by which these facts are almost obscured, most of the wonderful narratives with which they are embellished, and the long discourses that are put into the mouth of St. Catherine, are to be rejected as inventions, pure and simple. An example will illustrate. Although all these texts mention the miraculous translation of the saint's body to Mount Sinai, the itineraries of the ancient pilgrims who visited Sinai do not contain the slightest allusion to it. Even in the eighteenth century Dom Deforis, the Benedictine who prepared an edition of Bossuet's works, declared the tradition followed by this orator in his

panegyric on the saint, to be in a great measure false, and it was just at this time that the feast of St. Catherine disappeared from the Breviary of Paris. Since then devotion to the virgin of Alexandria has lost all its former popularity.

MIGNE, *P. G.*, CXVI, col. 276–301; VITEAU, *Passions des saints Ecaterine et Pierre d'Alexandrie, Barbara et Anysia* (Paris, 1897); VARNHAGEN, *Zur Geschichte der Legende der Katharina von Alexandrien* (Erlangen, 1891); *Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels, XXII, 1903, 423–436; XXVI, 1907, 5–32).

LEON CLUGNET.

Catherine of Aragon. See HENRY VIII.

Catherine of Bologna, SAINT, Poor Clare and mystical writer, b. at Bologna, 8 September, 1413; d. there, 9 March, 1463. When she was ten years old, her father sent her to the court of the Marquis of Ferrara, Nicolò d'Este, as a companion to the Princess Margarita. Here Catherine pursued the study of literature and the fine arts; and a manuscript illuminated by her which once belonged to Pius IX is at present reckoned among the treasures of Oxford. After the marriage of the Princess Margarita to Roberto Malatesta, Prince of Rimini, Catherine returned home, and determined to join the little company of devout maidens who were living in community and following the rule of the Third Order of St. Augustine in the neighbouring town of Ferrara. Later the community, yielding to the entreaties of Catherine, adopted the Rule of St. Clare, and in 1432 they were clothed with the habit of the Second Order of St. Francis by the provincial of the Friars Minor. The increasing number of vocations, however, made it necessary to establish other monasteries of the Poor Clares in Italy, and in pursuance of the Brief of Callistus III, "Ad ea quæ in omnipotentis Dei gloriam", convents were founded at Bologna and Cremona. St. Catherine was chosen abbess of the community in her native town, which office she held until her death. The grievous and persistent temptations which in the early days of her religious life had tried her patience, humility, and faith, especially the latter virtue, gave place in later years to the most abundant spiritual consolation, and enjoyment of the heights of contemplation. A large part of St. Catherine's counsels and instructions on the spiritual life are to be found in her "Treatise on the Seven Spiritual Weapons", which contains, besides, an account of the saint's own struggles in the path of perfection, and which she composed with the aid of her confessor shortly before her death. The body of St. Catherine, which remains incorrupt, is preserved in the chapel of the Poor Clares at Bologna. St. Catherine was canonized by Pope Benedict XIII. Her feast is kept on the 9th of March throughout the Order of Friars Minor.

WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, X, 184; XII, 307; XIII, 324, and passim; *Acta SS.*, March, II, 35–89; LEO, *Lives of the Saints and Blessed of the Three Orders of St. Francis* (Taunton, 1885), I, 394–437; ZAMBONI, *La Vita di Santa Caterina di Bologna* (Bologna, 1877).

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Catherine of Genoa, SAINT, (CATERINA FIESCHI ADORNO), b. at Genoa in 1447, d. at the same place 14 Sept., 1510. The life of St. Catherine of Genoa may be more properly described as a state than as a life in the ordinary sense. When about twenty-six years old she became the subject of one of the most extraordinary operations of God in the human soul of which we have record, the result being a marvellous inward condition that lasted till her death. In this state, she received wonderful revelations, of which she spoke at times to those around her, but which are mainly embodied in her two celebrated works: the "Dialogues of the Soul and the Body", and the "Treatise on Purgatory". Her modern biographies, chiefly translations or adaptations of an old Italian one which is itself founded on "Memoirs" drawn up by the saint's own confessor and a friend, mingle what facts they give of her outward life with accounts of her supernatural state and "doctrine", regardless of sequence, and in an almost casual fashion that makes them entirely subservient to her psychological history. These facts are as follows:

St. Catherine's parents were Jacopo Fieschi and Francesca di Negro, both of illustrious Italian birth. Two popes—Innocent IV and Adrian V—had been of the Fieschi family, and Jacopo himself became Viceroy of Naples. Catherine is described as an extraordinarily holy child, highly gifted in the way of prayer, and with a wonderful love of Christ's Passion and of penitential practices; but, also, as having been a most quiet, simple, and exceedingly obedient girl. When about thirteen, she wished to enter the convent, but the nuns to whom her confessor applied having refused her on account of her youth, she appears to have put the idea aside without any further attempt. At sixteen, she was married by her parents' wish to a young Genoese nobleman, Giuliano Adorno. The marriage turned out wretchedly; Giuliano proved faithless, violent-tempered, and a spendthrift, and made the life of his wife a misery. Details are scanty, but it seems at least clear that Catherine spent the first five years of her marriage in silent, melancholy submission to her husband; and that she then, for another five, turned a little to the world for consolation in her troubles. The distractions she took were most innocent; nevertheless, destined as she was for an extraordinary life, they had the effect in her case of producing lukewarmness, the end of which was such intense weariness and depression that she prayed earnestly for a return of her old fervour. Then, just ten years after her marriage, came the event of her life, in answer to her prayer. She went one day, full of melancholy, to a convent in Genoa where she had a sister, a nun. The latter advised her to go to confession to the nuns' confessor, and Catherine agreed. No sooner, however, had she knelt down in the confessional than a ray of Divine light pierced her soul, and in one moment manifested her own sinfulness and the Love of God with equal clearness. The revelation was so overwhelming that she lost consciousness and fell into a kind of ecstacy, for a space during which the confessor happened to be called away. When he returned, Catherine could only murmur that she would put off her confession, and go quickly home.

From the moment of that sudden vision of herself and God, the saint's interior state seems never to have changed, save by varying in intensity and being accompanied by more or less severe penance, according to what she saw required of her by the Holy Spirit, Who guided her incessantly. No one could describe it except herself; but she does so, minutely, in her writings, from which may here be made one short extract:—"[The souls in Purgatory] see all things, not in themselves, nor by themselves, but as they are in God, on whom they are more intent than on their own sufferings. . . . For the least vision they have of God overbalances all woes and all joys that can be conceived. Yet their joy in God does by no means abate their pain. . . . This process of purification to which I see the souls in Purgatory subjected, I feel within myself." (Treatise on Purgatory, xvi, xvii.) For about twenty-five years, Catherine, though frequently making confessions, was unable to open her mind for direction to anyone; but towards the end of her life a Father Marabotti was appointed to be her spiritual guide. To him she explained her states, past and present, in full, and he compiled the "Memoirs" above referred to from his intimate personal knowledge of her. Of the saint's outward life, after this great change, her biographies practically tell us but two facts: that she at last converted her husband, who died penitent in 1497; and that both before and after his death—though more entirely after it—she gave herself to the care of the sick in the great Hos-

pital of Genoa, where she eventually became manager and treasurer. She died worn out with labours of body and soul, and consumed, even physically, by the fires of Divine love within her. She was beatified in 1675, by Clement V, but not canonized till 1737, by Clement XII. Meantime, her writings had been examined by the Holy Office and pronounced to contain doctrine that would be enough, in itself, to prove her sanctity.

The first published life, based on early MSS., is GENUTI, *Vita mirabile e dottrina santa della Beata Caterina da Genova* (Florence, 1551). Founded on the above: FLICHE, *St. Catherine de Gênes, sa vie et son esprit* (1881); *Life and Doctrine of St Catherine of Genoa* (Eng. tr., New York, 1874). For a discussion of her doctrine, PARPERA, *Beata Caterina Genuensis illustrata* (Genoa, 1682). See also BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, IX, 14 Sept., and a modern life by DE BUSSIÈRE.

F. M. CAPES.

Catherine of Siena, SAINT, Dominican Tertiary, b. at Siena, 25 March, 1347; d. at Rome, 29 April, 1380. She was the youngest but one of a very large family. Her father, Giacomo di Benincasa, was a dyer; her mother, Lapa, the daughter of a local poet. They belonged to the lower middle-class faction of tradesmen and petty notaries, known as "the Party of the Twelve", which between one revolution and another ruled the Republic of Siena from 1355 to 1368. From her earliest childhood Catherine began to see visions and to practise extreme austerities. At the age of seven she consecrated her virginity to Christ; in her sixteenth year she took the habit of the Dominican Tertiaries, and renewed the life of the anchorites of the desert in a little room in her father's house. After three years of celestial visitations and familiar conversation with Christ, she underwent the mystical experience known as the "spiritual espousals", probably during the carnival of 1366. She now rejoined her family, began to tend the sick, especially those afflicted with the most repulsive diseases, to serve the poor, and to labour for the conversion of sinners. Though always suffering terrible physical pain, living for long intervals on practically no food save the Blessed Sacrament, she was ever radiantly happy and full of practical wisdom no less than the highest spiritual insight. All her contemporaries bear witness to her extraordinary personal charm, which prevailed over the continual persecution to which she was subjected even by the friars of her own order and by her sisters in religion. She began to gather disciples round her, both men and women, who formed a wonderful spiritual fellowship, united to her by the bonds of mystical love. During the summer of 1370 she received a series of special manifestations of Divine mysteries, which culminated in a prolonged trance, a kind of mystical death, in which she had a vision of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven, and heard a Divine command to leave her cell and enter the public life of the world. She began to dispatch letters to men and women in every condition of life, entered into correspondence with the princes and republics of Italy, was consulted by the papal legates about the affairs of the Church, and set herself to heal the wounds of her native land by staying the fury of civil war and the ravages of faction. She implored the pope, Gregory XI, to leave Avignon, to reform the clergy and the administration of the Papal States, and ardently threw herself into his design for a crusade, in the hopes of uniting the powers of Christendom against the infidels, and restoring peace to Italy by delivering her from the wandering companies of mercenary soldiers. While at Pisa, on the fourth Sunday of Lent, 1375, she received the Stigmata, although, at her special prayer, the marks did not appear outwardly in her body while she lived.

Mainly through the misgovernment of the papal officials, war broke out between Florence and the Holy See, and almost the whole of the Papal States rose in insurrection. Catherine had already been sent on a mission from the pope to secure the neutrality of Pisa and Lucca. In June, 1376, she went to Avignon as ambassador of the Florentines, to make their peace; but, either through the bad faith of the republic or through a misunderstanding caused by the frequent changes in its government, she was unsuccessful. Nevertheless she made such a profound impression upon the mind of the pope, that, in spite of the opposition of the French king and almost the whole of the Sacred College, he returned to Rome (17 January, 1377). Catherine spent the greater part of 1377 in effecting a wonderful spiritual revival in the country districts subject to the Republic of Siena, and it was at this time that she miraculously

CANONIZATION OF CATHERINE BENINCASA BY PAUL II (Pinturicchio Library, Siena)

learned to write, though she still seems to have chiefly relied upon her secretaries for her correspondence. Early in 1378 she was sent by Pope Gregory to Florence, to make a fresh effort for peace. Unfortunately, through the factious conduct of her Florentine associates, she became involved in the internal politics of the city, and during a popular tumult (22 June) an attempt was made upon her life. She was bitterly disappointed at her escape, declaring that her sins had deprived her of the red rose of martyrdom. Nevertheless, during the disastrous revolution known as "the tumult of the Ciompi", she still remained at Florence or in its territory until, at the beginning of August, news reached the city that peace had been signed between the republic and the new pope. Catherine then instantly returned to Siena, where she passed a few months of comparative quiet, dictating her "Dialogue", the book of her meditations and revelations.

In the meanwhile the Great Schism had broken out in the Church. From the outset Catherine enthusiastically adhered to the Roman claimant, Urban VI, who, in November, 1378, summoned her to Rome. In the Eternal City she spent what remained of her life, working strenuously for the reformation of the

Church, serving the destitute and afflicted, and dispatching eloquent letters in behalf of Urban to high and low in all directions. Her strength was rapidly being consumed; she besought her Divine Bridegroom to let her bear the punishment for all the sins of the world, and to receive the sacrifice of her body for the unity and renovation of the Church; at last it seemed to her that the Bark of Peter was laid upon her shoulders, and that it was crushing her to death with its weight. After a prolonged and mysterious agony of three months, endured by her with supreme exultation and delight, from Sexagesima Sunday until the Sunday before the Ascension, she died. Her last political work, accomplished practically from her death-bed, was the reconciliation of Pope Urban VI with the Roman Republic (1380).

Among Catherine's principal followers were Fra Raimondo delle Vigne, of Capua (d. 1399), her confessor and biographer, afterwards General of the Dominicans, and Stefano di Corrado Maconi (d. 1424), who had been one of her secretaries, and became Prior General of the Carthusians. Raimondo's book, the "Legend", was finished in 1395. A second life of her, the "Supplement", was written a few years later by another of her associates, Fra Tommaso Caffarini (d. 1434), who also composed the "Minor Legend", which was translated into Italian by Stefano Maconi. Between 1411 and 1413 the depositions of the surviving witnesses of her life and work were collected at Venice, to form the famous "Process". Catherine was canonized by Pius II in 1461. The emblems by which she is known in Christian art are the lily and book, the crown of thorns, or sometimes a heart—referring to the legend of her having changed hearts with Christ. Her principal feast is on the 30th of April, but it is popularly celebrated in Siena on the Sunday following. The feast of her Espousals is kept on the Thursday of the carnival.

The works of St. Catherine of Siena rank among the classics of the Italian language, written in the beautiful Tuscan vernacular of the fourteenth century. Notwithstanding the existence of many excellent manuscripts, the printed editions present the text in a frequently mutilated and most unsatisfactory condition. Her writings consist of (1) the "Dialogue", or "Treatise on Divine Providence"; (2) a collection of nearly four hundred letters; and (3) a series of "Prayers". The "Dialogue" especially, which treats of the whole spiritual life of man in the form of a series of colloquies between the Eternal Father and the human soul (represented by Catherine herself), is the mystical counterpart in prose of Dante's "Divina Commedia". A smaller work in the dialogue form, the "Treatise on Consummate Perfection", is also ascribed to her, but is probably spurious. It is impossible in a few words to give an adequate conception of the manifold character and contents of the "Letters", which are the most complete expression of Catherine's many-sided personality. While those addressed to popes and sovereigns, rulers of republics and leaders of armies, are documents of priceless value to students of history, many of those written to private citizens, men and women in the cloister or in the world, are as fresh and illuminating, as wise and practical in their advice and guidance for the devout Catholic today as they were for those who sought her counsel while she lived. Others, again, lead the reader to mystical heights of contemplation, a rarefied atmosphere of sanctity in which only the few privileged spirits can hope to dwell. The key-note to Catherine's teaching is that man, whether in the cloister or in the world, must ever abide in the cell of self-knowledge, which is the stable in which the traveller through time to eternity must be born again.

Processus contestationum super sanctitate et doctrina beatæ Catharinæ de Senis, in MARTÈNE AND DURAND, *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Amplissima Collectio* (Paris, 1729), VI; GIGLI, *L'opere della serafica Santa Caterina da Siena* (Siena and Lucca, 1707–54); TOMMASEO, *Le Lettere di S. Caterina da Siena* (Florence, 1860); GROTTANELLI, *Leggenda minore di S. Caterina da Siena e lettere dei suoi Discepoli* (Bologna, 1868); CAPECELATRO, *Storia di S. Caterina da Siena e del papato del suo tempo* (4th ed., Siena, 1878); DRANE, *The History of St. Catherine of Siena and her Companions* (London, 1887); THOROLD, *The Dialogue of St. Catherine* (London, 1898); SCUDDER, *St. Catherine as seen in her Letters* (London and New York, 1905); GARDNER, *St. Catherine of Siena* (London and New York, 1907). Italian translations of the *Legend* and the *Supplement* are included in the first and fifth volumes of GIGLI'S *Edition;* important portions of the *Process* are still left unpublished in MSS. in the Biblioteca Comunale of Siena and the Biblioteca Casanatense at Rome.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

Catherine of Sweden, SAINT, the fourth child of St. Bridget (q. v.) and her husband, Ulf Gudmarsson, b. 1331 or 1332; d. 24 March, 1381. At the time of her death St. Catherine was head of the convent of Wadstena, founded by her mother; hence the name, Catherine Vastanensis, by which she is occasionally called. At the age of seven she was sent to the abbess of the convent of Riseberg to be educated and soon showed, like her mother, a desire for a life of self-mortification and devotion to spiritual things. At the command of her father, when about thirteen or fourteen years old, she married a noble of German descent, Eggart von Kürnen. She at once persuaded her husband, who was a very religious man, to join her in a vow of chastity. Both lived in a state of virginity and devoted themselves to the exercise of Christian perfection and active charity. In spite of her deep love for her husband, Catherine accompanied her mother to Rome, where St. Bridget went in 1349. Soon after her arrival in that city Catherine received news of the death of her husband in Sweden. She now lived constantly with her mother, took an active part in St. Bridget's fruitful labours, and zealously imitated her mother's ascetic life. Although the distinguished and beautiful young widow was surrounded by suitors, she steadily refused all offers of marriage. In 1372 St. Catherine and her brother, Birger, accompanied their mother on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; after their return to Rome St. Catherine was with her mother in the latter's last illness and death.

In 1374, in obedience to St. Bridget's wish, Catherine brought back her mother's body to Sweden for burial at Wadstena, of which foundation she now became the head. It was the mother-house of the Brigittine Order, also called the Order of St. Saviour. Catherine managed the convent with great skill and made the life there one in harmony with the principles laid down by its founder. The following year she went again to Rome in order to promote the canonization of St. Bridget, and to obtain a new papal confirmation of the order. She secured another confirmation both from Gregory XI (1377) and from Urban VI (1379), but was unable to gain at the time the canonization of her mother, as the confusion caused by the Schism delayed the process. When this sorrowful division appeared she showed herself, like St. Catherine of Siena, a steadfast adherent of the party of the Roman Pope, Urban VI, in whose favour she testified before a judicial commission. Catherine stayed five years in Italy and then returned home, bearing a special letter of commendation from the pope. Not long after her arrival in Sweden she was taken ill and died. In 1484 Innocent VIII gave permission for her veneration as a saint and her feast was assigned to 22 March in the Roman martyrology. Catherine wrote a devotional work entitled "Consolation of the Soul" (Sielinna Troëst), largely composed of citations from the Scriptures and from early religious books; no copy is known to exist. Generally she is represented with a hind at her side, which is said to have come to her aid when unchaste youths sought to ensnare her.

Vita S. Catharinæ Suecicæ, auct. Ulphone monachio [d. 1433] *in cœnobia Wadstenensi:* in SURIUS, *De probatis Sanctor. historiis* (Cologne, 1571), II, 346 sqq.: *in Acta SS.*, March, III, 503

sqq., with introduction: in KLEMING (Stockholm, 1869), with photo-lithograph and introduction; *Miracula a commissariis episcopalibus excepta*, in *Acta SS.*, loc. cit., 519 sqq.; *Translatio Katerinæ anno* 1489 *auct. Nic Ravaldi* (in Swedish), in FANT, *Script. rer. Suecicarum* (1871), III, § II, 268 sqq.; SCHRÖDER, *Translatio S. Catharinæ* 1489 *Wadstensis celebrata* (Upsala, 1832–33), III parts; KARSMAN, *De hell. Katrina von Zweden* (Antwerp, 1843).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Catholic.—The word *Catholic* (*καθολικός* from *καθ' ὅλου*—throughout the whole, i. e., universal) occurs in the Greek classics, e. g., in Aristotle and Polybius, and was freely used by the earlier Christian writers in what we may call its primitive and non-ecclesiastical sense. Thus we meet such phrases as "the catholic resurrection" (Justin Martyr), "the catholic goodness of God" (Tertullian), "the four catholic winds" (Irenæus), where we should now speak of "the general resurrection", "the absolute or universal goodness of God", "the four principal winds", etc. The word seems in this usage to be opposed to *μερικός* (partial) or *ἴδιος* (particular), and one familiar example of this conception still survives in the ancient phrase "Catholic Epistles" as applied to those of St. Peter, St. Jude, etc., which were so called as being addressed not to particular local communities, but to the Church at large.

The combination "the Catholic Church" (*ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία*) is found for the first time in the letter of St. Ignatius to the Smyrnæans, written about the year 110. The words run: "Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be, even as where Jesus may be, there is the universal [*καθολικὴ*] Church." However, in view of the context, some difference of opinion prevails as to the precise connotation of the italicized word, and Kattenbusch, the Protestant professor of theology at Giessen, is prepared to interpret this earliest appearance of the phrase in the sense of *μία μόνη*, the "one and only" Church [Das apostolische Symbolum (1900), II, 922]. From this time forward the technical signification of the word Catholic meets us with increasing frequency both East and West, until by the beginning of the fourth century it seems to have almost entirely supplanted the primitive and more general meaning. The earlier examples have been collected by Caspari (Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols, etc., III, 149 sqq.). Many of them still admit the meaning "universal". The reference (c. 155) to "the bishop of the catholic church in Smyrna" (Letter on the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, xvi), a phrase which necessarily presupposes a more technical use of the word, is due, some critics think, to interpolation. On the other hand this sense undoubtedly occurs more than once in the Muratorian Fragment (c. 180), where, for example, it is said of certain heretical writings that they "cannot be received in the Catholic Church". A little later, Clement of Alexandria speaks very clearly. "We say", he declares, "that both in substance and in seeming, both in origin and in development, the primitive and Catholic Church is the only one, agreeing as it does in the unity of one faith" (Stromata, VII, xvii; P. G., IX, 552). From this and other passages which might be quoted, the technical use seems to have been clearly established by the beginning of the third century. In this sense of the word it implies sound doctrine as opposed to heresy, and unity of organization as opposed to schism (Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, Part II, vol. I, 414 sqq. and 621 sqq.; II, 310–312). In fact Catholic soon became in many cases a mere appellative—the proper name, in other words, of the true Church founded by Christ, just as we now frequently speak of the Orthodox Church, when referring to the established religion of the Russian Empire, without adverting to the etymology of the title so used. It was probably in this sense that the Spaniard Pacian (Ep. i ad Sempron.) writes, about 370: "Christianus mihi nomen est, catholicus cognomen", and it is noteworthy that in various early Latin expositions of the Creed, notably that of Nicetas of Remesiana, which dates from about 375 (ed. Burn, 1905, p. lxx), the word Catholic in the Creed, though undoubtedly coupled at that date with the words Holy Church, suggests no special comment. Even in St. Cyprian (c. 252) it is difficult to determine how far he uses the word Catholic significantly, and how far as a mere name. The title, for instance, of his longest work is "On the Unity of the Catholic Church", and we frequently meet in his writings such phrases as *catholica fides* (Ep. xxv; ed. Hartel, II, 538); *catholica unitas* (Ep. xlv, p. 600); *catholica regula* (Ep. lxx, p. 767), etc. The one clear idea underlying all is orthodox as opposed to heretical, and Kattenbusch does not hesitate to admit that in Cyprian we first see how Catholic and Roman came eventually to be regarded as interchangeable terms. (Cf. Harnack, Dogmengeschichte, II, 149–168.) Moreover it should be noted that the word *Catholica* was sometimes used substantively as the equivalent of *ecclesia Catholica*. An example is to be found in the Muratorian Fragment, another seemingly in Tertullian (De Præscrip, xxx), and many more appear at a later date, particularly among African writers.

Among the Greeks it was natural that while Catholic served as the distinctive description of the one Church, the etymological significance of the word was never quite lost sight of. Thus in the "Catechetical Discourses" of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 347) he insists on the one hand (§ 26): "And if ever thou art sojourning in any city, inquire not simply where the Lord's house is—for the sects of the profane also attempt to call their own dens, houses of the Lord—nor merely where the church is, but where is the Catholic Church. For this is the peculiar name of the holy body the mother of us all." On the other hand when discussing the word Catholic, which already appears in his form of the baptismal creed, St. Cyril remarks: (§ 23) "Now it [the Church] is called Catholic because it is throughout the world, from one end of the earth to the other." But we shall have occasion to quote this passage more at length later on.

There can be no doubt, however, that it was the struggle with the Donatists which first drew out the full theological significance of the epithet Catholic and passed it on to the schoolmen as an abiding possession. When the Donatists claimed to represent the one true Church of Christ, and formulated certain marks of the Church, which they professed to find in their own body, it could not fail to strike their orthodox opponents that the title Catholic, by which the Church of Christ was universally known, afforded a far surer test, and that this was wholly inapplicable to a sect which was confined to one small corner of the world. The Donatists, unlike all previous heretics, had not gone wrong upon any Christological question. It was their conception of Church discipline and organization which was faulty. Hence, in refuting them, a more or less definite theory of the Church and its marks was gradually evolved by St. Optatus (c. 370) and St. Augustine (c. 400). These doctors particularly insisted upon the note of Catholicity, and they pointed out that both the Old and the New Testament represented the Church as spread over all the earth. (See Turmel, "Histoire de la théologie positive, 1904, I, 162–166, with references there given.) Moreover, St. Augustine insists upon the consensus of Christians in the use of the name Catholic. "Whether they wish or no", he says, "heretics have to call the Catholic Church Catholic" ("De verâ religione", xii). "Although all heretics wish to be styled Catholic, yet if any one ask where is the Catholic place of worship none of them would venture to point out his own conventicle" (Contra Epistolam quam vocant Fundamenti, iv). Of later exponents of this same thesis the most famous is Vincent of

Lérins (c. 434). His canon of Catholicity is "That which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all." "This", he adds, "is what is truly and properly Catholic" (Commonitorium, I, ii).

Although belief in the "holy Church" was included in the earliest form of the Roman Creed, the word Catholic does not seem to have been added to the Creed anywhere in the West until the fourth century. Kattenbusch believes that our existing form is first met with in the "Exhortatio" which he attributes to Gregorius of Eliberis (c. 360). It is possible, however, that the creed lately printed by Dom Morin (Revue Bénédictine, 1904, p. 3) is of still earlier date. In any case the phrase, "I believe in the holy Catholic Church" occurs in the form commented on by Nicetas of Remesiana (c. 375).

With regard to the modern use of the word, Roman Catholic is the designation employed in the legislative enactments of Protestant England, but *Catholic* is that in ordinary use on the Continent of Europe, especially in Latin countries. Indeed, historians of all schools, at least for brevity's sake, frequently contrast Catholic and Protestant, without any qualification. In England, since the middle of the sixteenth century, indignant protests have been constantly made against the "exclusive and arrogant usurpation" of the name Catholic by the Church of Rome. The Protestant, Archdeacon Philpot, who was put to death in 1555, was held to be very obstinate on this point (see the edition of his works published by the Parker Society); and among many similar controversies of a later date may be mentioned that between Dr. Bishop, subsequently vicar Apostolic, and Dr. Abbot, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, regarding the "Catholicke Deformed", which raged from 1599 to 1614. According to some, such combinations as Roman Catholic, or Anglo-Catholic, involve a contradiction in terms. (See the Anglican Bishop of Carlisle in "The Hibbert Journal", January, 1908, p. 287.) From about the year 1580, besides the term papist, employed with opprobrious intent, the followers of the old religion were often called Romish or Roman Catholics. Sir William Harbert, in 1585, published a "Letter to a Roman pretended Catholique", and in 1587 an Italian book by G. B. Aurellio was printed in London regarding the different doctrines "dei Protestanti veri e Cattolici Romani". Neither do the Catholics always seem to have objected to the appellation, but sometimes used it themselves. On the other hand, Protestant writers often described their opponents simply as "Catholics". A conspicuous instance is the "Pseudomartyr" of Dr. John Donne, printed in 1610. Moreover, if only for brevity's sake, such burning questions as "Catholic Emancipation" have commonly been discussed by both sides without any qualifying prefix. In connexion with this matter we may call attention to a common Anglican view represented in such a popular work of reference as Hook's "Church Dictionary" (1854), s.v. "Catholic" —"Let the member of the Church of England assert his right to the name of Catholic, since he is the only person in England who has a right to that name. The English Romanist is a Roman Schismatic and not a Catholic." The idea is further developed in Blunt's "Dictionary of Sects and Heresies" (1874), where "Roman Catholics" are described as "a sect organised by the Jesuits out of the relics of the Marian party in the reign of Queen Elizabeth". An earlier and less extreme view will be found in Newman's "Essays Critical and Historical", published by him as an Anglican (see No. 9, "The Catholicity of the Anglican Church"). The Cardinal's own note on this essay, in the last revised edition, may be read with advantage.

So far we have been considering only the history and meaning of the name Catholic. We turn to its theological import as it has been emphasized and formalized by later theologians. No doubt the enumeration of four precise "notes" by which the Church is marked off from the sects is of comparatively recent development, but the conception of some such external tests, as pointed out above, is based upon the language of St. Augustine, St. Optatus, and others, in their controversies with the heretics of their time. In a famous passage of St. Augustine's treatise "Contra Epistolam quam vocant Fundamenti", directed against the Donatists, the holy doctor declares that besides the intrinsic acceptability of her doctrine "there are many other things which most justly keep me within the bosom of the Church", and after indicating the agreement in faith among her members, or, as we should say, her Unity, as well as "the succession of priests from the installation of Peter the Apostle, to whom our Lord after His resurrection entrusted His sheep to be fed, down to the present episcopate", in other words the quality which we call Apostolicity (q. v.), St. Augustine continues in a passage previously cited in part, "Lastly there holds me the very name of Catholic which not without reason so closely attaches to the Church amid the heresies which surround it, that although all heretics would fain be called Catholics, still if any stranger should ask where the Catholic service is held, not one of these heretics would dare to point to his own conventicle" (Corpus Scrip. Eccles. Lat., XXV, Pt. I, 196). It was very natural that the situation created by the controversies of the sixteenth century should lead to a more exact determination of these "notes". English theologians like Stapleton (Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio, Bk. IV, cc. iii sqq.) and Sander (De Visibili Monarchiâ, Bk. VIII, cap. xl) were foremost in urging this aspect of the question between the Churches, and foreign scholars like Bellarmine, who engaged in the same debates, readily caught the tone from them. Sander distinguished six prerogatives of the Church instituted by Christ. Stapleton recognized two primary attributes as contained in Christ's promises—to wit, universality in space and perpetuity in time—and from these he deduced the other visible marks. Bellarmine, starting with the name Catholic, enumerated fourteen other qualities verified in the external history of the institution which claimed this title (De Conciliis, Bk. IV, cap. iii). In all these varying schemes, it may be remarked, the universality of the Church was given a foremost place among her distinctive marks. However, already in the fifteenth century the theologian John Torquemada had set down the notes of the Church as four in number, and this more simple arrangement, founded upon the wording of the familiar Mass Creed (Et unam, sanctam, catholicam et apostolicam Ecclesiam), eventually won universal acceptance. It is adopted, for instance, in the "Catechismus ad Parochos", which in accordance with a decree of the Council of Trent was drawn up and published in 1566 with the highest official sanction (see DOCTRINE, CHRISTIAN). In this authoritative document we read:—

"The third mark of the Church is that she is Catholic, that is, universal; and justly is she called Catholic, because, as St. Augustine says, 'she is diffused by the splendour of one faith from the rising to the setting sun'. Unlike republics of human institution, or the conventicles of heretics, she is not circumscribed within the limits of any one kingdom, nor confined to the members of any one society of men, but embraces within the amplitude of her love, all mankind, whether barbarians or Scythians, slaves or freemen, male or female."

In confirmation of this, various prophetic utterances of Holy Scripture are quoted, after which the Catechism proceeds: "To this Church, built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets (Ephes., ii, 20) belong all the faithful who have existed from

Adam to the present day, or who shall exist in the profession of the true faith to the end of time, all of whom are founded and raised upon the one cornerstone, Christ, who made both one, and announced peace to them that are near, and to them that are afar. She is also called universal, because all who desire eternal salvation must cling to and embrace her, like those who entered the ark to escape perishing in the flood. This, therefore, is to be taught as a most just criterion to distinguish the true from a false church."

This multiplex and somewhat confused presentment of the note of Catholicity undoubtedly finds its warrant in the equally wide interpretation of some of the early Fathers. Thus, for example, St. Cyril of Jerusalem says: "The Church is called Catholic because she is diffused throughout the whole world [i. e. the habitable world, *οἰκουμένης*] from one end of the earth to the other, and because she teaches universally and without curtailment all the truths of faith which ought to be known to men whether they concern visible or invisible things, heavenly things or the things of earth; further because she brings under the yoke of God's true service all races of men, the mighty and the lowly, the learned and the simple; and finally because she tends and heals every kind of sin committed by body or soul and because there is no form of virtue, whether in word or deed or in spiritual gifts of any kind whatever, which she does not possess as her own" (Cateches., xviii, 23; P. G., XXXIII, 1043). In similar terms speaks St. Isidore (De Offic., Bk. I), among the Fathers of the West, and a variety of other explanations might also, no doubt, be appealed to.

But of all these various interpretations, which, after all, are not inconsistent with one another, and which are probably only characteristic of a fashion of exegesis which delighted in multiplicity, one conception of Catholicity is almost invariably made prominent. This is the idea of the actual local diffusion of the Church, and this is also the aspect which, thanks no doubt to the influence of Protestant controversy, has been most insisted upon by the theologians of the last three centuries. Some heretical and schismatical teachers have practically refused to recognize Catholicity as an essential attribute of Christ's Church, and in the Lutheran version of the Apostles' Creed, for example, the word Catholic ("I believe in the holy Catholic Church") is replaced by Christian. But in the majority of the Protestant professions of faith the wording of the original has been retained, and the representatives of these various shades of opinion have been at pains to find an interpretation of the phrase which is in any way consistent with geographical and historical facts. (For these see CHRISTENDOM.) The majority, including most of the older Anglican divines (e. g. Pearson on the Creed), have contented themselves with laying stress in some shape or form upon the design of the Founder of the Church that His Gospel should be preached throughout the world. This diffusion *de jure* serves its purpose sufficiently as a justification for the retention of the word Catholic in the Creed, but the supporters of this view are of necessity led to admit that Catholicity so understood cannot serve as a visible criterion by which the true Church is to be distinguished from schismatical sects. Those Protestant bodies who do not altogether reject the idea of "notes" distinctive of the true Church consequently fall back for the most part upon the honest preaching of God's word and the regular administration of the sacraments as the only criteria. (See the "Confession of Augsburg", Art. 7, etc.) But such notes as these, which may be claimed by many different religious bodies with apparently equal right, are practically inoperative, and, as Catholic controversialists have commonly pointed out, the question only resolves itself into the discussion of the nature of the Unity of the Church under another form. The same must be said of that very large class of Protestant teachers who look upon all sincere Christian communions as branches of the one Catholic Church with Christ for its invisible head. Taken collectively, these various branches lay claim to world-wide diffusion *de facto* as well as *de jure*. But clearly, here again the question primarily involved is that concerning the nature of the Unity of the Church, and it is to the articles CHURCH and UNITY, that the reader who wishes to pursue the matter further must be referred.

As against these and other interpretations which have prevailed among Protestants from the Reformation until quite recent times, the scholastic theologians of the last three centuries have been wont to put forward the conception of the note of Catholicity in various formal propositions, of which the most essential elements are the following. The true Church of Christ, as it is revealed to us in prophecy, in the New Testament, and in the writings of the Fathers of the first six centuries, is a body which possesses the prerogative of Catholicity, i. e. of general diffusion, not only as a matter of right, but in actual fact. Moreover, this diffusion is not only successive—i. e. so that one part of the world after another should in course of ages be brought in contact with the Gospel—but it is such that the Church may be permanently described as spread throughout the world. Further, as this general diffusion is a property to which no other Christian association can justly lay claim, we are entitled to say that Catholicity is a distinctive mark of the true Church of Christ.

It will be seen from this that the point upon which stress is laid is that of actual local diffusion, and it can hardly be denied that both the Scriptural and Patristic arguments adduced by Bellarmine, Thomassin, Alexander Natalis, Nicole, and others, to take but a few prominent names, afford strong justification for the claim. The Scriptural argument seems first to have been developed by St. Optatus of Mileve against the Donatists, and it was equally employed by St. Augustine when he took up the same controversy a few years later. Adducing a large number of passages in the Psalms (e. g. Pss. ii and lxxi), with Daniel (ch. ii), Isaiah (e. g. liv, 3), and other prophetic writers, the Fathers and modern theologians alike draw attention to the picture which is there afforded of the Kingdom of Christ the Messiah as something gloriously and conspicuously spread throughout the world, e. g. "I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession", "He shall rule from sea to sea", "All the nations shall serve Him", etc., etc. Moreover, in combination with these we have to notice our Lord's instructions and promises: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations", "You shall be witnesses unto me . . . even to the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts, i, 8), or St. Paul's words quoting Psalm xviii, "Yes, verily, their sound went out over all the earth and their words unto the ends of the whole world" (Rom., x, 18), etc. But the real strength of the argument lies in the patristic evidence, for such words of Scripture as those just quoted are cited and interpreted, not by one or two only, but by a large number of different Fathers, both of the East and of the West, and nearly always in such terms as are consistent only with the actual diffusion over regions which to them represented, morally speaking, the whole world. It is indeed particularly important to note that in many of these patristic passages the writer, while insisting upon the local extension of the Church, distinctly implies that this diffusion is relative and not absolute, that it is to be general indeed, but in a moral, not in a physical or mathematical sense. Thus St. Augustine (Epist. cxcix; P. L., XXXIII, 922, 923) explains that nations which formed no part of the Roman Empire had already

joined the Church, which was fructifying and increasing throughout the whole world. But he adds that there will be always need and room for it still to grow; and, after quoting Rom., x, 14, he adds: "In those nations therefore among whom the Church is not yet known it has still to find a place [in quibus ergo gentibus nondum est ecclesia, oportet ut sit], not indeed in such a way that all who are there should become believers; for it is all nations that are promised, not all the men of all nations. . . . Otherwise how shall that prophecy be fulfilled, 'Ye shall be hated by all for my name's sake', unless among all nations there are those who hate as well as those who are hated?"

Lastly, it should be said that among some confused thinkers of the Anglican communion, as also among certain representatives of Modernist opinions, an interpretation of the Catholicity of the Church has lately come into fashion which has little connexion with anything that has hitherto fallen under our notice. Starting with the conception familiar in such locutions as "a man of catholic tastes", meaning a man who excludes no rational interest from his sympathies, these writers would persuade us that a *catholic* church either does or should mean a church endowed with unlimited comprehensiveness, i. e. which is prepared to welcome and assimilate all opinions honestly held, however contradictory. To this it may be answered that the idea is absolutely foreign to the connotation of the phrase *Catholic Church* as we can trace it in the writings of the Fathers. To take a term consecrated by centuries of usage and to attach a brand-new meaning to it, of which those who through the ages had it constantly on their lips never dreamed, is to say the least extremely misleading. If this comprehensiveness and elasticity of belief is regarded as a desirable quality, by all means let it have a new name of its own, but it is dishonest to leave the impression upon the ignorant or the credulous, that this is the idea which devout men in past ages have all along been groping for, and that it has been left to the religious thinkers of our own day to evolve from the name *catholic* its true and real significance. So far from the idea of a nebulous and absorbent substance imperceptibly shading off into the media which surround it, the conception of the Fathers was that the Catholic Church was cut off by the most clearly defined of lines from all that lay outside. Its primary function, we might almost say, was to set itself in acute opposition to all that threatened its vital principle of unity and stability. It is true that patristic writers may sometimes play with the word *catholic*, and develop its etymological suggestiveness with an eye to erudition or edification, but the only connotation upon which they insist as a matter of serious import is the idea of diffusion throughout the world. St. Augustine, indeed, in his letter to Vincentius (Ep. xciii, in "Corpus Scrip. Eccles. Lat.", XXXIV, p. 468) protests that he does not argue merely from the name. I do not maintain, he declares equivalently, that the Church must spread throughout all the world, simply because it is called Catholic. I base my proof of its diffusion upon the promises of God and upon the oracles of Holy Scripture. But the saint at the same time makes it clear that the suggestion, that the Church was called Catholic because it observed all God's Commandments and administered all the sacraments, originated with the Donatists, and he implies that this was a view in which he did not himself concur. Here again the demonstration of the unity of the Church as built upon a dogmatic basis is fundamental, and the reader must be referred to the article CHURCH. The Anglican Bishop of Carlisle, in an article published in the Hibbert Journal for January, 1908, and entitled "The Catholic Church, What Is It?", seems to carry the modern formula, Catholic = comprehensive, to its most extreme lengths. No principle of cohesion seems to be left except this, that the Catholic Church is that which bans nothing. The bishop conceives of it, apparently, as an institution invested by Christ with unlimited power to add to its numbers, but no power to expel. It must surely be plain that practical common sense pronounces against such a conception not less strongly than the plain words of our Lord in the Gospel or the consistent attitude of the Fathers.

In addition to the references given in the course of the article, see WILHELM AND SCANNELL, *Manual of Catholic Theology* (1898), II, 351–4; KRAUS, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer* (Freiburg, 1882), s. v. *Catholicus;* MAZZELLA, *De Religione et Ecclesiâ* (Rome, 1885); SCHANZ, *A Christian Apology* (tr. Dublin, 1891); MOUREAU, in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v. *Catholicité;* BILLOT, *De Sacrâ Traditione* (Rome, 1904), 72–134; SEMERIA, *Dogma, Gerarchia e Culto* (Rome, 1902), 235–257; TURMEL, *Histoire de théologie positive* (Paris, 1906), II, 117; NEWMAN, *Essays Historical and Critical*, Essay ix, with note.

For the Protestant view see the latest (HAUCK) ed. of HERZOG, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, s. v. *Kirche;* HARNACK, *History of Dogma* (tr. London, 1896), II; PEARSON, *Exposition of the Creed;* FAIRBAIRN, *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican* (London, 1899).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Catholic Benevolent Legion, a fraternal assessment life-insurance society organized in Brooklyn, New York, U. S. A., 5 Sept., 1881. The charter members were Dr. George R. Kuhn, John C. McGuire, John D. Carroll, John Rooney, Thomas Cassin, John D. Keiley, Patrick F. Keany, William G. Ross, David T. Leahy, and Robert Myhan Bishop Loughlin of Brooklyn was the spiritual adviser of the supreme council, the body through which the legal incorporation was made, and which governed the entire organization. The object of the Legion was, as stated in its constitution, to unite fraternally, for social, benevolent, and intellectual improvement, Catholic men between the ages of eighteen and fifty-five years at the time of admission. Life insurance not to exceed $5,000 was given in various amounts to members according to an optional classification, assessments for which were governed by the age of the member. The original figures of these assessments were increased in 1905 to meet the requirements of sounder insurance experience, as was the case with most of the other organizations of this character. Reports to 1908 showed that the Legion had, from its establishment, paid in death insurance $19,000,000. It had 20,000 members out of a total, from time of organization, of 74,188, and was represented by councils in six States. New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Indiana, Illinois, and Connecticut.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Catholic Club of New York, THE, a social organization described by its constitution as a club which "shall consist of Catholic gentlemen who are governed by a spirit of devotion to the Church and fidelity to the Holy Father". Its objects, as defined by the constitution, "shall be to advance Catholic interests, to promote the moral improvement of its members, to foster among them a true Catholic spirit, to encourage the study of Catholic history, literature, science and art, and for these purposes to maintain a library, and by frequent social intercourse to bind themselves more closely in the pursuit of these and kindred ends". The club sprang from the Xavier Alumni Sodality, which was organized in 1863, in connexion with the College of St. Francis Xavier, New York, with the object of encouraging Christian piety among the educated Catholic men of the city, and for many years directed by the Rev. P. F. Dealy, S. J. In March, 1871, the Xavier Union was organized by members of the Sodality to promote other desirable ends not embraced in the scope of a purely religious

organization, and to unite the members more intimately in social intercourse. The club was formally opened 13 March, 1871, with a membership of about 150, and Joseph Thoron was elected its first president, on 28 March of the same year. In 1872 Archbishop McCloskey took the club under his formal protection, and the organization has ever since enjoyed the active patronage of the archbishops of New York, and has co-operated with them in promoting Catholic interests. On 1 January, 1888, the name was changed from the Xavier Union to the Catholic Club of the City of New York. Its growth was soon such that a building was erected for it on a site purchased at No. 120 Central Park South, for $115,000. Here a building, 75 by 200 feet, was erected at a cost of $225,000, of which formal possession was taken in 1892. From this period the club grew with great rapidity until the normal resident membership numbers about 1000, the non-resident over 500, and, in addition, there is a considerable army and navy membership consisting of officers of these arms of the service. The club is governed by a board of officers and managers, and has a spiritual director appointed by the Archbishop. A Committee on Catholic Interests has special charge of all matters within the scope indicated in which Catholic lay activity or co-operation with the archbishop may seem necessary. The library contains over 35,000 volumes. Many lectures are given during the season, and the club co-operates with leading educational and charitable Catholic enterprises.

JOHN JEROME ROONEY.

Catholic Committee. See ENGLAND, ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.

Catholic Educational Association. See EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, CATHOLIC.

Catholic Emancipation. See ENGLAND, ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIEF BILL.

Catholic Epistle, the name given to the Epistle of St. James, to that of St. Jude, to two Epistles of St. Peter and the first three of St. John, because, unlike the Epistles of St. Paul, they were addressed not to any particular person or church, but to the faithful generally after the manner of an Encyclical letter. Though addressed to particular persons the other two Epistles of St. John are also styled Catholic, because they have always been grouped with the epistles bearing that name. See JAMES, ST.; JOHN, ST.; JUDE, ST.; PETER, ST.

Catholic Knights of America.—A fraternal life-insurance company chartered under the laws of the State of Kentucky, U. S. A. It was founded in Nashville, Tennessee, by James J. McLoughlin, D. N. Burke, John Broderick, and John McDonald. The first meeting was held, 23 April, 1877, at Emmett Hall, Nashville, with James J. McLoughlin as temporary chairman. At the second meeting, 1 May, 1877, the first permanent branch was organized with J. J. McLoughlin, president, and John McDonald, secretary. The name selected for the new organization was the Order of United Catholics, which was subsequently changed, on the recommendation of Bishop P. A. Feehan, of Nashville, to Catholic Knights of America. The bishop gave his cordial approval to the new society, and accepted the office of spiritual director. In June, 1877, plans were drawn up for the establishment of a supreme council form of government, and branches were organized in Grafton, West Virginia; Louisville, Kentucky; New Albany, Indiana; and Galion, Ohio.

CATHOLIC KNIGHTS OF AMERICA

The first session of the supreme council was held in Louisville, Kentucky, 9 July, 1878. Sixteen branches were represented; a supreme constitution was adopted, the Hon. W. C. Smith of Louisville was elected first Supreme President, and Bishop Feehan was chosen Supreme Spiritual Director. At the second annual session, held in Indianapolis, 8 July, 1879, seventy-two branches were represented. It was then decided to hold biennial sessions. Like most of the fraternal societies that were founded at this period, the Catholic Knights had to learn by experience that their rates were inadequate, and the association was among the first of these bodies to change the rate system. Although the organization sustained a loss of several thousands, the wisdom of the change of rates was early recognized by the loyal members, and the loss was soon made good by the influx of nearly 5000 young members in a period of a little over two years. Financially it is one of the strongest organizations of its kind in the United States. It has a membership of 20,000, divided among 560 branches, located in forty-two States of the Union. Since its inception to 1 August, 1907, it has paid to the heirs of over 8500 deceased members nearly fifteen million dollars. The total resources of the order on 1 August, 1907, were $828,000. The head-quarters are located at St. Louis, Missouri.

ANTHONY MATRE.

Catholic Missionary Union, the corporate name of a society whose directors are chosen from among the bishops of the United States, the seminaries, the parishes and the missionary organizations of that country, its purpose being to engage priests and laymen as missionaries to non-Catholics in the United States, to provide for their maintenance, to distribute Catholic literature, and in every way to assist the bishops in establishing and carrying on home missions in their various jurisdictions. It was formed by the Paulist Fathers in carrying out the vocation of their founder, Isaac Thomas Hecker, i. e. the conversion of non-Catholics in America.

This movement recognizes and helps to meet the responsibility of clergy and people for the spiritual welfare of Catholics, of baptized non-Catholics, as being even sacramentally part of Christ's fold; and of all others, as called by God to be saved and brought to the knowledge of the truth by the Church's ministrations. Thus, instead of ignoring the religious condition of their non-Catholic countrymen, all classes of Catholics will be aided by this society in zealously striving to convert them. Among the practical efforts of this movement is the forming in each diocese of bands of missionaries composed of diocesan priests acting under their bishops. These assemble non-Catholics wherever possible and explain to them the doctrines of the Catholic Church. The mode of explanation is more expository than controversial. Through a "question box" queries are invited concerning the Church's teaching, and through carefully prepared lectures and the widespread dissemination of literature misunderstandings are dispelled and an attractive presentation of the Catholic teaching provided.

The Catholic Missionary Union owns the Apostolic Mission House, the training school for the missionaries, located at the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., and dedicated in April, 1904. It provides a normal course of instruction for priests who are desirous of devoting themselves to the conversion of non-Catholics in the diocesan mission-bands, or even in the parochial ministry. The following dioceses are now provided with these apostolates, as the missionary bands are called: Providence, Hartford, Burlington, New York, Pittsburg, Cleveland, Wheeling, Covington, Peoria, St. Paul, Dubuque, St. Louis, Sioux Falls, Fort Wayne, Richmond, North Carolina,

Charleston, St. Augustine, Mobile, Natchez, and Oklahoma, numbering altogether 51 priests. There are six other priests assisting at missions in these dioceses in preparation for forming apostolates in their own dioceses, namely in Springfield, Buffalo, and Winona. Meanwhile priests are making their courses of study in the Apostolic Mission House for Ogdensburg, Erie, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Alton, Baker City, Peoria, Pittsburg, Sioux City, St. Augustine, and St. Paul, together with several members of religious communities, some domiciled, and others attending classes Giving missions, or preparing to do so, there is now a total of 82 priests. For the more necessitous dioceses not only are the missionaries trained without any expense to the bishops, but financial support is furnished them after they begin their work. During a decade of years the missionaries in the movement that centres about the Apostolic Mission House have given 1008 missions to Catholics, 1468 missions to non-Catholics, and received many converts into the Church, besides placing many more under instruction to be received later by the parochial clergy. It is not possible to give precise statistics, but it is sure that conversions have been stimulated by these missionary activities. During the year 1906 it is computed that about 25,000 converts were received into the Church in the United States by various missionary agencies.

An important feature of the missions is the free distribution of Catholic literature. The books are given into the hands of non-Catholics by the missionaries themselves standing before the altar after the public services, it being expressly stated that they are accepted to be read. In this way a great deal more than a million of Catholic books have passed into non-Catholic hands during the last ten or twelve years. These are Cardinal Gibbons' "Faith of Our Fathers", Searle's "Plain Facts", Conway's "Question Box", Faa Di Bruno's "Catholic Belief", Xavier Sutton's "Clearing the Way", and others; not counting a very great number of catechisms, Mass-books, pamphlets, and leaflets.

A public convention of missionaries to non-Catholics is assembled by the society every two or three years. The delegates discuss fully the religious conditions in America and the prospects of converting the people to the Catholic Church. Carefully prepared papers are read, and addresses delivered, and their topics debated, all looking to the choice of means and methods for increasing the number of converts. The proceedings of each convention are published in book form and circulated very extensively with remarkably good results. It is noteworthy that at the latest convention (June, 1905) the principal religious orders were present by their representatives. The Missionary Union depends wholly on charity for funds to support its work. The principal medium of collection is its monthly magazine "The Missionary", which, by edifying Catholics with authentic accounts of the results of the propaganda, stimulates their charitable offerings. The whole movement has from the beginning enjoyed the fullest approval of the bishops and the co-operation of the religious orders, and has received the express commendation of the Holy See.

WALTER ELLIOTT.

Catholicos (Gr. Καθολικός, universal), ecclesiastical title of the Nestorian and Armenian patriarchs.

I. *Nestorians.*—During the first five centuries Seleucia in Mesopotamia, subsequently the see of the Nestorian catholicos, was under the Patriarchate of Antioch. In the fifth century, as can be seen in the "Synodicon Orientale" (ed. Chabot), almost all the bishops of Seleucia-Ctesiphon bore the title of catholicos, without, however, severing their relations with Antioch; hence, originally, the word *catholicos* was not synonymous with *patriarch*. Owing to the political separation of the East from the West and to theological disputes, several attempts were made during the fifth century to secure religious independence. In the synod held at Seleucia under Dadjesus in 424 (cf. Synodicon, 51, text, and 296, tr.) it was forbidden to appeal from the Catholicos of Seleucia to the Patriarch of Antioch. The breach, however, became complete and permanent under the Nestorian Mar Babai. The synod held under him (497 or 499) renewed the decree of independence from Antioch, and henceforth Seleucia became the centre of Nestorianism. The list of the Nestorian catholicoi is given by Bar Hebræus (Chronicon, ed. Abbeloos, and Lamy, III *passim*); the list is supplemented by the editors, III, 566 sqq. In the middle of the sixteenth century, in opposition to the Catholicos Mar Mama, several bishops met, elected Sullaka, and sent him to Rome for consecration. Since then there has been a Catholic patriarch whose residence is now at Mosul. A list of the catholicoi united with Rome is given by Abbeloos and Lamy, op. cit., 570 sqq. (See NESTORIANS.)

II. *Armenians.*—Among the Armenians also *catholicos* was originally a simple title for the principal bishop of the country; he was subordinate to the See of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. The bishops of Albania and Georgia, although dependent on the Catholicos of Armenia, bore the same title. Under King Pap and the Catholicos Iousik Armenia asserted its independence of Cæsarea. In the fifth century the Armenians adopted Monophysitism and anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, 491. Many of the catholicoi, however, especially after the Crusades, professed the orthodox Catholic Faith. The see of the Armenian catholicos, originally Achtichat, has varied considerably. Besides many schisms have taken place, and to-day there are no less than five Armenian catholicoi. One of them, the successor of the old catholicos, is at Sis in Cilicia, with jurisdiction over the Turkish provinces of Asia. His power in ecclesiastical matters, supreme in theory, is considerably curtailed in practice by the appointment of a catholicos with additional civil powers in Constantinople. Since 1113 there is also an Armenian catholicos at Aghtamar with jurisdiction over the island of that name and the villages surrounding Lake Van. Another catholicos resides in Jerusalem, but with greatly reduced powers. In 1441 another schism occurred, and a catholicos was elected in Etchmiadzin in Greater Armenia. To-day he bears the title of "Supreme Patriarch and Catholicos of all Armenians", and, at least theoretically, is considered the principal catholicos by all non-Catholic Armenians. Since 1740 there has also been a Uniat catholicos in Constantinople with the title of Patriarch of Cilicia. He is recognized by the Porte as having jurisdiction over all Catholic Armenians in the Turkish possessions. (See ARMENIA; CONSTANTINOPLE.)

In the beginning of the fourth century Albania and Georgia (Iberia) were converted to Christianity by Armenian missionaries, and the principal bishop of each of these countries bore the title of catholicos, although neither of them was autocephalous. They followed the Armenians in rejecting the Council of Chalcedon. At the end of the sixth, or beginning of the seventh, century the Georgian catholicos asserted his independence and came back to orthodoxy. Henceforward the Georgian Church underwent the same evolutions as the Greek. In 1783 Georgia abolished the office of its catholicos, and placed itself under the Holy Synod of Russia, to which country it was united politically in 1801. The Albanian catholicos remained loyal to the Armenian Church, with the exception of a brief schism towards the end of the sixth century. Shortly afterwards Albania was assimilated partly with Armenia and partly with Georgia. There is no mention of any catholicos in Albania after the seventh century. It is asserted by

some that the head of the Abyssinian Church, the *Abuna*, also bears the title of catholicos, but, although this name may have been applied to him by analogy, there is, to our knowledge, no authority for asserting that this title is used by the Abyssinian Church itself.

LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christ.* (Paris, 1740), I, 1333 sqq.; PETIT in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v. *Arménie;* KAULEN in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Iberien;* TER-MINASSIANTZ, *Die armen. Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu der syr. Kirche* (Leipzig, 1904); CHEVALIER, *Rép.: Topo-bib.*, 215 sq.

R. BUTIN.

Catholic Summer Schools. See SUMMER SCHOOLS.

Catholic Truth Societies. See TRUTH SOCIETIES, CATHOLIC.

Catholic University of America, THE, a pontifical institution located at Washington, D. C. It comprises the Schools of the Sacred Sciences, Philosophy, Law, Letters, and Science, each of which includes several departments. Under the supreme authority of the Holy See, the governing power of the university resides in the episcopate of the United States, and by their delegation in the board of trustees, composed of bishops, priests, and laymen. The president of the board is the Chancellor of the University, and this office is held by the Archbishop of Baltimore ex officio. The immediate government of the university is entrusted to the rector who is assisted by the academic senate. Instruction is given by professors, associate professors, and tutors. The number of these in 1907 was 32; the number of students (1906-07) was 210. The library contains 100,000 volumes. The official organ of the university is "The Catholic University Bulletin" published quarterly 1895-1907, and since 1908 eight times yearly. Other official publications are the "General Announcements", the "Announcements" of the different Schools and the rector's "Annual Report".

MCMAHON HALL

In the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, October, 1866, the Bishops expressed their desire for the establishment of a university. The project took definite shape in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884) which included in its "Acta et Decreta" the decision to found a university and accepted Miss Mary Gwendoline Caldwell's offer of $300,000 to inaugurate the work. Washington was selected as the site, and the Right Rev. John J. Keane, then Bishop of Richmond, was appointed rector. Pope Leo XIII, in 1887, sanctioned the undertaking and by the Apostolic Letter "Magni nobis gaudii" (7 March, 1889) approved the constitution and statutes, and empowered the university to grant the usual degrees. The scope of the university as defined by Leo XIII was "to provide instruction in every department of learning to the end that the clergy and laity alike might have an opportunity to satisfy fully their laudable desire for knowledge". The pope furthermore urged that the seminaries, colleges, and other Catholic institutions of learning should be affiliated to the university; and he ordained that no step should be taken towards founding any other university without the approbation of the Holy See.

The School of the Sacred Sciences was opened in November, 1889. This was followed in 1895 by the School of Philosophy for which Mgr. James McMahon of New York donated the hall bearing his name. Chairs were founded by Miss Caldwell (2); the Misses Andrews, Baltimore; the Misses Drexel, Philadelphia; Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Kelly, New York (2); Hon. M. P. O'Connor, San José, California; Patrick Quinn, Philadelphia; Mrs. C. B. Whitford, Baltimore; Joseph Banigan, Providence; Col. M. P. O'Brien, New Orleans (3); Rev. A. H. Walburg, Cincinnati; Miss Margaret Gardiner, Baltimore; The Catholic Total Abstinence Union; The Ancient Order of Hibernians; and the Knights of Columbus. Founders of fellowships were Miss Anna Hope Hudson, Baltimore, and Rev. Thomas Brehony, Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania. Scholarships were endowed by the Messrs. Benziger, New York; Duke Joseph de Loubat, New York; Michael Jenkins, Baltimore; Miss Emily Harper, Baltimore; Charles M. Routt, Alton, Illinois; Rev. W. A. Nolan, Butler, Pennsylvania; Rev. Dwight Lyman, Govanstown, Maryland; Miss Winifred Martin, Baltimore; Rev. P. J. Lavin, Necedah, Wisconsin; Miss Mary D. Peabody, Washington; Rev. Thomas Carroll, Oil City, Pennsylvania; The Mitchell Memorial Committee, Brooklyn; The Catholic Young Men's National Union; the Right Rev. John J. Conroy, second Bishop of Albany, New York; Very Rev. Mgr. R. L. Burtsell, Rondout, New York;

Miss Ruth C. Dana, Boston; the Most Rev. John Hennessy, Archbishop of Dubuque; Rev. E. W. J. Lindesmith, Rootstown, Ohio; Rev. James Brennan, Erie, Pennsylvania; Timothy Riordan, Baltimore; Edward Johnson, Milwaukee; the Right Rev. T. M. Burke, Bishop of Albany, New York; Rev. P. J. Murphy, Oliphant, Pennsylvania; the Right Rev. Mgr. D. W. Murphy, Dover, New Hampshire; the Right Rev. Mgr. J. M. Mackey, Cincinnati.

The university has also received donations and bequests from Albert F. Ryan, Norfolk, Virginia; Michael Cudahy, Chicago, Illinois; Miss Lina Caldwell, Newport, Rhode Island; Miss Rebecca Reyburn, Baltimore, Maryland; Miles P. O'Connor, San José, California; Mrs. A. R. Reynolds, Philadelphia; David T. Leahy, Brooklyn, New York; Messrs. Leopold Huffer and Sons, Paris, France; O. Andrews, Baltimore, Maryland; Miss Eliza P. Blight, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Sylvester Johnson, Louisville, Kentucky; Rev. J. Lambert, Laconia, New Hampshire; Gen. John Lawlor, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin; John McCaffrey, Albany, New York; Miss M. Moran, Baltimore; M. Murphy, Chicago, Illinois; J. F. Sinnott, Philadelphia; Mrs. Staley, Baltimore; J. Walsh, Baltimore; Rev. J. J. Doherty, Hernsdale, Pennsylvania; J. P. Morgan, C. A. Hoyt and A. Dougherty, New York. Numerous subscriptions were also made to the Divinity, University Chapel, and Guarantee Funds, as also to the Archbishop Kenrick Chair and the Archbishop Williams Chair.

In 1896, Bishop Keane was succeeded in the rectorship by Rev. Thomas J. Conaty of Worcester, Massachusetts, who became (1903) Bishop of Los Angeles. His successor was the Right Rev. Denis J. O'Connell, appointed (1907) Bishop of Sebaste. His prudent administration and the generous response of the Catholic people in the collection which Pius X directed to be taken up annually in each diocese enabled the university to overcome the financial difficulties which it encountered in 1904.

Since its foundation the university has gradually become a centre of learning for the laity, the diocesan clergy, and the religious orders. The institutions grouped about it, with the dates of establishment, are as follows: St. Thomas College (Paulist Fathers), 1889; Marist College (Marists), 1891; Holy Cross College (Congregation of the Holy Cross), 1895; College of the Holy Land (Franciscans), 1897; St. Austin's College (Sulpicians), 1901; The Apostolic Mission House (Catholic Missionary Union), 1902; College of the Immaculate Conception (Dominicans), 1903. These colleges are the novitiates and houses of study of the several communities; their advanced students pursue courses in the University. Other affiliated institutions, outside the city of Washington, are the St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota, and the Institute of Scientific Study, New York. In compliance with the express desire of the Holy See the university has contributed toward the improvement and co-ordination of the Catholic schools in the United States and has taken an active part in the organization and proceedings of the Catholic Educational Association established for the purpose of unifying and furthering educational work. Though as yet but partially developed and inadequately endowed, it has exerted a salutary influence by encouraging research, maintaining a high standard of scholarship, and impressing upon the minds of the Catholics throughout the country the need of providing university education under Catholic auspices.

HERBERMANN, in *Am. Cath. Quart. Review* (Philadelphia, 1889); HEWITT, in *The Catholic World* (New York), XLII, 85; KEANE, *ibid.* XLVII, 577; XLIX, 427; MAAS, in *Amer. Eccl. Review* (Dec., 1903); MCPOLIN, in *New Ireland Review* (Jan., 1908); SHAHAN, *The House of God* (New York, 1905), gives a good bibliography, p. 347.

E. A. PACE.

Catholic University of Ireland. See IRELAND.

Catholic Young Men's National Union. See YOUNG MEN'S NATIONAL UNION, CATHOLIC.

Catrou, FRANÇOIS, French historian, b. at Paris, 28 December, 1659; d. there 12 October, 1737. He was the son of Mathurin Catrou, secretary to Louis XIV. During his college days a marked facility and grace in composition gave promise of his future literary success. At eighteen he entered the Society of Jesus. During his regular period of Jesuit probation and study his talents for preaching were discovered, and at the completion of his course in 1690 he began his active career as a preacher, in which office he continued for ten years with remarkable success. In 1701 he founded the "Journal de Trévoux", and was an active member of its staff for twelve years. While thus engaged in journalistic duties he found time for historical research, and to his productions in this line his fame is chiefly due. His principal works are: (1) "Histoire générale de l'empire du Mogul", published in five duodecimo volumes, 1715, the matter being drawn, in the main, from the memoirs of the Venetian traveller Manuzio (translated into Italian as "Istoria generale del Imperio del Mogul" by Domenico Occhi, Venice, 1751, and into English as "History of the Mogul Dynasty", London, 1826).—(2) "Histoire du fanatisme dans la religion protestante", a controversial work dealing principally with the Anabaptists and the Quakers; the best edition, 1740, in two duodecimo volumes, Paris.—(3) "Histoire romaine", with geographical and critical notes in twenty-one quarto volumes (1725–37), edited a second time in 1737.—The notes are from the pen of P. Rouillé, S. J. This gigantic work was translated into Italian by Fra Zannino Marsecco, Venice, 1730–37, and into English by R. Bundy, as "The Roman History with Notes, done into English from the Original French of the Rev. Fathers Catrou and Rouillé", London, 1728–37, in six folio volumes. The French work was highly praised at the time for its deep research and solid reasoning, but its somewhat pompous style soon brought severe censure from the critics. Its appearance in an English dress gave occasion to some very bitter attacks; but, though censured, this work was the source of Nathaniel Hooke's inspiration. In his "Roman History" he drew freely from the text of Catrou and more freely from the critical notes of Rouillé.—(4) "Traduction de Virgile", with critical and historical notes. The translation is at all times free and not infrequently inaccurate. The notes and the accompanying life of Virgil manifest a thorough acquaintance with both poem and poet. Catrou's Virgil was a constant companion of the historian Gibbon during his early studies. "I always consulted the most learned and ingenious commentators", he writes in his autobiography; "Torrentius and Dacier on Horace, and Catrou and Servius on Virgil".

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II, 882–89

DENNIS J. KAVANAGH.

Cattaro (CATHARUM), DIOCESE OF (CATARENSIS), suffragan of Zara. Cattaro, the principal town in one of the four divisions of Dalmatia, is situated at the foot of steep limestone rocks, on one of the small bays of the Adriatic, and nearly surrounded by mountains. The Gulf of Cattaro, itself a natural port, is divided into four smaller bays called Bocche di Cattaro, one of the most picturesque sites in Europe. The ancients called the town *Ascrivium*, and its gulf, *Sinus Rhizonicus*. Early in the Christian Era Ascrivium became a Roman colony; it was destroyed about 860 by the Saracens, but was rebuilt by the inhabitants of the town of Cattaro, who had been driven from home by the Hungarians. In the twelfth century, Cat-

taro seems to have been a republic; as early as 1178 its coins appear, bearing the image of St. Trypho. Later on it passed successively under Byzantine and Servian rule, and in 1368 formed an alliance with King Louis of Hungary. Having sided with the Genoese against the Venetians, it was captured and burned by the latter (1378). In 1423 Cattaro voluntarily submitted to Venice, though retaining a certain autonomy. The long rule of Venice is reflected in the architecture of the town. During the Napoleonic period it passed successively into the hands of the Austrians, the French, the Russians, the French,

CATTARO

and the Montenegrins, who sacked it after the departure of the French (1814). It then fell under Austrian rule, and is now a seaport of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, and the commercial outlet of Montenegro. Situated as it was, Cattaro must have received the Gospel at an early period, according to legend from St. Boimus. The list of bishops, however, does not go farther back than 877. The Catholic population of the diocese is 13,363, the non-Catholic, 15,000. There are 19 parishes, 11 vicariates, 50 secular and 12 regular priests.

FARLATI, *Illyr. sacr.* (1800) VI, 421–518; GIUROVICH, *Patriologia degli uomini santi, illustri ecc. di Bocche di Cattaro* (Venice, 1844); VALENTINELLI, *Biblioth. Dalmaziana* (1855), 242–53; *Ann. pont. cath.* (1907), 321.

U. BENIGNI.

Caubert, JEAN. See COMMUNE, MARTYRS OF THE PARIS.

Cauchy, AUGUSTIN-LOUIS, French mathematician, b. at Paris, 21 August, 1789; d. at Sceaux, 23 May, 1857. He owed his early training to his father, a man of much learning and literary taste, and, at the suggestion of La Grange, who early detected his talents and took a lively interest in him, he received a good classical education at the Ecole Centrale du Panthéon in Paris. In 1805 he entered the Ecole Polytechnique, where he distinguished himself in mathematics. Two years later he entered the Ecole des Ponts et Chaussées and, after a brilliant course of study, he was appointed one of the engineers in charge of the extensive public works inaugurated by Napoleon at Cherbourg. While here he devoted his leisure moments to mathematics. Several important memoirs from his pen, among them those relating to the theory of polyhedra, symmetrical functions, and particularly his proof of a theorem of Fermat which had baffled mathematicians like Gauss and Euler, made him known to the scientific world and won him admittance into the Academy of Sciences. At about the same time the Grand Prix offered by the Academy was bestowed on him for his essays on the propagation of waves. After a sojourn of three years at Cherbourg his health began to fail, and he resigned his post to begin at the age of twenty-two his career of professor at the Ecole Polytechnique. In 1818 he married Mlle. de Bure, who, with two daughters, survived him.

Cauchy was a stanch adherent of the Bourbons and after the Revolution of 1830 followed Charles X into exile. After a brief stay at Turin, where he occupied the chair of mathematical physics created for him at the university, he was invited to become one of the tutors of the young Duc de Bordeaux, grandson of Charles, at Prague. The old monarch conferred the title of baron upon him in recognition of his services. He returned to France in 1838, and was proposed by the Academy for a vacant chair at the Collège de France. His conscientious refusal to take the requisite oath on account of his devotion to the prince prevented his appointment. His nomination to the Bureau des Longitudes was declared void for the same reason. After the Revolution of 1848, however, he received a professorship at the Sorbonne. Upon the establishment of the Second Empire the oath was reinstated, but an exception was made by Napoleon III in the cases of Cauchy and Arago, and he was thus free to continue his lectures. He spent the last years of his life at Sceaux, outside of Paris, devoting himself to his mathematical researches until the end.

Cauchy was an admirable type of the true Catholic savant. A great and indefatigable mathematician, he was at the same time a loyal and devoted son of the Church. He made public profession of his faith and found his greatest pleasure and recreation in works of zeal and charity. He was an active member of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and took a leading part in founding the "Ecoles d'Orient", in 1856, and the "Association pour la liberté du dimanche". During the famine of 1846 in Ireland Cauchy made an appeal to the pope on behalf of the stricken people. He was on terms of intimate friendship with Père de Ravignan, S. J., the well-known preacher, and when, during the reign of Louis-Philippe, the colleges of the Society of Jesus were attacked he wrote two memoirs in their defence. Cauchy is best known for his achievements in the domain of mathematics, to almost every branch of which he made numerous and important contributions. He was a prolific writer and, besides his larger works, he was the author of over seven hundred memoirs, papers, etc., published chiefly in the "Comptes Rendus". A complete edition of his works has been issued by the French Government under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences. Among his researches may be mentioned his development of the theory of series in which he established rules for investigating their convergency. To him is due the demonstration of the existence and number of real and imaginary roots of any equation, and he did much to bring determinants into general use. In connexion with his work on definite integrals, his treatment of imaginary limits deserves special mention. He was the first to give a rigid proof of Taylor's theorem. The "Calculus of Residues" was his invention, and he made important researches in the theory of functions. By his theory of the continuity of functions and the method of limits he placed the differential calculus on a logical basis. Cauchy was also a pioneer in extending the applications of mathematics to physical science, especially to molecular mechanics, optics, and astronomy. In the theory of dispersion we have his well-known formula giving the refractive index in terms of the wave length and three constants. Besides his numerous memoirs, he was the author of "Cours d'analyse de l'Ecole royale polytechnique" (1821); "Résumé des leçons données à l'Ecole royale polytechnique sur les applications du calcul infinitésimal" (1823); "Leçons sur les applications du calcul infinitésimal à la géométrie" (1826,

1828); "Leçons sur le calcul différentiel" (1829); "Anciens exercices de mathématiques" (1826–1830); "Résumés analytiques" (1833); "Nouveaux exercices de mathématiques" (1835–1836); "Nouveaux exercices d'analyse et de physique mathématique" (1840–47).

VALSON, *La vie et les travaux du baron Cauchy* (Paris, 1868); MARIE, *Hist. des sciences math. et phys.* (1888), XII; BALL, *Hist. of Math.* (London, 1893); KNELLER, *Das Christentum, u. die Vertreter der neueren Naturwissenschaft* (Freiburg, 1904); IDEM in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (Freiburg, 1903), LXIV; *The Month*, No. 516 (New Series, 126), June, 1907.

HENRY M. BROCK.

Caughnawaga, or SAULT ST. LOUIS, an Iroquois reservation, situated on the south bank of the St. Lawrence, about ten miles above Montreal. Area, 12,327 acres. Population, in 1905, 2,100; all Catholics, except five or six families. The language is the Mohawk dialect. The *Sault* (or Rapids) was an old seigniory, or concession, granted to the Jesuits in 1680. To P. Raffeix, S. J., is due the idea of thus grouping the Iroquois neophytes on the banks of the St. Lawrence, to guard them from the persecution and temptation to which they were subject amid the pagan influences of their own villages. In 1667 the missionary prevailed upon seven communities to take up their residence at Laprairie, opposite Montreal. Other Christian Iroquois, from different localities, soon came to join the settlement, and in 1670 there were twenty families. As the proximity of the whites was prejudicial to the Indians, the mission was transferred, in 1676, several miles higher up the river. This second site is memorable as the scene of the saintly life and death of Catherine Tegakwitha (d. 1680). In 1890 a granite monument was erected on the site, in memory of the humble Iroquois virgin. In 1689, to escape the threatened attacks of their pagan tribesmen, the Christian Iroquois sought refuge in Montreal, where they remained eight or nine months. When the danger had passed, they founded another settlement a mile or two above the last. In 1696 another migration took place to a fourth site. Here it was that P. Lafitau, S. J., discovered the famous "ginseng" plant, so valuable in the eyes of the Chinese. The discovery created a great sensation, and was for a time the source of a lucrative commerce. This fourth site still proving unsatisfactory, the settlement was moved to the present site of Caughnawaga in 1716. From 1667 to 1783 the mission was conducted by the Jesuits; from 1783 to 1903 by secular priests and Oblates. In 1903 it was again confided to the Jesuits. Among the more noted missionaries were Fathers Bruyas, S. J., Chauchetière, S. J., Lafitau, S. J., Burtin, O. M. I., Marcoux, who composed an Iroquois dictionary and grammar, and Forbes, who drew up complete genealogical tables of the settlement. The Indians are intelligent and industrious. Some are engaged in farming, others take rafts down the Lachine rapids. The industries are principally bead-work and the making of lacrosse rackets and snowshoes. Besides the presbytery, dating from 1716, and the church, built in 1719 and restored in 1845, there are in the village the ruins of a French fort of 1754, two schools, and a hospital. The government by chiefs was, in 1889, replaced by that of a mayor and council.

Jesuit Relations (Cleveland, 1901); CHAUCHETIÈRE, *La Vie de la B. C. Tegakouita* (Manate, 1887); SHEA, *History of Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the U. S.* (New York, 1854; new ed. 1899); DE ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1906).

JOSEPH GRAS.

Caulet, FRANÇOIS-ETIENNE (also called M. DE FOIX from an abbey of which he was commendatory abbot), a French bishop and Jansenist, b. at Toulouse, 1610; d. at Pamiers, 1680. After completing his studies at the Collège de La Flèche he laboured for some time under Père de Condren, Superior of the French Oratory, and then joined M. Olier in founding the Vaugirard Seminary and the Company of Saint-Sulpice. When M. Olier accepted the parish of Saint-Sulpice (1642), Caulet became practically the head of the seminary. In 1644 Louis XIV, at the suggestion of St. Vincent de Paul, made him Bishop of Pamiers. Caulet had not sought episcopal honours, but once a bishop he showed great zeal in the reformation of the clergy, the annual visitation of the diocese, the holding of synods, and the founding of schools, one of which was devoted especially to the training of teachers. His impulsive zeal did not fail to raise opposition. The chapters of Foix and Pamiers, which he tried to reform, revolted openly, and had to be coerced into submission by Briefs of Alexander VII and ordinances of Louis XIV. For an account of his conflict with the Jesuits of Pamiers (1668) regarding approbation for hearing confessions, see Bertrand, "Hist. Litt. de la Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice" (Paris, 1900), III, 55, 57. For the lengthy previous controversies see CONFESSION, apropos of Approbation, and Ferraris (Roman ed., 1885) s. v. "Approbation"; Santi (ed. Leitner, Rome, 1905), "Prælectiones juris canonici", III, 366; Bouix, "De episcopo", II, 250, and "De jure regularium", II, 213 sqq.

Two facts stand out prominently in Caulet's episcopal career, his dubious attitude with regard to the formulary of Alexander VII (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", no. 971) and his noble conduct in the *affaire de la régale*, i. e. the royal pretension to the revenues and the administration of vacant sees. On receipt of the formulary of Alexander VII Caulet issued a pastoral letter requesting his clergy to subscribe to it, but with certain qualifications (*foi aux dogmes révélés, déférence respectueuse aux faits non révélés*). Most people see in that respectful deference the *silence respectueux* of the Jansenists. However, De la Chambre (Traité du formulaire), Bouix (De Papâ, II, 95), and Bertrand (Histoire littéraire, III, 19) are of opinion that Caulet really meant an internal adhesion of the mind, albeit this adhesion may not have come up to the "ecclesiastical faith" as proposed by Fénelon, and later admitted commonly by theologians. Clement IX did not urge the point, and accepted Caulet's adhesion such as it was. In February, 1673, Louis XIV, in need of funds, attempted to extend to all French bishoprics the *droits de régale*. Caulet was one of the few bishops who stoutly resisted the royal encroachment. Betrayed by his metropolitan, despoiled by the king, he appealed to Innocent XI, who issued several Briefs lauding his courage and his loyalty to the Church. The last of these Briefs, dated 17 July, 1680 (Inn. XI, Epistolæ, Rome, 1890, I, 357), reached Pamiers just after Caulet's death, and it contained the best eulogy a bishop could receive. Caulet left a mass of episcopal ordinances, synodal statutes, memoirs, etc., analyzed by Doublet and Bertrand. Two treatises on the *régale* were published under his name in 1680 and 1681.

DOUBLET, *Un prélat janséniste* (Paris, 1895); *François Caulet* (Foix, 1896); *Un diocèse pyrénéen sous Louis XIV* (Toulouse, 1896), and other monographs.—BERTRAND, *Histoire littéraire de la Compagnie de S. Sulpice* (Paris, 1900), III, 19; BESOIGNE, *Vie des quatre évêques engagés dans la cause de Port-Royal* (Cologne, 1756); RAPIN, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1865).

J. F. SOLLIER.

Caumont. See LA FORCE.

Caunus (KAUNOS), a titular see of Asia Minor. Kaunos was said to have been founded by Kaunos, son of Miletos and Kyane, on the southern coast of Caria, opposite Rhodes, and was known as Rhodian Perœa, at the foot of Mount Tarbelos. Its acropolis was called Imbros. It exported, chiefly to Rome, highly prized figs. It was the home of the painter Protogenes. The "Synecdemus" of Hierocles and

most "Notitiæ episcopatuum", as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century, place it in Lycia, as a suffragan of Myra. Four bishops are mentioned by Lequien (I, 981): Basil, who attended the council at Seleucia in 359; Antipater, at Chalcedon in 451; Nicolaus, who subscribed the letter to Emperor Leo in 458; Stephanus at Nicæa in 787. The interesting ruins of the city are half an hour from the modern village of Dalian, in the vilayet of Konia, on the right bank of a little brook, the ancient Kalbis. Among them are a theatre, a large rectangular building that was probably a temple, others of uncertain destination, a Byzantine church, and very curious rock-hewn tombs.

COLLIGNON, in *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* (1877), I, 338–46; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography* (London, 1878), 576.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cause (Gr. *αἰτία, αἴτιον*, Lat. *causa*, Fr. *cause*, Ger. *Ursache;* from the Latin both the Italian term *cosa* and the French *chose*, meaning "thing", are derived), as the correlative of effect, is understood as being that which in any way gives existence to, or contributes towards the existence of, any thing; which produces a result; to which the origin of any thing is to be ascribed. The term *cause* is also employed in several other suppositions, philosophical, scientific, legal, etc., to which reference will be made in the course of the present article. The description just given is that of cause taken in the philosophical sense, as well as in its ordinary signification in popular language, for, strictly speaking, cause, being a transcendental, cannot receive a logical definition. It is that also commonly advanced as a preliminary to the investigation of the nature of causality, in the schools. Although the ideas of cause and of causality are quite obviously among the most familiar that we possess, since they are involved in every exercise of human reasoning, and are presupposed in every form of argument and by every practical action, a very great vagueness attaches to the popular concept of them, and a correspondingly great ambiguity is to be found in the use of the terms expressing them. In view of this fact, it will be necessary to clear the ground traversed in the main portion of the present article by stating that it is concerned, not so much in treating of individual causes considered in the concrete, as with the analysis of the idea of causality underlying and involved in that of every cause. There is also a psychological, as well as a metaphysical, aspect of the subject, which ought not to be lost sight of, especially in that part of the article in which the more recent speculations with regard to causality are touched upon.

As a matter of fact, all mankind by nature attributes to certain phenomena a causative action upon others. This natural attribution of the relationship of cause and effect to phenomena is anterior to all philosophical statement and analysis. Objects of sense are grouped roughly into two classes—those that act and those that are acted upon. No necessarily conscious reflection seems to enter into the judgment that partitions natural things into causes and effects. But when we proceed to ask ourselves precisely what we mean when we say, for example, that A is cause and B effect, that A causes B, or that B is the result of A, we raise the question of causality. Whatever answer we put forward, it will be the statement of our conception of causation. It will be the expression of our judgment as to the actual relationship between A and B involved in the conception of the one as cause and of the other as effect. It will probably be found, when we attempt to formulate any answer to the question, that much more is involved than we had at first sight thought; and, since the investigation we should pursue would probably proceed upon lines analogous to those upon which philosophy has, as a matter of fact, travelled, it will not be amiss to trace the history and development of the problem concerned with causes and causality, and to set down briefly the various solutions advanced. We shall begin, therefore, with the first crude conception of power or efficiency, and pass on through the stages of hyloism and idealism to the full analysis of cause and statement of causality made by Aristotle. This will be considered merely in outline, and filled in in the following more detailed account of the doctrines of the Schoolmen upon the subject, who, while adopting it in all its main lines, in several respects modified the teaching of the Stagirite. The critical attack upon the possibility of a knowledge of causality, made by the Scottish sceptic Hume, will next be considered in its relation to the reply of the Common Sense School, as represented by Reid. The doctrine of Kant, with its double sequence of idealism and materialism, will be touched upon briefly; and, with a comparison of the mechanical concept of modern science with regard to causes and the more fundamental metaphysical analysis of causality, the philosophical treatment of the topic will be brought to an end.

Before the inception of the pre-Socratic schools of Greek philosophy, the first rude and popular conception of causes was mixed up with much that was extravagant and, in the proper sense of the word, superstitious. The powers of nature were personified, and thought of as intelligent and wilful. They were conceived of as far more powerful than man, but uncertain and capricious, so that it was necessary to propitiate them and enlist their favour by offering them sacrifices and praying to them. Thus there was the idea of power, and a loose attribution of effects to one or another of the natural forces that had vaguely come to be looked upon as causes. It was in order to provide a ground of unity, rather than thus to distract causes, that the early philosophers took up their search for the principles of things. The problem immediately before them was that of explaining similarity and diversity, as well as change, in the visible world. With them, though the term *αἰτία* was employed, and even occasionally in several of the senses in which Aristotle later distinguished it, the commoner term was *ἀρχή*, with which the former was apparently generally interchangeable. By this term a principle was designated that, in some vague sense, approaches in meaning to the material cause of the Stagirite. It was used to signify an entity prior to existing entities, and yet in some way coexisting with them and furnishing the ground or reason for their existence. But it did not connote the idea of cause in the strict sense, namely as that which actually gives being to its effect, such as is involved in later concepts of causality and is derived from the observation and analysis of the conditions of physical change. The problem thence arising had not yet been definitely set. The task of the philosophers of these early schools was the investigation of nature, with, for result, the discovery of its elemental constituent or constituents, its primordial principles. Thus the representatives of both the Ionian and Eleatic Schools, in reducing all things to a single purely material basis, or to several bases, assign, indeed, a principle that may be considered as a concrete cause, but do not raise the real question of causality, or give any satisfactory account either as to how one thing differs from another or as to how things can come to be at all. Nor, in explaining diversity and change by assigning heat, rarefaction, condensation, arrangement in space, number, etc., was more than an attempt made to call closer attention to the fact of causation and to determine more accurately than did popular opinion what were the concrete causes by which things came to be what they are. This, obviously, is not an analysis of causality, and in no sense

really touches the heart of the question. It hardly calls for the remark that at most the causes, or more properly the principles, assigned, even if understood in the sense of inherent differentiating principles, were such as would account for no more than an accidental diversity, leaving all things, the diversity of which was the very point to be explained, really identical in substance.

The progress from this first search for the elemental principles of being to the later investigation and interpretation of alteration, or change, in itself was gradual. Something had to be found that would account for the regularity of the succession of phenomena in the physical world, as well as for their diversity and alteration. The Pythagoreans put forward their doctrines of number as an explanation; Plato, his theory of ideas. Thus, in his advance upon his predecessors, he clearly allows, in a very real sense, for formal causes of existence. But he does not specify the nature of these ideas, other than as substances, separate from the individual entities that they cause. In some manner not fully explained, these individual entities are precisely what they are by participating in the idea. In different passages in his writings Plato alludes to the relation between the ideas and the concrete entities as a participation, a community, or an imitation. Thus he states the fact of similarity in the essences and processes of the physical world, but does not offer any explanation or definite account of it. In common with the earlier nature philosophers, Plato assigns concrete causes but does not attempt to give any solution of the real problems of causality. Not until Aristotle formulated his famous doctrine of the four causes of being can it be said that the question was envisaged with sufficient clearness to admit of exact presentation or fruitful discussion. Instead of explaining diversity in the physical world by a reference to a common underlying principle and an accidental modification, either fortuitous or designed, proceeding from it and in it—at best the crude makeshift of an incipient philosophy that has yet to state correctly the problem to be solved, instead of looking outside the object, or effect, for that which specifies it, and finding a substance entirely separated from it, to which its substantial existence in the world of phenomena, in some cryptic manner, is to be attributed, Aristotle instituted a profound inquiry into the essentially diverse modes in which any one thing can be said to contribute to the existence of any other. In so doing he changed the nature of the inquiry. The result was not only the discovery of the four causes, but a solution of the really far more important question of causality. There is no doubt but that his teaching is, in a very real sense, a synthesis of all that had gone before it; but it is a synthesis in which no one of the preceding doctrines is adopted precisely as it stood in the earlier systems. The secret which governed the adaptation of the currently accepted "principles" and made the synthesis possible, lay in the signification that he gave to the formal cause. The task he had to perform had ceased to be that of discovering merely physical constituents or principles, and had shifted to the fundamental issue of metaphysical inquiry. Aristotle gives the opinions of his predecessors at considerable length in the "Physics", and again in the "Metaphysics", in which he submits them to a careful analysis and rigorous criticism. But the elements of his own doctrine with regard to the four causes, as causes, were there in solution. The signification of the term *ἀρχή*, already used, was sufficiently comprehensive to include that of *αἰτία*, since all causes come necessarily under the head of principles. The Ionians of the older school had dealt with matter. Later Ionians had treated vaguely of efficient causes. The method and moral teaching of Socrates had involved and brought out the idea of the final, while Plato had definitely taught the existence of separated formal, causes. All these factors contributed to the result of his inquiry, and the splendid historical criticism and review to which he submits the earlier philosophers and their teachings on this point show not only his wide and profound acquaintance with their doctrines, but his readiness also to credit them with whatever they had advanced that at all made for knowledge. Still, to this point, as has been said, it was a question of principle rather than of cause; and, when of cause as such, of cause considered in the concrete rather than of the causality of causes.

The problem, then, for Aristotle, took the form of an analysis of essences in such wise as to perceive, separate, and classify those principles which, in conspiring to bring the essence of any effect, object or event, actually into existence, as it were, flow into it. For the idea of cause is of that which in any way influences the production of an effect as an essence. And, to declare the manner in which such causes, once discovered, are found to correspond, and play their several parts in causation, will be to state causality. Now, as our notion of principles in general, whether in the being, in the becoming, or in the understanding of any thing, is primarily derived from observation of motions taking place in space, so our notion of cause is derived from observation of changes, whether local, quantitative, qualitative, or substantial. The explanation of any change leads to the doctrine of the four distinctions, or classes, of causes as formulated by Aristotle. They were:—

matter, *ὕλη—τὸ ἐξ οὗ γίνεταί τι ἐνυπάρχοντος*
form, *μορφή, εἶδος—ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ τι ἦν εἶναι—*
moving, or efficient, cause, *τὸ κινητικόν—ὅθεν ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς μεταβολῆς ἡ πρώτη—*
final cause, *τὸ τέλος—τὸ οὗ ἕνεκα.* (Cf. Physics, II, iii.)

These are severally related in various ways. It is in the declaration of this relationship that the notion and explanation of causality is to be found. The material cause, that out of which the principiate, or effect, is made or caused, is conceived as an indeterminate potentiality. It is determined to a definite substantial essence by the formal cause. This, in turn, is conceived as an actuality specifying the material potentiality. Formal causes are the changeless essences of things in themselves, permanent in them amid the flux of accidental modifications, yet by actual union with the material cause determining this to the concrete individual; and not, like the ideas of Plato, separated from it. They are, under the action of the moving, or efficient, cause, the accomplishment of the determinability of matter. The moving, or efficient, cause, which, as will be seen later, is that which has come to be chiefly regarded as the true cause, and that round which most controversy has arisen, is, in this fourfold division of causes, that one by the operation or agency of which the effect is brought into being; i. e. by the operation of which the formal cause of the effect is induced in the material. Lastly, the final cause is that principle on account of which the efficient cause moves towards the production of its effect. It is the effect itself formally considered as the term of the intention of the agent, or efficient cause. Neither Aristotle nor Plato is very clear as to the precise sense in which the final cause is to be understood. The Aristotelean phrase is loose enough to cover the two meanings: i. e., the end considered as the object desired, and the end considered as the desire of the object. Aristotle perceives and teaches that the end is frequently identified with the form, and that this is also frequently identified *in species* with the moving cause; for man, as he says in the example that he gives, begets man. It does not, however, follow that all moving causes are always identified, even *in species*, with their effects. Indeed, Aristotle teaches that this is not the case.

He holds that the world is eternal; but, in virtue of his fundamental principle that no potentiality can precede actuality, he makes it a participative eternity. Hence the material and the formal causes that together go to make up the world are created, or more properly, eternally concreated. From this fundamental principle of the priority of actuality over potentiality, Aristotle proves also the fact of the existence of God as the first moving cause. As each effect of a process is now to be reckoned an actuality that was before no more than potential, and postulates a moving cause in order that it should have come into being as the term of a motion, so all things in the world, taken together, necessitate an absolutely first cause of the same nature. This first moving cause must, on Aristotle's principle, be an absolute actuality, since, were it not entirely in act, it could not be the moving cause of all things nor keep them eternally in motion. Similarly, it must be pure form, or νοῦς, with no admixture of matter, since this would import a limitation of its actuality. Thus did Aristotle raise and answer the question of causality, dividing causes into four classes, and indicating the nature of the causal influx with which each contributes towards the production of their common effect. For, according to this theory, all the four causes, taken together, are really *the* cause of any given physical effect.

The teaching of Aristotle is that which substantially passed current in the medieval schools. With certain important modifications concerning the eternity of the material cause, the substantiality of certain formal causes of material entities, and the determination of the final cause, the fourfold division was handed on to the Christian teachers of patristic and scholastic times. As Aristotle had developed and improved the doctrine of Plato with regard to inherent substantial forms, so the leaders of Christian thought, guided in their work by the light of revelation and the teaching of the Church, perfected the philosophical teaching of Aristotle. It is not, indeed, advanced that the Christian philosophy of this period was merely theological; but it is contended that certain purely philosophical truths, verifiable in and by philosophy, were obtained as a result of the impetus given to metaphysical research by the dogmas of revelation. This is not the place for enlarging upon such a topic except in so far as it is directly pertinent to the question of causes; and it is principally in other matters that the contention obtains. Still, at least in the three cases to which allusion has just been made, it is true that speculation was helped forward on the right lines by the teaching of the Church. The truth of the contention is patent. In the patristic period, particularly in the works of St. Augustine, who was a Platonist rather than an Aristotelean, and in the scholastic period, the foremost representative of which is St. Thomas Aquinas, the doctrine of the four causes of being is set forth in connexion with the modifications noted. The theory of causality, as held and taught in the Middle Ages, and as taught in the schools to-day, will in this section be exhibited in some detail.

"The ancient philosophers came to the knowledge of truth by degrees and slowly", writes St. Thomas. "For at first, being as it were less cultivated, they did not recognize any beings other than sensible bodies. And those of them who acknowledged movement in them only admitted movement as to accidents, as in rarity and density, aggregation and disgregation. And, supposing that the substance of bodies was uncreated, they assigned certain causes for accidental changes of this kind, as, for example, friendship, strife, intellect, or something of this nature. Proceeding, they distinguished intellectually between the substantial form and the matter, which they considered as uncreated; and they perceived that substantial transmutation takes place in bodies with respect to their substantial forms." (Summa Theologica, Q. xliv, a. 1, 2.)

The last sentence of this passage gives the basis of the Scholastic doctrine with regard to causes. "Consider", a Scholastic would say, "a substantial change—that is to say, a change in which one substance, made known to the understanding by its qualities, ceases to be what it was in the instant A, and becomes, in the instant B, another substance. In order that such a change should be possible, four things are necessary: namely, (1) the thing that is changed; (2) the term, or manner of being, or essence, that is induced in that which is changed; (3) the active agent that produces the change, or accomplishes the existence of the new term, manner of being, or essence; and (4) the motive, or reason why this latter acts. There is also, though it cannot be reckoned as a cause, the *terminus a quo*, or the original determinative of the thing changed, which passes out of being with the advent of the newly induced term. These four necessary things, since they produce the final result by a mutual action and interaction, in which they give being to it considered as result, are its causes. They are to be discovered, moreover, wherever and whenever any change takes place, not only in substantial, but also in accidental, changes, or mere changes of qualities." Consider the two cases, the one of accidental, the other of substantial, change. A cube of wax is moulded by the hand into a sphere. The wax, as permanent substratum of the change of figure, is considered to be the matter, or material cause. The spherical figure supervening upon that of the cubical, is the induced formal cause. The moulder, or fashioner of the sphere, is the efficient cause. The final cause is to be sought for in the intention of the moulder. The substance of the wax remains throughout the entire process of the moulding. It is affected only accidentally by the operation. Consequently the example is one of accidental change, and gives us no more than an accidental formal cause. But in cases of substantial change, such as, for example, the electrolysis of water, the induced formal cause is a substantial one; and, moreover, since the substance of the water does not remain after the change has taken place, the material cause cannot be other than a subject, or permanent substratum, that is neither water nor oxygen and hydrogen taken together. In such a case, it is called primordial, or first matter, and is conceived as being a subject potential to information by any and all formal causes. It is a potentiality, but, as a permanent substratum, or determinable entity, is capable of receiving new substantial determinations in the place of that which actually denominates it. It cannot exist alone, but exists only as informed, or actuated by a formal cause. It is not eternal, but created, or, more properly, concreated *with* substantial form.

The material cause, as presented in the Scholastic system of philosophy, fulfils the conditions of a cause as given above. It gives being to the effect, since without it this could neither exist nor come into being. Though it is conceived as an essentially incomplete subject, as a merely passive potentiality, it is distinguished from the complete effect, to the becoming and being of which it contributes. The diversity of primordial matter from the forms which actuate it is exhibited by the consideration that there is an essential distinction between the subject of change and the states, modifications, or determined natures from which and towards which the change is conceived as acting. Hence primordial matter is reasonably held to be a reality, belonging reductively to the category of substance, and determinable to every kind of corporeal substance by reason of its essential ordination to the reception of a form. Quantity is said to be a consequent of material substances by reason of the matter entering into their physical composition; and by matter, as quantified,

forms, specifically the same, are held to be numerically individuated.

The doctrine of the school with regard to formal causes must be understood in the light of the thesis that all forms are, of their nature, acts, or actualities. The formal cause of material entities has been described as that substantial reality which intrinsically determines matter in any species of corporeal substance. It is conceived as the actuating, determining, specifying principle, existent in the effect. It is a substance, not of itself as form, but reductively, as the quidditative act, as the material cause belongs to the same category in the sense of being a receptive potentiality. But substantial form, with which we are here dealing, is not of its nature either dependent or independent of the matter that it informs, or actuates. Certain substantial forms are said to be drawn from the potentiality of matter—those, namely, that for the exercise of all their functions are totally dependent upon material dispositions or organs. Of this nature are said to be all substantial forms, or formal causes, specifically below that of the human being, i. e. the soul of man. This, as intrinsically independent of matter in its chief functions of intellection and volition, is, although the formal cause of man, as such, held to be immaterial, and to necessitate a special and individual creative act on the part of God. While the material cause of corporeal entities is one, in the sense that it is one indeterminate potentiality, the formal cause is said to be one in the sense that one substantial formal cause only can exist in each effect, or result, of the union of form and matter. For formal causes, as the specifying factors in diverse corporeal entities, are diverse both numerically and specifically. They are so specifically, in that they proceed in an order of varying perfection, from the formal causes of the simple elements upwards, just as the various effects, or results, of the union of matter and form, which are specified by them, proceed in an order of varying perfection, to the lower of which, in each subsequent grade, a higher is superadded. They are numerically diverse, in the same species, because of the differentiation that accrues to them on account of their reception in quantified matter (*materia signata*).

Consistent with this teaching is that in which the angels are said to be distinguished specifically, and not numerically, as lacking the material subject by which substantial forms of the same species are differentiated. In the same way the human soul, when separated from the body at death, is held to retain its "habit" towards the quantified matter that it actuated as formal principle, and from which it received its differentiation from all other human souls. In a sense similar to that of substantial forms specifying primordial matter, accidental formal causes are conceived as informing corporeal substances already in existence as entities. The causality of the substantial formal cause is shown in the same manner as that of the material. It concurs in the being of the effect, or result of the union of matter and form, as actually constituting this in its proper and specific essence. Yet it is distinct from it in that it does not include in itself matter, which the composite effect does. A parallel consideration will show the nature of the causality of accidental formal causes. The specific qualities of material substances, as well as of immaterial, are said to depend upon their formal causes. It may be noted that, while both the material and the formal principle are, properly speaking, causes, in that they contribute, each in its proper manner, towards the resultant effect, their causal nature is intrinsic. The informed matter *is* the effect, produced and sustained by the act of information. Form and matter are physically component parts of the effect. The theory derived from an examination of corporeal changes, both accidental and substantial, that has just been outlined, is that commonly known as Hylomorphism. It permeates the whole of Scholastic physical science and philosophy, and is employed, both as to terminology and signification, in the exposition of Catholic theology. In this place it will be well to note that the terminology and meaning of this doctrine are not only consecrated to theology by the usage of theologians, but have also been employed in the solemn definitions of the Church. In the general Council of Vienne it was defined that whosoever shall presume to assert, defend, or pertinaciously hold that the rational or intellective soul is not the form of the human body, of itself and essentially, is to be considered as a heretic. (Cf. "Conc. Viennen. Definitiones . . . ex Clementinâ de Summâ Trinitate" in Denzinger, "Enchirid.", n. 408.) This teaching was reasserted in the decree of Pope Leo X, in the Fifth Lateran Council (Bull, Apostolici Regiminis), and again by Pope Pius IX, in a Brief to the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne, concerning the books and teaching of Günther (1857).

The efficient cause is that which, by its action, produces an effect substantially distinct from itself. It is denominated *efficient* on account of the term produced by its action, i. e. the effect itself, and not necessarily from any presupposed material principle which it is conceived as potent to transform. The action, or causality, of the efficient cause is conceived as one which educes the actuality of the effect from its potentiality. This it is held to do in virtue of its own actuality, though precisely how no one has ever explained. No explanation of the essential nature of the action of the efficient cause would seem to be possible. St. Thomas Aquinas tells us that "an effect shows the power of the cause only by reason of the action, which proceeds from the power and is terminated in the effect. But the nature of a cause is not known through its effect except in so far as through its effect its power is known, which follows upon its nature". (Contra Gentiles, III, lxix, tr. Rickaby.) Both the fact of efficient causality, and an account of its mode of action, as to accidents, are thus expressed by St. Thomas, in answer to the objections of "some Doctors of the Moorish Law": "Now this is a ridiculous proof to assign of a body not acting, to point to the fact that no accident passes from subject to subject. When it is said that one body heats another, it is not meant that numerically the same heat, which is in the heating body, passes to the body heated; but that by virtue of the heat, which is in the heating body, numerically another heat comes to be in the heated body actually, which was in it before potentially. For a natural agent does not transfer its own form to another subject, but reduces the subject upon which it acts from potentiality to actuality." (Op. cit., Bk. III, lxix.) The same argument, *mutatis mutandis*, would likewise hold good if applied to the efficient causes of substances. The efficient cause, unlike the material and the formal, is thus seen to be entirely extrinsic to its effect. It is held to act in virtue of its form. The fact and mode of this action is given in the above quotation from the "Contra Gentiles"; but the precise nature of the action, or relation, between the efficient cause and its effect is not stated. It is quite clear that the accident, quality, power, or motion in the cause A is not held to pass over into the effect B, since a numerically new one is said to be reduced from potentiality. Equally clear is it that nothing of the first efficient cause is supposed to pass over into its effects, as creation is said to be *ex nihilo sui et subiecti;* and there is nothing in God to pass over, since all that we conceive of as in God is God Himself. Consequently it would seem that the concept of efficiency in general includes no more than the activity of the cause as producing the effect by educing an accidental or a substantial form from the potentiality of matter. In the one case of forms not so educible, the efficient

cause (God) creates and infuses them into matter. (Cf. In III Phys., Lect. 5.)

There are many divisions and subdivisions of the efficient cause commonly made in Scholastic treatises, to which the reader is referred for a more complete development of the subject. Under this head, however, will be added the principal dignities, or axioms of causality, as laid down by the Schoolmen: (1) Whatever exists in nature is either a cause or an effect (Contra Gent., III, cvii). (2) No entity can be its own cause (op. cit., II, xxi). (3) There is no effect without a cause. (4) Given the cause, the effect follows; the cause removed, the effect ceases. This axiom is to be understood of causes efficient *in act*, and of effects related to them not only in becoming but also in being (op. cit., II, xxxv). (5) An effect requires a proportionate cause. This axiom is to be understood in the sense that actual effects respond to actual causes, particular effects to particular causes, etc. (op. cit., II, xxi). (6) The cause is by nature prior to its effect. Priority is not necessarily understood here as relating to time. (Op. cit., II, xxi; "Summa theol.", III, Q. lxii, a. 6; "De potentiâ", Q. iii, a. xiii; "De veritate", Q. xxviii, a. vii.) (7) The perfection of the effect pre-exists in its cause (formally, virtually, or eminently). (Cf. Summa theol., I, Q. vi, a. 2.) (8) Whatever is the cause of a cause (precisely as cause) is the cause also of its effect. This axiom enunciates a truth with regard to series of connected causes formally acting by their nature. (Cf. Summa Theol., I, Q. xlv, a. 5.) (9) The first cause (in any order of causes dependent one on the other) contributes more to the production of the effect than the secondary cause. (Cf. De causis, in cap.) Arguments, besides that given above, for the establishing of the fact of efficient causality in the physical world are to be found in the "Contra Gentiles", III, lxix. It may be pointed out, in anticipation of the conception of purely mechanical, or dynamical, causation to be referred to later on, that in this system causation is not merely taken to mean an impulse, or change, in motion. The theory advanced is one to account for change of any kind, and, by a profound analysis, to reach the causes upon which things depend for their becoming and their actual being.

The final cause, or end, is that for the sake of which the effect, or result of an action, is produced. It is distinguished in the following manner: I (1) The end considered objectively, or the effect itself as desired by the agent; (2) the end formally considered, or the possession or use of the effect. II (1) The end of the efficient operation, or that effect or result to which the operation is directed by the efficient cause; (2) the end of the agent, or that which he principally and ultimately intends by his operation. III (1) The end prior to the activity caused by it, both as cause and in the line of being; (2) the end prior to the activity as cause, but posterior to this in the line of being. There are other divisions of the final cause, for the details of which the reader is referred to the literature upon the subject. The causality of the final cause is to be referred to its appetibility. "As the influx of the efficient cause is in its act, so the influx of the final cause is in its being sought after and desired." (St. Thomas, De veritate, Q. xxii, a. ii.) That it is a true cause Aquinas shows in the following words: "Matter does not acquire form, except according as it is moved by an acting cause (agent); for nothing reduces itself from potency to act. But the acting cause does not move, except by reason of the intention of an end. For if the acting cause were not determined to some effect, it would not act to produce one rather than another. In order, therefore, that it should produce a determined effect, it is necessary that it should be determined to something certain as end." (Summa theol., I–II, Q. i, a. 2; cf. also In V Metaphysic., Lect. 2.)

The final cause, like the efficient, is extrinsic to the effect, the latter being the cause of the existence of the former, and the former causing the latter, not in its existence, but as to its activity here and now exercised. Efficient causes acting towards ends are distinguished as: (1) acting by intelligence; or (2) acting by nature. Ultimately, the tendency of the operation of the latter class is resolved into operation by intelligence, since the determined operation following on their nature is, and must be, assigned to an intelligent first cause, either of a particular series, or of all series: i. e. God. Thus deliberative operation is seen not to be of the essence of operation towards the attainment of ends. It is shown that, in no one of the four classes into which causes are differentiated is an infinite progression possible; and, upon the doctrine advanced as to causality in general, and the four classes of causes in particular, are based arguments demonstrating rationally the existence of God. It may be of interest to refer in this section to the exemplary cause, or exemplary ideas, as conceived by St. Thomas. He writes (Summa theol., I, Q. xv, a. 1): "In all those things that are not generated by chance, it is necessary that form should be the end of the generation of each. But the efficient cause [*agens*] does not act on account of the form, except in so far as the likeness of the form is in it. And this happens in two ways. (1) For in certain efficient causes the form of the thing to be made pre-exists, agreeably to natural essence, as in those things that act by nature; as man begets man, and fire produces fire. (2) But in others it pre-exists agreeably to intelligible essence; as in those things which act by intellect; as the likeness of the house pre-exists in the mind of the builder." He concludes that, since the world is not the result of chance, there is an idea (in the succeeding article of the same question, many ideas) in the Divine mind, as the archetype forms of things. But these ideas are the essence of God understood by Him as imitable in diverse modes on the part of His creatures. In this sense, perhaps, did Aristotle identify form, end, and moving cause. In the imitability on the part of creation, St. Thomas finds the secret of the world of phenomena. Viewed with his theory of causality as exposed above, it is perhaps the most complete and consistent explanation that has ever been given of the problem. When we find Spinoza putting forward substance, with its two attributes of thought and extension, determined to modes (unreal as these ultimately turn out to be); when Berkeley teaches that what we take to be causal changes in the phenomenal world are illusory, that there are no secondary causes, and that God and the human mind alone are real; when Hegel posits the unfolding of thought as the cause of phenomenal change, or Schopenhauer will manifesting itself in phenomenal succession—we seem to have found some clue to the labyrinth of causality, some common ground of unification. But it is at the cost of doing violence to our sense perception and immediate necessary judgments that the unification is brought about. In the Scholastic solution of the problem a ground of unification is provided in the transcendence, rather than the immanence, of the first and original source of all efficient causality. Moreover, with the isolation of the four causes and the declaration of their relationships and interaction, a coherent account is given of the working of secondary causality, as a matter of fact, in the phenomenal world.

There is one aspect of the present topic that usually has a treatment apart from the more general question of causality. How, it is asked, can causal action be conceived as taking place between soul and body—between mind and matter, or between matter and mind? For a fuller statement of the answer to the latter part of this question the reader must be referred to the article EPISTEMOLOGY. It may be

pointed out here, however, that in the Scholastic philosophy, man is not regarded as being a double entity—i. e. body + soul—but as a single one. The soul is the true and proper form of the body, which is its matter. It is, consequently, man who sees, hears, feels, etc., just as it is man who understands and wills. The communication from the outside world to his consciousness is made by the action of phenomena upon his organs of sensation. He is in touch with things external to himself through the medium of their "sensible species". These, as phantasmata, under the abstraction of the "acting intellect", are transformed into "intelligible species". Thus, from the observation of causal action in the concrete, man rises to a true intellectual knowledge of causality in itself.

The first part of the question includes two issues. Man wills and performs actions, either becoming the efficient cause of effects, or causing efficient causes to act. God wills and creates the world. In the second case philosophy must confess to a mystery. It is held to be proved, by a consideration of the multiplicity and mutability of the entities that together form the world, that they have their origin in that one supreme and immutable entity which is God. It is further held to be proved that they are neither produced out of Him nor out of an already existing subject. To such a production of effects is given the name Creation. How God, as efficient cause of creation, acts, it is impossible to conceive. In the first case, will is a faculty of the soul, which is the substantial form of man. Consequently a man wills, rather than the will (or the soul), and, by reason of the intimate union of body and soul as matter and form (i. e. one suppositum, thing, or person), man acts. As informed by "soul" man is capable of willing to act and of acting; as body, or matter informed by "soul", he is capable of acting upon other bodies. For a more complete development of this point see PSYCHOLOGY.

Though the Scholastic philosophy never fell into complete desuetude, nor ever lacked distinguished exponents of its principles, the upheaval of the sixteenth century was productive of new systems of thought in the development of which the idea of causality was profoundly modified, and ultimately was, in any intelligible sense, to a great extent abandoned. In this period two main lines of thought with regard to causes and causal action are pursued. On the one hand there is a tendency to revert to a purely mechanical conception, on the other to a purely idealistic one. The later Schoolmen had, by indulging largely in stereotyped, and often useless, speculations, in which a perplexing number of concrete cases of causality figure, brought Scholasticism into disrepute; while a general vague unrest and a desire for practical results from philosophy contributed to the formation of a new empirical system, constructed upon the principles of what is called the scientific method. In his "Instauratio magna", Bacon gave impetus to the movement. While accepting the traditional fourfold division of causes, he was of opinion that any speculation with regard to final causes is fruitless. The material cause, also, is not a proper subject for investigation. Even the efficient cause, except in given conditions, is such as cannot lead us to knowledge. Forms alone help the interpreter of nature—and this in the practical sense that by a knowledge of forms he is in a position to become an efficient minister of nature. What is meant by form is not very clearly explained; but it is fairly safe to say that by it Bacon intended something approximating in meaning to the *εἶδος* of Aristotle. Both Bacon, as is to be seen in his treatment of heat in the "Novum Organum", and Descartes make motion the cause of the "apparently diverse changes in nature". The latter entirely rejected the Scholastic system of formal causes, and considered matter as entirely inert. Hence diversity and change are to be accounted for immediately by motion + matter; while ultimately the sole efficient cause of all things is nothing else than the Will of God. The opinion of Descartes on this head, together with his complete dualism of body and mind, led to the theory of causality, already advanced by certain Arabs in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and known as Occasionalism. This is one of the most curious causal theories that has ever been put forward, and merits some notice. The Occasionalists —Malebranche, Geulincx (Leibniz)—taught that created things do not themselves possess any effective activity, but are merely occasions in which the activity of the sole efficient cause, God, is manifested. A cause in nature does not produce any effect; but is the condition—or, more properly, the occasion—of the production of effects. Similarly, there is no causal connexion or relation between body and soul. When God acts in nature producing effects, or things, occasioned by the previous existence of other things, He acts directly likewise upon our minds producing the corresponding idea of causal change. When we will, our volition is no more than the occasion of His acting on our bodies and effecting a movement, or change, corresponding to our willing. Akin to this explanation of the origin of our concepts of causality and of volition, is the doctrine of Leibniz on "pre-established harmony" between the soul-monad and the material-monads. Conformably to the theory of the Occasionalists, there is no transeunt, but only immanent, action to be admitted in causal changes. Several of the considerations given above in the section developing the doctrine of the Schoolmen anticipate this theory as an objection, notably that which deals with the reductive nature of efficient causality, by which the potential is said to become actual and thus constitute the effect.

The problem of causation, for which a solution was advanced by the Occasionalists in the introduction of God as sole efficient cause, was disposed of by Hume in a still more drastic manner. His critical examination of the idea of causality issues, in full accordance with his sensistic principles, in sheer scepticism. Having previously reduced mind to no more than a succession of perceptions, he declares: "To me there appear to be only three principles of connexion among ideas, namely, *Resemblance*, *Contiguity* in time or place, and *Cause* or *Effect*" (Works, IV, 18). Thus, for Hume, causality is no more than a relation between ideas. It is not an a priori relation, "but arises entirely from experience, when we find that any particular objects are *constantly conjoined* with each other" (ibid., 24). However, we can never comprehend any force or power, by which the cause operates, or any connexion between it and its supposed effect. The same difficulty occurs in contemplating the operations of mind on body. . . . So that, upon the whole, there appears not, throughout all nature, any one instance of connexion, which is conceivable by us" (ibid., 61 sqq.). Whence, then, does our conception of cause come? Not from a single observed sequence of one event from another, for that is not a sufficient warranty for us to form any general rule, but from the conjunction of one particular species of event with another, in all observed instances. "But there is nothing", he writes, "in a number of instances, different from every single instance, which is supposed to be exactly similar; except only, that after a repetition of similar instances, the mind is carried by habit, upon the appearance of one event, to expect its usual attendant, and to believe that it will exist. . . . When we say, therefore, that one object is connected with another, we mean only, that they have acquired a connexion in our thought, and give rise to this inference, by which they become proofs of each other's existence" (p. 63). Hence Hume defines cause as

that object, followed by another, "*where, if the first object had not been, the second would never have existed*", or "*an object followed by another, and whose appearance always conveys the thought to that other*" (ibid.). In this doctrine Hume advances a psychological explanation of the origin of the idea (habit), but inculcates an utter scepticism as to the reality of causation. Hume's position was sharply attacked by Thomas Reid, who invoked "common sense" to confute him, principally on account of the consequences of his scepticism in the region of natural theology. But Reid, mistaking the doctrine of the Schoolmen as to perception—he supposed that Scholasticism taught that the *species sensibilis* was that which is perceived, rather than that *by which* the sensible object is perceived—went so far as to assert that sense perception is the same as intellectual judgment. Reid was accused by Kant of having altogether misunderstood the point of the question raised by Hume; and was defended by Galluppi, who instead makes Kant mistaken as to Hume's meaning. Kant represents Hume as saying: "Metaphysical causation is not in the objects observed; therefore it is a product of the imagination based on custom or habit." This he alters to: "Causation is not in the things observed; therefore it is in the observer." But Hume's real argument is: "Metaphysical causality is not in the things observed; therefore it cannot be in the observer, in whom all is derived from observation." This, he says, Reid thoroughly understands, and pertinently retorts: "As a matter of fact the concept of metaphysical causation *is* in the intellect; and, since it is not derived from the things observed, it must therefore be a subjective law of the observer." Had Reid not misunderstood the import of the *species sensibilis* his appeal to "common sense" would have given him a greater affinity to the Schoolmen. His division of first principles as necessary or contingent has the metaphysical in the first category. Among these he places the principle of causation, thus assigning it a place as a necessary first principle, prior to all experience and independent of it.

Thomas Brown, whose work was said by Mackintosh to be "an open revolt against the authority of Reid", agrees with Hume in resolving causality into invariable succession, but dissents from his theory that the idea has its origin in "habit", and contends, with Reid, that it is an intuitive, or first truth. His analysis of consciousness into "the whole series of states of the mind", and consequent denial that there is a consciousness capable of knowing its own states, is, however, in explicit contradiction with Reid's teaching. Thus, Reid having overlooked the point of transition from phenomenal observance to noumenal truth, Brown still further separates the two and prepares the way for Hamilton and Mill, the former of whom makes our notion of causality a belief dependent upon a powerlessness of our nature to think otherwise. The latter explains causality as uniform antecedence, the growth of human experience, and not to be extended beyond the realm of experience. "In distant parts of the stellar regions", he writes, "where the phenomena may be entirely unlike those with which we are acquainted, it would be folly to affirm that this general law prevails." (System of Logic, III, xxi.)

Hume was the philosophical predecessor of Kant. We accordingly find in the "Kritik der reinen Vernunft" that, on the question of causality, the doctrine of Kant, to a considerable extent, is in substantial agreement with that of the Scottish sceptic. Where Hume posited a repetition of similar instances of connexion, by the observance of which is set up a habit that accounts psychologically for the idea of necessary causation, Kant advances a regular succession of effect from cause. This regular succession, whatever it may chance to be in nature, is physical causation. But we cannot know anything of it a priori. There is, as far as we can discover, no reason why A should succeed to B, rather than to C, D, or E. Whatever the order of succession is *de facto*, we must learn by observation, since there is nothing in the nature of things, so far as we can judge, to make one the consequent of another rather than of some third. We do, however, know—and this a priori—that the order of succession, whatever it may actually happen to be, is, and must be, regular. This follows from a fundamental position of the Kantian philosophy. Space and time are a priori concepts, or subjective forms. All phenomenal successions, whatever they may be, exist in time and space. Or, rather, time is regular succession, just as space is regular reciprocal occupancy. Hence, whatever the things existing in space may *de facto* be, and however the order of succession may happen to take place, the one must be definitely determined to some set of reciprocal relations, and the other must be one, definite, and irreversible. We arrive at a knowledge of the one actual order of succession, of which some one order *must* be, by observation; but the datum of a regular order is known beforehand. Efficient causality, therefore, in the world, as regular succession, is an a priori item of knowledge. What the precise order is remains to be discovered, and its formulation is the formulation of natural laws. Between cause, then, and effect there is a constant and necessary relation; but the effect is not in the cause. In the scheme of categories developed by Kant, cause and effect fall under the head of Relation, together with substance and accident, and action and passion. But the relation is known through experience, and consequently is of no value beyond the realm of experience. No inference can be made from it to God, as cause. The cosmological proof is thus rejected by Kant.

From Kant onwards the two lines of thought already noted become yet more clearly marked. Indeed the elements of both are to be found in his own writings. On the one hand, the idealistic development of philosophic thought reaches its expression in Hegel, Schopenhauer, etc. On the other, science, as such, limits itself more and more to purely mechanical concepts. The problems of causality are referred to the idealistic standpoint, or else are treated in terms of matter and motion, with no reference to the essences of the effects. With Hegel causality takes the form of the development of the Idea, as the Absolute in itself (*an sich*), through its manifestation as otherness (*für sich*), and back to identity (*an und für sich*). All that is, in the way of cause, is the working out, or unfolding, and coming back to itself, of the Absolute Idea. Being is becoming. The Hegelian notion of Being as essentially pure thought issues naturally in a kind of inversion of the ordinary notion of causality; for, with Hegel, the notion of causality is causality itself. Although he opposed Hegel and his philosophy with great violence, the system of Schopenhauer is not greatly dissimilar to this. Schopenhauer substitutes Will for Idea. The world, and its processes, are the objectivized form of the Will. But, strictly speaking, Will cannot be considered as cause and effect. Rather are these but two aspects of one and the same thing. Thus Schopenhauer (as does to some extent von Hartmann) reduces causality to the universal operation of a single ideal principle. Both attenuate the idea of it, Schopenhauer by his extreme doctrine of relativity, von Hartmann by his conception of the all-oneness of the Unconscious. According to Schopenhauer, we call cause that state of objects which is followed by another state (i. e. the effect), on account of the principle of sufficient reason of becoming—*principium rationis sufficientis fiendi*. This last notion of causality, as mere sequence, but without any idealistic ground to account for it, is that which principally obtains in current science. A

given event, in the instant A, is uniformly followed by a second given event in the instant B. No implication of power, or dependence, is conceived or stated. Similarly, a group of events, in one instant, is followed by another group in the next; the total sum of things comprising the world is succeeded by the total sum of things comprising the world in two succeeding instants. In all these cases, as far as they are considered by science, the event or events of the prior instant are always the cause of what follows, provided the succession is invariable. Thus the same thing may conceivably be, and is sometimes said to be, both cause and effect, identical in all respects but that of succession in time. There need be no necessary contradiction between such a view and that of philosophy; for science, as such, does not consider the questions of metaphysics or seek to determine the essential causes of beings. A relationship, given that it is invariable, as the unconditional constant succession of John Stuart Mill, between the two or more phenomena, is all that science demands and, under the particular abstractions with which it deals, this is enough to ensure scientific results. A knowledge of the conditions of the existence of certain phenomena is the principal aim of science; and this is strictly pursued by observation, experiment, and the application of mathematical methods. There is, consequently, no radical opposition between the two provinces of knowledge, since both the ends sought and the means employed in their search differ. Indeed were a man of science to make any pronouncement as to the nature of essential causes or their mode of causality, he would have overstepped the boundaries drawn by his science and declared himself a metaphysician. As a matter of fact, there have not been wanting scientists, whose habit of mind and training are entirely scientific and in no sense metaphysical, who have done this very thing and attempted to give a scientific solution of a purely metaphysical problem. There will be no need to give any detailed account of such an attempt, the success of which is obviously impossible. The scientific means at disposal are not equal to the task. But, on the other hand, in its own sphere and working with its own particular abstractions, science is quite competent to reach its own results in its own way, and this without any necessary correction on the part of metaphysics.

It will be perceived that the period of groping for the concrete causes of things gave place to one in which the synthesis of causes provided an explanation of causality. The concept of the efficient cause—not of the causal nexus and interaction as a whole—was, in the next stage, submitted to a critical analysis resulting in scepticism, then rehabilitated either on idealistic or mechanical lines. But the critical analysis, though it certainly led indirectly to both these later views as to causality, was answered, by the appeal to "common sense", in a way that, but for one missing factor, would probably have turned the current of philosophic thought back to Scholasticism and the Aristotelean doctrine, as the only one providing a satisfactory account, either of the action of what we call causes and the production of effects in the world, or of the true origin of the idea of necessary causality. For the theory of Aristotle and the Schoolmen can lay claim, most truly, to a character of common sense. It is based upon the observation, by the senses, of individual cases of causal action in the phenomenal world. So far it is no more than in agreement with the common experience of mankind. But, beyond this, it provides a suitable account of the manner in which an observation of individual cases can become an intellectual concept. This it does in its theory of the origin of ideas. In this point, then, the Scholastic system of philosophy can be represented as in full accord with, and built out of, the common judgments of mankind. It parts company with this only in requiring clearer evidence, using stricter analysis and sharper criticism. Also, it proceeds farther, though still along the lines traced by common sense, in its analyses and syntheses, until it has presented natural knowledge as a complete and co-ordinate whole.

The fact, already alluded to, that several of the systems given to the world, even after Hume's criticism, have much in common with, yet lack the conclusive and convincing force of, the Scholastic system on this issue, would seem to argue in favour of the claim of the latter to common sense or naturalness. As a metaphysical theory, it has the merit of being straightforward, clear, and consistent; and it accounts for that for which it professes to account without ambiguity or circumlocution. That, as a matter of history, modern speculation on this point did not return, confirmed and justified, to the earlier lines, after the criticism of Hume, is probably due, in the main, to the fact that the full concept of causality had been more or less lost sight of during the period preceding him. His criticism was aimed at the possibility of a knowledge of causal efficiency; and without an adequate theory of cognition, as well as a proper grasp of the relationships between efficient cause and effect in the process of becoming, the idea of efficiency, or power, is indeed inexplicable. Thus, while in the idealistic theories the attempt is made to restate the problem on a new basis, and solve it by reference to the manifestation, in one or another form, of Spirit, modern science pursues its own course and limits itself to the investigation of purely scientific conditions. Neither the one nor the other, properly speaking, raises the question as to the true and immediate causes of the qualities or essences of entities, for both have abandoned that standpoint from which alone the problem, in this sense, is envisaged.

Cause, in law, embraces any action, suit, or other original proceeding, between a plaintiff and a defendant. A cause of action is the entire set of facts that give rise to an enforceable claim. It includes the right of action; but the right does not necessarily include the cause. Thus, by lapse of time, a cause may cease to be actionable; or by legal enactment, as in the case of a solicitor, who cannot sue for his bill of costs until one month after its delivery. Until the expiry of the time there is no cause of action.

HISTORIES OF PHILOSOPHY.—RITTER AND PRELLER, *Historia Philosophiæ Græcæ* (7th ed., Gotha, 1888); UEBERWEG, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philosophie* (Berlin, 1862–66), tr. MORRIS, *A History of Philosophy* (London, 1872–74); STANLEY, *The History of Philosophy* (2d ed., London, 1687); TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903); GOMPERZ, *Griechische Denker* (Leipzig, 1896), tr. MAGNUS, *Greek Thinkers* (London, 1901); ERDMANN, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Berlin, Jena, 1866), tr. HOUGH (London, 1892); MERZ, *A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (Edinburgh, London, 1903); DE WULF, *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* (Louvain, 1900).

SOURCES.—PLATO, *Works*, especially *Timæus;* ARISTOTLE, *Works*, especially the *Physics* and *Metaphysics;* ST. AUGUSTINE, *Works*, especially *Confessions*, ed. CONGREGATION OF ST. MAUR (Paris, 1689–1700), also *P. L.;* ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Works* (Parma, 1852–73), especially the following: *Summa theol., Contra Gentiles, Commentaries on the Physics and Metaphysics, De veritate, De principiis naturæ, De pluralitate formarum, De formis, De principio individuationis, De æternitate mundi, De naturâ materiæ;* BACON, *Works*, ed. ELLIS, SPEDDING, AND HEATH (London, 1858–59); BERKELEY, *Works*, ed. FRASER (Oxford, 1901); MALEBRANCHE, *De la recherche de la vérité* (Amsterdam, 1688; Paris, 1712); LEIBNIZ, *Second et troisième éclaircissement du nouveau système de la communication des substances* in *Works* (Berlin, 1840); HUME, *The Philosophical Works of David Hume*, ed. GREEN AND GROSE (London, 1878), especially, *Treatise on Human Nature*, and *Essay: Of the Idea of Necessary Causation;* REID, *The Works of Thomas Reid*, preface, notes, etc. by SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON (Edinburgh, 1846–63); BROWN, *An Inquiry into the Relation of Cause and Effect* (Edinburgh, 1804); IDEM, *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind* (Edinburgh, 1820); KANT, *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (Riga, 1781), tr. MEIKLEJOHN (London, 1844); HEGEL, *Werke* (Berlin, 1832); SCHOPENHAUER, *Werke* (Leipzig, 1894); VON HARTMANN, *Philosophie des Unbewussten* (Berlin, 1869); STEWART, *Elements of Philosophy of the Human Mind* (Edinburgh, London, 1792–1827); HAMILTON, *Notes on Works of Reid* (Edinburgh, 1846–63); IDEM, *Lectures on Metaphysics*

and Logic, ed. MANSELL AND VEITCH (London, Edinburgh, 1859–60), Nos. 39, 40; MILL, *System of Logic* (London, 1843); JOSEPH RICKABY, *God and His Creatures*, tr. of *Contra Gentiles* (London, 1905).

COMMENTARIES.—GROTE, *Aristotle*, ed. BAIN AND ROBERTSON (London, 1872); SAINT-HILAIRE, *Works*, especially prefaces and notes to *Logique d'Aristote* (Paris, 1844), *Psychologie d'Aristote* (Paris, 1846), *Physique d'Aristote* (Paris, 1862), *Métaphysique d'Aristote* (Paris, 1879); HARPER, *Metaphysics of the School* (London, 1881); LORENZELLI, *Philosophiæ Theoreticæ Institutiones* (Rome, 1896); DE MANDATO, *Institutiones Philosophicæ* (Prato, 1894); CORNOLDI, tr. DERING, *The Physical System of St. Thomas* (London, 1893); RICKABY, *First Principles*, in *Stonyhurst Manuals* (London, 1888); BALMEZ, tr. BROWNSON, *Fundamental Philosophy* (New York, 1896); DE WULF, *Introduction à la philosophie néo-scholastique* (Louvain, 1903), tr. COFFEY, *Scholastic Philosophy* (Dublin, New York, 1907); BRADLEY, *Appearance and Reality* (London, 1893); STIRLING, *The Secret of Hegel* (London, 1865); MCCOSH, *The Scottish Philosophy* (London, 1875); *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, ed. BALDWIN, I: (New York, London, 1901); TYNDALL, *Address delivered before the British Association at Belfast* (London, 1874); *Mr. Mill on Causation* in *Dublin Review* (July, 1876), XXVII.

FRANCIS AVELING.

Caussin, NICOLAS, a famous Jesuit preacher and moralist; b. at Troyes in France, in 1583; d. at Paris, 2 July, 1651. His father, a physician of extensive practice, was able from a competent income to aid materially in the development of the remarkable talents that his son early displayed. Young Caussin's success in oratory, particularly after his entrance into the Society of Jesus (1609), was brilliant, and drew to him the attention of the royal family. When the kingdom of Henry IV was fast declining under the impotent sway of the queen-regent, Marie de' Medici, Louis XIII came to the throne. Richelieu summoned Caussin to Court to direct the young king's conscience. The task was a difficult one in those disturbed times, but Caussin, with scrupulous earnestness, gave heart and soul to the work. The king, who relied implicitly on him, was made to realize that peace would once more reign in his realm and in his own soul when he recalled the queen-mother and other members of the royal family from the banishment in which they were languishing. Richelieu disliked this advice and accused Caussin of raising false scruples in the king's mind, and even of holding communications that savoured of treachery, or that were at all events disloyal to his sovereign, with another of the royal chaplains. Caussin was at once banished to Quimper-Corentin in Brittany, where he remained until the death of Richelieu in 1643, when he returned to Paris to prepare his works for the press.

Many false statements regarding Caussin's disgrace were current. The Jansenist Arnauld claims that "it was well known from persons intimately connected at the former Court of Louis XIII, that Father Caussin considered himself obliged to tell His Majesty that attrition, arising from the fear of hell alone, was not sufficient for justification, as there could be no justification without love of God, and this was what caused his disgrace". Many more surmises were indulged in by other Jansenists, but the reason given above is admitted by unfriendly biographers of the father. Among his works are: "La Cour Sainte" (5 vols.)—"A comprehensive system of moral maxims, pious reflections and historical examples, forming in itself a complete library of rational entertainment, Catholic devotion, and Christian knowledge." It was translated into several languages, and has done much to perpetuate his fame. The English translation was printed in Dublin in 1815. "Le parallèle de l'éloquence sacrée et profane"; "La vie de Sainte Isabelle de France, sœur du roi St. Louis"; "Vie du Cardinal de Richelieu"; "Thesaurus Græcæ Poeseos". For his other works see De Backer, "Bibl. des écriv. de la c. de J." (Liège, 1855), and Sommervogel (new ed., Liège), II.

FELLER, *Biog. Univ.* (Paris, 1834), III, 252; DUHR, *Jesuiten Fabelen* (4th ed., 1904), 670 sqq.; CHÉROT in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s.v.

JOHN J. CASSIDY.

Cava and Sarno, DIOCESE OF (CAVENSIS ET SARNENSIS). Cava dei Tirreni is a city picturesquely situated in the province of Salerno, in Southern Italy. It was built by the inhabitants of Marina, after the destruction of that city by the Vandals (c. 455). In 980 St. Alferio Pappacarbona, monk of Cluny, withdrew to a deep cleft in Monte Finestre which dominates the city, and became the founder of one of the most celebrated of Italian monasteries. Its abbots received many privileges from the popes, especially from Urban II, who visited the monastery, and from Boniface IX, who in 1394 attached the episcopal dignity to the abbot's office. The cathedral of Cava, famous for its organ, has been since 1513 the principal church of the city. The library of the monastery is very rich in ancient parchments, mostly private in character, written in Greek, Latin, Italian, and Arabic. It has also a beautiful gallery of paintings. Since 1860 the monastery has been one of the "national monuments"; some monks remain as its custodians. There are in Cava a college, gymnasium, and lyceum, in charge of Benedictines. In 1818 the Diocese of Sarno was united to that of Cava. Sarno is a city in the province of Salerno, situated on the river of the same name. It was made an episcopal see in 1066, the first bishop being Riso. Cardinal Sfondrato, Archbishop of Amalfi, was at one time Bishop of Sarno. The united dioceses are immediately subject to the Holy See. They contain a population of 58,200, with 27 parishes, 5 religious houses of men and 7 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 380–84; *Annales Cavenses* (569–1315) in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.* (1839), III, 186–97; MORCALDI, *Codex diplomaticus Cavensis* (Naples, 1870); A. DANTIER, *Les couvents d'Italie: La Cava* in *Rev. Contempor.* (1854), XIII, 523–48; GRUYER, *Une abbaye bénédictine aux environs de Salerne, la Sainte Trinité de Cava*, in *Le Correspondant* (Paris, 1880), 846–73; *Brownson's Quart. Rev.* (1848), V, 183; C. I. HEMANS in *The Academy* (1875), VIII, 262–63, 364–65.

U. BENIGNI.

Cavagnis, FELICE, canonist, b. in Bordogna, Diocese of Bergamo, Italy, 13 January, 1841; d. at Rome, 29 December, 1906. After a brilliant course in the Pontifical Roman Seminary he received the doctorate in philosophy, theology, and in civil and canon law. Leo XIII named him professor of public ecclesiastical law in the Roman Seminary in 1880, a position which he retained for fifteen years, during which time he proved himself an eminent canonist, especially in all that related to the constitution of the Church and its relations with civil society. The Roman Congregations vied with one another in securing his services. He was appointed Consultor of the Sacred Congregations of Bishops and Regulars, of the Council, and of Studies; Consultor and Secretary of the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs; Canonist of the Sacred Penitentiary; and member of the Commission for the Codification of Canon Law. In all these exalted offices he left profound traces of his acuteness and skill in handling arduous and delicate questions. Austria, Spain, and Portugal honoured him with titles and distinctions, while the sovereign pontiff made him successively canon of several Roman basilicas, rector of the Roman Seminary, Domestic Prelate, and finally, 18 April, 1901, raised him to the cardinalate. He is best known by his important work: "Institutiones Juris Publici Ecclesiastici" (Elements of Public Ecclesiastical Law), a reliable and even classical manual of ecclesiastical government. He was conspicuous for gentleness of manner and the modest retirement which he observed even as cardinal. His death was mourned as a public loss to religion and science. The most important of his publications are: "Della natura di società giuridica e pubblica competente alla Chiesa" (Rome, 1880); "Nozioni di diritto pubblico naturale ed ecclesiastico" (Rome, 1886); "La Massoneria quel

che è, quel che ha fatto, quel che vuole" (Rome, 1905); "Institutiones Iuris Publici Ecclesiastici" (Rome, 1906), in three volumes. S. LUZIO.

Cavalieri, BONAVENTURA, Italian mathematician, b. at Milan in 1598; d. at Bologna, 3 December, 1647. At the age of fifteen he entered the Congregation of Hieronymites, or Jesuates. He taught theology for a time, but, as he showed a decided preference and talent for mathematics, his superiors sent him to the university at Pisa. Here he studied under Castelli, and became one of the most illustrious of the disciples of Galileo. In 1629 he became professor of mathematics at Bologna, where he continued to teach until his death. He suffered many years from gout, and, like Pascal, sought relief from pain in mathematical researches. Cavalieri was one of the leading mathematicians of his time, and is celebrated for his "Method of Indivisibles", to which he was led by his investigations on the determination of areas and volumes. The principle was known to Kepler. Cavalieri published an account of his method in 1635 in his "Geometria indivisibilibus continuorum novâ quâdam ratione promota". It is an improvement over the method of exhaustions employed by the Greek mathematicians and was a forerunner of the integral calculus, which has since superseded it. In his "Geometria" he assumes that lines are made up of an infinite number of points, surfaces of an infinite number of lines, and solids of an infinite number of surfaces. This statement was attacked, especially by Guldinus, as being unscientific, and in 1647 in his "Exercitationes Geometricæ sex", Cavalieri endeavours to put it into better form, and answer the objections of his critics. In this work he also gives the first rigid demonstration of the theorem of Pappus, which Guldinus had rediscovered, though he was unable to give a statisfactory proof of it. A later edition of the "Geometria" appeared in 1653. Cavalieri did much to render common the use of logarithms in Italy. Besides the works already mentioned, he was the author of "Lo Specchio ustorio, ovvero trattato delle settioni coniche", 1632; "Directorium generale uranometricum in quo trigonometriæ logarithmicæ fundamenta ac regulæ demonstrantur", 1632; "Rota planetaria", 1640; "Trigonometria plana et sphærica linearis et logarithmica", 1635.

BALL, *Hist. of Math.* (London, 1893); CAJORI, *Hist. of Math.* (New York, 1894); *Biog. Univ.*, VII; FRISI, *Elogio di B. Cavalieri* (Milan, 1829), I.

H. M. BROCK.

Cavanagh, JAMES, soldier, b. in County Tipperary, Ireland, 1831; d. in New York, 7 January, 1901. He emigrated to New York when he was sixteen years old and went to work as a carpenter. In 1852 he enlisted as a private in the Sixty-Ninth Regiment of the Militia, and was captain of Company C of the same command when it went to take part in the Civil War, 23 April, 1861. When the regiment returned after the battle of Bull Run and was reorganized as the Sixty-Ninth New York Volunteers of the Irish Brigade, he again went to the front as its major. In this rank he served during the campaigns of the Army of the Potomac, until the battle of Fredericksburg, 13 December, 1862, when he was shot in the hip while leading the regiment in one of the charges up Marye's Heights. He was then discharged from the army because of the disabilities from his wound. When the State Militia was reorganized as the National Guard, he rejoined the regiment and was made its lieutenant-colonel. In 1867 he was elected colonel, which command he held for more than twenty years. He received the brevet of brigadier-general, 10 January, 1893, the first time that rank was conferred on an officer of the New York State Militia, and in 1894 he retired, after a service of forty-two years. For a number of years before his death he was attached to the New York Custom House as a special customs inspector.

CONYNGHAM, *The Irish Brigade and its Campaigns* (Boston, 1869); *The Irish American* (New York), files; MICHAEL CAVANAGH, *Memoirs of Gen. Thomas Francis Meagher* (Worcester, 1892).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Cavazzi, GIOVANNI ANTONIO, of Montecucolo, a Capuchin friar of the province of Bologna, date of birth uncertain; d. at Genoa, 1692. In 1654 a band of friars was sent to the Congo to supply the place of those who had died or were incapacitated by sickness, and amongst the new-comers was Cavazzi. He suffered much on the long sea-voyage, yet his zeal was unabated when he landed in the Congo, where he laboured for many years with much spiritual fruit. Being invalided home, he was summoned by the Propaganda to give an account of the mission, and from this he got the idea of setting down in writing his observations and experiences. He produced a voluminous work, but had hardly finished it when he was again sent on the mission. The manuscript was entrusted by the superiors of the order to Fortunato da Bologna, who rewrote the book in more elegant style, and published it at Bologna in 1687 under the title "Istorica Descrizione de' Tre Regni Congo, Matamba et Angola". The work is profusely illustrated. In the "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Ordinis" Fortunato da Bologna is stated to have rewritten an already published work of Cavazzi, but the "Bibliotheca" seems in error on this point, as may be gathered from Fortunato's prefatory remarks.

FATHER CUTHBERT.

Cavedoni, CELESTINO, an Italian ecclesiastic, archæologist, and numismatist; b. 18 May, 1795, at Levizzano-Rangone, near Modena; d. 26 November, 1865, at Modena. He pursued his theological studies in the diocesan seminary, and from 1816 to 1821 distinguished himself in the study of archæology and the Greek and Hebrew languages at the University of Bologna. He was then appointed custodian of the Numismatical Museum of Modena, and received a position in the City Library, of which he became librarian in 1847. From 1830 to 1863 he held the chair of hermeneutics at the University of Modena. Cavedoni was, moreover, a corresponding member of the commission created by Napoleon III to edit the works of Count Bartolommeo Borghesi, to which collection he contributed numerous scientific notes. Among his numismatic works may be mentioned: "Saggio di osservazioni sulle medaglie di famiglie romane" (1829); "Carellii nummorum Italiæ Veteris tabulæ" (Leipzig, 1850); "Numismatica Biblica" (Modena, 1850; German tr. by Werlhof, Hanover, 1855–56). Cavedoni contributed numerous historical and archæological papers to the "Annali" and the "Bullettino" of the Archæological Institute of Rome and to other Italian publications. In religious polemics he wrote a refutation of Renan's "Life of Jesus", which passed through four editions in several months: "Confutazione dei principali errori di Ernesto Renan nella sua Vie de Jésus" (Modena, 1863).

BERTAUX, in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, IX, 967; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck 1895), III, 1024–25.

N. A. WEBER.

Cavellus, HUGO. See MACCAGHWILL, HUGO.

Cavo, ANDRES, a writer frequently quoted on Spanish-Mexican history; b. at Guadalajara in Mexico, 21 January, 1729. He entered the Society of Jesus, 14 January, 1758, and went to Italy with the other members of the order after their expulsion from Mexico in 1767. An important chronicle of events from the date of the conquest of Mexico (1521) to the year 1767, which Cavo wrote for the

municipality of the City of Mexico, Bustamente asserts was composed after his expatriation and while at Rome. From considerations of delicacy, Cavo desisted from the work after his order had been expelled from Mexico. He has preserved and co-ordinated a large number of facts that are found nowhere else. Bustamente edited and continued the chronicle to 1836, but not with the impartiality of Cavo. The book was published at Jalapa in Mexico in 1870.

Beristain de Souza, *Biblioteca hispano-americana setentrional* (Mexico, 2nd ed., 1885, by Fortino Hipólito Vera); Cavo, *Los Tres Siglos en México* (Jalapa, 1870); *Diccionario universal de Historia y Geografía* (Mexico).

Ad. F. Bandelier.

Caxton, William, b. in the Weald of Kent c. 1422; d. at Westminster, 1491; the first English printer and the introducer of the art of printing into England. Of his life we have little definite information beyond that given us by himself in the prefaces and epilogues to his printed books. He thanks his parents for having given him an education that fitted him to earn a living, though he says nothing as to the place where he had been educated. From the records of the Mercers' Company we learn that in 1438 (the first definite date of his life that is known) he was apprenticed to Robert Large, a well-known and wealthy London mercer. About 1446 he became a merchant on his own account and settled at Bruges, and, being a good man of business, soon became prosperous. In 1453 he went to England for his formal admittance to the Mercers' Company, and in 1465 he was appointed governor for Bruges of the Merchant Adventurers, an association of English merchants. This important position involved delicate and responsible commercial negotiations, and Caxton seems to have fulfilled his duties honourably and with success. About 1470 a change took place in his life. He gave up his connexion with commerce, and entered the service of Margaret, Duchess of Burgundy, sister of Edward IV. It is not known why he did this, but it may well be that he wished for greater freedom for literary work. He had already begun his first translation from the French, the "Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye", and this he finished in 1471, dedicating it to his patroness, the Duchess of Burgundy. It was this piece of work which led him to turn his attention to the art of printing. The book in manuscript was much sought after, and the labour of copying was too heavy and too slow to meet the demand. Therefore, he says, "I have practysed & lerned at my grete charge & dispense to ordeyne this said book in prynte. . . that every man may have them attones."

William Caxton

There is some evidence to show that Caxton first learned printing at Cologne, where other famous printers had learned it, but the question is still under debate. His first book, the "Recuyell", was undoubtedly printed at Bruges in 1474, at the press of Colard Mansion, an illuminator of manuscripts, who had set up a press in that city in 1473. Caxton's second book, the "Game & Pleye of Chess", another translation from the French, came, it is almost certain, from the same press in 1475.

The highest point of interest in Caxton's life is reached when in 1476, returning to England, he set up a printing press of his own at Westminster. The first dated book issued from this press was the "Dictes and sayings of the Philosophers" and bears the imprint 1477. From this date to the end of his life he issued ninety-six books from the Westminster press, including, amongst others, the works of Chaucer and Gower, Sir Thomas Malory's "Morte d'Arthur", and various translations of more or less classical works from French, Latin, and Dutch, together with a number of smaller books, a good many of which are religious. His industry was very great, and he died in the midst of his work. He was not only a skilful master printer and publisher of books, but to some extent a man of letters—editor, author, translator—with a certain style of his own and a true enthusiasm for literature. His work as writer and translator helped to fix the literary language of England in the sixteenth century. Specimens of his printed books exist in various public and private libraries. The British Museum possesses eighty-three Caxton volumes, twenty-five of which are duplicates.

Blades, *Life and Typography of Wm. Caxton* (London, 1861–63); condensed and revised edition of the above (London, 1882); Gordon Duff, *William Caxton* (Chicago, 1903); Lee, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; *British Museum Catalogue*.

K. M. Warren.



If it plese ony man spirituel or temporel to bye ony pyes of two and thre comemoracions of salisburi vse enprynted after the forme of this prelet lettre whiche ben wel and truly correct, late hym come to westmo; nester in to the almonesrye at the reed pale and he shal haue them good chepe .·.·

Caxton's Advertisement at Westminster (Bodleian Library)

Cayes, Diocese of (Cajesensis), in the Republic of Haiti, suffragan to Port-au-Prince. The actual ecclesiastical province of Port-au-Prince (the archdiocese and the four suffragan dioceses of Cap Haïtien, Gonaïves, Cayes, and Port-de-Paix) dates only from the reorganization following upon the Concordat of 1860 between Pope Pius IX and the Republic of Haiti; but the Faith was planted in this part of Santo Domingo towards the end of the fifteenth century, and despite the many political and social vicissitudes of the island has never been quite extinguished there. The jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cayes (Monseigneur Jean-Marie-Alexandre Morice, elected 4 March, 1893) extends over the whole civil Department of the South (Werner, Orb. Terr. Cath., Freiburg, 1890), and his episcopal see is at Cayes (commonly spoken of as *Aux Cayes*), a seaport in the extreme south-western part of the island. This diocese is divided into 25 parishes containing altogether a population of 500,000, almost without exception Catholics by profession. According to the "Annuaire pontifical" for 1907, there were 95 churches or chapels in the diocese, with 35 secular priests.

The Catholic progress of Cayes since the first settlement of Santo Domingo, as well as the educational, racial, and economic conditions and development of the district, have been substantially the same as in the northern dioceses of Haiti. (See Cap Haïtien.)

M. Chatté.

Caylus, ANNE-CLAUDE-PHILIPPE DE TUBIÈRES-GRIMOARD DE PESTELS DE LÉVIS, COMTE DE, French archæologist, b. at Paris, in 1692; d. in 1765. He was the eldest son of Lieutenant-General de Caylus and was educated with the greatest care by his mother, a woman of much ability and literary distinction, whose "Souvenirs" are full of valuable information for the history of the time. When only seventeen years old he enlisted and took part in the campaigns of the French army in Spain and Germany. After the peace of Rastadt (1714), he left the army and devoted himself entirely to the study of the arts and sciences. He first travelled for a few years in Italy, Greece, the East, England and Germany, visiting old ruins and gathering inscriptions and antiquities. His desire to see everything himself and verify the information given by ancient historians was such that he sometimes risked his life. He went even so far, during his excursion to the ruins of Ephesus and Colophon, as to take as guides and bodyguards a troop of much-dreaded highwaymen who infested the country. After his return to Paris, he wrote his most important book, "Recueil d'antiquités égyptiennes, étrusques, grecques, romaines et gauloises" (Paris, 1752–67, seven vols., the last two volumes published after his death). He also worked, with Mariette, Barthélémy and Rive, at the collection of ancient paintings known as "Peintures antiques trouvées à Rome" (three vols. folio), which was published in 1783–87, long after Caylus' death. A member of the Academy of Painting in 1731, and of the Academy of Inscriptions in 1742, he wrote no fewer than fifty reports on various topics of erudition. Caylus was also a painter and an engraver of no little merit, and he is credited with finding a new process to inlay colors in marble. Many engravings were made at his own expense, such as those of the "Histoire de Saint Joseph", after Rembrandt (Amsterdam, 1755). In his moments of leisure Caylus took pleasure in composing novels, humorous pieces, and fairy tales, which were published together under the title of "Œuvres badines" (Paris, 1787). His "Oriental Tales" were translated into English (London, 1817).

LE BEAU, *Eloge de Caylus*, in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres* (April, 1766); SERIEYS, *Souvenirs du Comte de Caylus* (Paris, 1805); COCHIN, *Mémoires inédits sur le Comte de Caylus* (Paris, 1800); NISARD, *Correspondance inédite du Comte de Caylus avec le P. Paciaudi, théatin*, 1755–65 (2 vols., Paris, 1877).

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Cazeau, CHARLES-FÉLIX, a French-Canadian priest, b. at Quebec, 24 December, 1807, of Jean-Baptiste Cazeau and Geneviève Chabot; d. 26 February, 1881. He studied at Nicolet Seminary and in 1825 joined the clergy, acting as under-secretary to Bishop Plessis of Quebec. He shared more or less directly in the diocesan administration during fifty-six years, serving successively under Bishops Plessis, Panet, Signay, Turgeon, Baillargeon, and Taschereau. With his arduous duties as secretary, vicar-general, and, at four different periods, administrator of an immense diocese, he combined the direction of the men's sodality and, later, the chaplaincy of the Good Shepherd Institute, from 1856 until his death. His generosity and charity were boundless. His chief title to veneration and gratitude is his devotedness to the "exiles of Erin", whom, in 1847, famine and pestilence forced to seek a home on the shores of the St. Lawrence. Not content with risking his life in the quarantine station with so many heroic priests, nine of whom fell victims to duty, the Abbé Cazeau, moved with compassion at the sight of the many orphans, took for his share 300, placed them in French-Canadian families, and helped to provide for their maintenance and education out of his slender means. Few of these failed to respond to his zeal; many graced the Church and society by their brilliant qualities and virtuous lives. He kept a register of his 300 orphans, in which were inscribed the chief events of their careers, and he was always ready by word, by letter, or by a gift, to reform the wayward, comfort and relieve the stricken and the afflicted. The Abbé Cazeau was appointed a Domestic Prelate by Pius IX in 1875.

MAGUIRE, *The Irish in America* (New York, 1868); TAYLOR, *Portraits of British Americans* (Montreal, 1865).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Ceadda, SAINT, commonly known as St. Chad, Abbot of Lastingham, Bishop successively of York and Lichfield, England, date of birth uncertain; d. 672. He is often confounded with his brother, St. Cedd, also Abbot of Lastingham, and Bishop of the East Saxons. He had two other brothers, Cynibill and Caelin, who also became priests. Probably Northumbrian by birth, he was educated at Lindisfarne under St. Aidan, but afterwards went to Ireland, where he studied with St. Ecgberht in the monastery of Rathmelsige (Melfont). Thence he returned to help his brother St. Cedd to establish the monastery of Læstingæu, now Lastingham in Yorkshire. On his brother's death in 664, he succeeded him as abbot. Shortly afterwards St. Wilfrid, who had been chosen to succeed Tudi, Bishop of Lindisfarne, went to Gaul for consecration, and remained so long absent that King Oswiu determined to wait no longer, and procured the election of Chad as Bishop of York, to which place the Bishopric of Lindisfarne had been transferred. As Canterbury was vacant, he was consecrated by Wini of Worcester, assisted by two British bishops. As bishop he visited his diocese on foot, and laboured in an apostolic spirit until the arrival of St. Theodore, the newly elected Archbishop of Canterbury, who was making a general visitation. St. Theodore decided that St. Chad must give up the diocese to St. Wilfrid, who had now returned. When he further intimated that St. Chad's episcopal consecration had not been rightly performed, the Saint replied, "If you decide that I have not rightly received the episcopal character, I willingly lay down the office; for I have never thought myself worthy of it; but under obedience, I, though unworthy, consented to undertake it". St. Theodore, however, desired him not to relinquish the episcopate, and himself supplied what was lacking ("ipse ordinationem ejus denuo catholica ratione consummavit" (Bede, Hist. eccl., IV, 2). Ceadda then returned to Lastingham, where he remained till St. Theodore called him in 669 to become Bishop of the Mercians. He built a church and monastery at Lichfield, where he dwelt with seven or eight monks, devoting to prayer and study the time he could spare from his work as bishop. He received warning of his death in a vision. His shrine, which was honoured by miracles, was removed in the twelfth century to the cathedral at Lichfield, dedicated to Our Lady and the Saint himself. At the Reformation his relics were rescued from profanation by Catholics, and they now lie in the Catholic cathedral at Birmingham, which is dedicated to him. His festival is kept on the 2nd of March. All accounts of his life are based on that given by Venerable Bede, who had been instructed in Holy Scripture by Trumberct, one of St. Chad's monks and disciples.

VEN. BEDE, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, III, 28; IV, 2 and 3, practically the only source of information, and followed by subsequent writers, such as WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY, *Gesta Pontificum* (Rolls Series, London, 1870), III, and CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (1516, latest edition Oxford, 1901). BEDE'S account is printed with *Introduction* and *Notes* by the BOLLANDISTS in *Acta Sanctorum*, 2 March, VII, 143, sqq. See also COLGAN, *Acta SS. Scotiæ seu Hiberniæ* (1645), I, 444–7. Accounts in English, all based on BEDE, are: CHALLONER, *Britannia Sancta* (London, 1745), I, 147; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 2 March (London, 1756); HOLE, in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* s. v.; STEPHENS, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1887), IX, s. v. There are a few allusions in HAEDDE'S contemporary *Life of St. Wilfrid*. The account given by TRITHEMIUS, *De viris illustribus ordinis S. Benedicti*, VII, is untrustworthy and erroneous. For the history of the relics, see *History of St. Chad's*

Cathedral, Birmingham, compiled by the cathedral clergy (Birmingham, 1904), vii; *Catholic Magazine* (London, 1833), III, 298.

EDWIN BURTON.

Ceara, DIOCESE OF. See FORTALEZZA.

Cebú (DIŒCESIS NOMINIS JESU), DIOCESE OF (CÆBUANENSIS), in the Philippine Islands. Cebú, the diocesan city, spelled also Sebú and Zebú, in the province of the same name, is so called from the island on which it is situated, in turn so called from the Indian ox (*bos indicus*), on account of a fancied resemblance between that animal and the outline of the island. Magellan discovered Cebú in April, 1521, but he lost his life in a foolhardy battle on the island of Mactan, opposite Cebú, and no trace of his expedition was left except the celebrated statuette of the Holy Child, called the *Santo Niño*, still held in the greatest veneration.

The Diocese of Cebú was separated from the Diocese of Manila, which originally included the whole Philippine archipelago, 14 August, 1595. The new territory comprised the present Dioceses of Cebú and Jaro, and the Vicariate Apostolic of the Marian Islands. The diocese now consists of the islands of Cebú, Leyte, Samar, Bohol, Siquijor, Camaguin, and the smaller islands adjacent. Since its establishment in 1595, twenty-two bishops have governed the Church of Cebú. The northern half of the island of Mindanao remains under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cebú, until the appointment of a bishop at Zamboanga, as provided for (1903) by Leo XIII, in the Bull "Quæ Mari Sinico". Cebú was the birthplace of the Christian religion in the Philippine Islands. It was here that it made its first stand against the gradually advancing forces of Mohammedanism. Father Urdaneta, an Augustinian friar, accompanied by six others of the same order, went to Cebú in April, 1565, and immediately began his work of evangelization. The first convert was a niece of Tupas, a native chief of great influence. Two other friars, Fathers Juan de Vivero and Juan de Villanueva, arrived with Salcedo in 1567. Shortly afterwards the Jesuits went to Bohol, in 1595, and also to Leyte, Samar, and Mindanao. They built fortified churches for defence against the Moros everywhere, and forts at Cebú, Iloilo, Misamis, Zamboanga, and other places. They also began, in 1595, the College of San Ildefonso, now called San Carlos College, in Cebú. The work of the missionaries was facilitated by the disposition of the brave but naturally peaceful Visayan people, who occupied most of the territory. The missionaries were opposed by the ferocious tribes of the Mohammedans, who for centuries had been gradually extending their sway eastwards, and by 1521 were strongly established in the western part of the island of Mindanao, in the Sulu archipelago. The efforts of the missionaries were threefold in character: defensive against the bloodthirsty Moros, who roamed over these seas in flotillas of ships; active in the evangelization of the tribes; and also didactic in the arts of peace, agriculture, trades, and the rudiments of learning. The natives, already well forward in trades, soon became expert carpenters, masons, workers in metals, weavers—in a word, well equipped to make the best use of the natural resources at hand. As the missionaries advanced, the domination of the Moros was gradually restricted, though even as late as 1856 occasional fleets of Moro boats appeared, striking terror into the peaceful Visayans. With the beginning of steam navigation, the Spanish ships of war at once assumed offensive tactics against the Moros, whose vessels were easily captured and destroyed.

After the insurrection of 1898, and the Spanish-American War that followed, the people suffered greatly, not only from the evils of war, but also from the loss of their cattle and horses by epidemics. Many of their churches were destroyed, not only by the *insurrectos*, but also by United States troops. The chief evil, however, was the lack of priests. The parishes average about ten thousand souls. In the mountainous regions about half a million of souls were without spiritual succour. The Franciscans, by whom many churches were formerly supplied, began to return, and the Jesuits worked with great success in Mindanao. Redemptorist Fathers from Ireland are exclusively occupied in giving missions to the people. The Lazarists have two colleges for boys, one in Cebú with 600, another in Samar with 350 pupils. The same Fathers have also charge of the ecclesiastical seminary, in which there are 85 students. A college for girls is conducted in Cebú by the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, with 500 pupils. An orphan asylum and trade school under the same Sisters care for 85 girls and a few small boys. A leper hospital was maintained for fifty years until 1906. The diocese contains 135 secular priests and 123 religious, of the following communities: Augustinians, Recollects, Franciscans, Benedictines, Jesuits, Lazarists, and Redemptorists. There are fifty-five schools in the diocese, with an attendance of about 12,000 pupils. The people are practically all Catholics, and are very devout and loyal to the Church. Estimated population, 2,145,679. The Right Rev. Thomas Augustine Hendrick, the first American bishop, was consecrated at Rome, 23 Aug., 1903, and took possession 6 March, 1904.

REDONDO, *Historia de la Diocese de Cebú*, in *Guia Official de Filipinas* (1907); BOURNE, *The Philippine Islands; The Philippine Commission Reports; The Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1908).

THOMAS A. HENDRICK.

Cecilia, SAINT, virgin and martyr, patroness of church music, d. at Rome. This saint, so often glorified in the fine arts and in poetry, is one of the most venerated martyrs of Christian antiquity. The oldest historical account of St. Cecilia is found in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum"; from this it is evident that her feast was celebrated in the Roman Church in the fourth century. Her name occurs under different dates in the above-mentioned martyrology; its mention under 11 August, the feast of the martyr Tiburtius, is evidently a later and erroneous addition, due to the fact that this Tiburtius, who was buried on the Via Labicana, was wrongly identified with Tiburtius, the brother-in-law of St. Cecilia, mentioned in the Acts of her martyrdom. Perhaps also there was another Roman martyr of the name of Cecilia buried on the Via Labicana. Under the date of 16 September Cecilia is mentioned alone, with the topographical note: "Appiâ viâ in eâdem urbe Româ natale et passio sanctæ Ceciliæ virginis" (the text is to be thus corrected). This is evidently the day of the burial of the holy martyr in the Catacomb of Callistus. The feast of the saint mentioned under 22 November, on which day it is still celebrated, was kept in the church in the Trastevere quarter at Rome, dedicated to her. Its origin, therefore, is to be traced

DETAIL FROM RAPHAEL'S ST. CECILIA (Academy, Bologna)

most probably to this church. The early medieval guides (*Itineraria*) to the burial-places of Roman martyrs point out her grave on the Via Appia, next to the crypt of the Roman bishops of the third century (De Rossi, Roma sotterranea, I, 180–181). De Rossi located the burial-place of Cecilia in the Catacomb of Callistus in a crypt immediately adjoining the crypt or chapel of the popes; an empty niche in one of the walls contained, probably, at one time the sarcophagus with the bones of the saint. Among the frescoes of a later time with which the walls of the sepulchre are adorned, the figure of a richly-dressed woman appears twice and Pope Urban, who was brought personally into close relation with the saint by the Acts of her martyrdom, is depicted once. The ancient titular church of Rome, mentioned above was built as early as the fourth century and is still preserved in the Trastevere. This church was certainly dedicated in the fifth century to the saint buried on the Via Appia; it is mentioned in the signatures of the Roman Council of 499 as "titulus sanctæ Cæciliæ" (Mansi, Coll. Conc. VIII, 236). Like some other ancient Christian churches of Rome, which are the gifts of the saints whose names they bear, it may be inferred that the Roman Church owes this temple to the generosity of the holy martyr herself; in support of this view it is to be noted that the property, under which the oldest part of the true Catacomb of Callistus is constructed, belonged most likely, according to De Rossi's researches, to the family of St. Cecilia (Gens Cæcilia), and by donation passed into the possession of the Roman Church. Although her name is not mentioned in the earliest (fourth century) list of feasts (Depositio martyrum), the fact that in the "Sacramentarium Leonianum", a collection of masses completed about the end of the fifth century, are found no less than five different masses in honour of St. Cecilia testifies to the great veneration in which the saint was at that time held in the Roman Church ["Sacram. Leon.", ed. Muratori, in "Opera" (Arezzo, 1771), XIII, I, 737, sqq.].

About the middle of the fifth century originated Acts of the martyrdom of St. Cecilia which have been transmitted in numerous manuscripts; these acts were also translated into Greek. They were utilized in the prefaces of the above-mentioned masses of the "Sacramentarium Leonianum". They inform us, that Cecilia, a virgin of a senatorial family and a Christian from her infancy, was given in marriage by her parents to a noble pagan youth Valerianus. When, after the celebration of the marriage, the couple had retired to the wedding-chamber, Cecilia told Valerianus that she was betrothed to an angel who jealously guarded her body; therefore Valerianus must take care not to violate her virginity. Valerianus wished to see the angel, whereupon Cecilia sent him to the third milestone on the Via Appia where he should meet Bishop (Pope) Urbanus. Valerianus obeyed, was baptized by the pope, and returned a Christian to Cecilia. An angel then appeared to the two and crowned them with roses and lilies. When Tiburtius, the brother of Valerianus, came to them, he too was won over to Christianity. As zealous children of the Faith both brothers distributed rich alms and buried the bodies of the confessors who had died for Christ. The prefect, Turcius Almachius, condemned them to death; an officer of the prefect, Maximus, appointed to execute this sentence, was himself converted and suffered martyrdom with the two brothers. Their remains were buried in one tomb by Cecilia. And now Cecilia herself was sought by the officers of the prefect. Before she was taken prisoner, she arranged that her house should be preserved as a place of worship for the Roman Church. After a glorious profession of faith, she was condemned to be suffocated in the bath of her own house. But as she remained unhurt in the overheated room, the prefect had her decapitated in that place. The executioner let his sword fall three times without separating the head from the trunk, and fled, leaving the virgin bathed in her own blood. She lived three days, made dispositions in favour of the poor, and provided that after her death her house should be dedicated as a church. Urbanus buried her among the bishops and the confessors, i. e. in the Catacomb of Callistus.

In this shape the whole story has no historical value; it is a pious romance, like so many others compiled in the fifth and sixth century. The existence of the aforesaid martyrs, however, is an historical fact. The relation between St. Cecilia and Valerianus, Tiburtius, and Maximus, mentioned in the Acts, has perhaps some historical foundation. These three saints were buried in the Catacomb of Prætextatus on the Via Appia, where their tombs are mentioned in the ancient pilgrim *Itineraria*. In the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" their feast is set down under 14 April with the note: "Romæ viâ Appiâ in cimiterio Prætextati"; and the octave under 21 April, with the comment: "Rome in cimiterio Calesti viâ Appiâ". In the opinion of Duchesne the octave was celebrated in the Catacomb of Callistus, because St. Cecilia was buried there. If, therefore, this second notice in the martyrology is older than the aforesaid Acts and the latter did not give rise to this second feast, it follows that before the Acts were written this group of saints in Rome was brought into relation with St. Cecilia. The time when Cecilia suffered martyrdom is not known. From the mention of Urbanus nothing can be concluded as to the time of composition of the Acts; the author without any authority, simply introduced the confessor of this name (buried in the Catacomb of Prætextatus) on account of the nearness of his tomb to those of the other martyrs and identified him with the pope of the same name. The author of the "Liber Pontificalis" used the Acts for his notice of Urbanus. The Acts offer no other indication of the time of the martyrdom. Venantius Fortunatus (Miscellanea, 1, 20; 8, 6) and Ado (Martyrology, 22 November) place the death of the saint in the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (about 177), and De Rossi tried to prove this view as historically the surest one. In other Western sources of the early Middle Ages and in the Greek "Synaxaria" this martyrdom is placed in the persecution of Diocletian. P. A. Kirsch tried to locate it in the time of Alexander Severus (229-230); Aubé, in the persecution of Decius (249-250); Kellner, in that of Julian the Apostate (362). None of these opinions is sufficiently established, as neither the Acts nor the other sources offer the requisite chronological evidence. The only sure time-indication is the position of the tomb in the Catacomb of Callistus, in the immediate proximity of the very ancient crypt of the popes, in which Urbanus probably, and surely Pontianus and Anterus were buried. The earliest part of this catacomb dates at all events from the end of the second century; from that time, therefore, to the middle of the third century is the period left open for the martyrdom of St. Cecilia.

Her church in the Trastevere quarter of Rome was rebuilt by Paschal I (817-824), on which occasion the pope wished to transfer thither her relics; at first, however, he could not find them and believed that they had been stolen by the Lombards. In a vision he saw St. Cecilia, who exhorted him to continue his search, as he had already been very near to her, i. e. near her grave. He therefore renewed his quest; and soon the body of the martyr, draped in costly stuffs of gold brocade and with the cloths soaked in her blood at her feet, was actually found in the Catacomb of Prætextatus. They may have been transported thither from the Catacomb of Callistus to save them from earlier depredations of the Lombards in the

vicinity of Rome. The relics of St. Cecilia with those of Valerianus, Tiburtius, and Maximus, also those of Popes Urbanus and Lucius, were taken up by Pope Paschal, and reburied under the high altar of St. Cecelia in Trastevere. The monks of a convent founded in the neighbourhood by the same pope were charged with the duty of singing the daily Office in this basilica. From this time the veneration of the holy martyr continued to spread, and numerous churches were dedicated to her. During the restoration of the church in the year 1599 Cardinal Sfondrato had the high altar examined and found under it the sarcophagi, with the relics of the saints, that Pope Paschal had transported thither. Recent excavations beneath the church, executed at the instigation and expense of Cardinal Rampolla, disclosed remains of Roman buildings, which have remained accessible. A richly adorned underground chapel was built beneath the middle aisle, and in it a latticed window, opening over the altar, allows a view of the receptacles in which the bones of the saints repose. In a side chapel of the church there have long been shown the remains of the bath in which, according to the Acts, Cecilia was put to death.

The oldest representations of St. Cecilia show her in the attitude usual for martyrs in the Christian art of the earlier centuries, either with the crown of martyrdom in her hand (e. g. at S. Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna, in a sixth-century mosaic) or in the attitude of prayer, as an *Orans* (e. g. the two sixth and seventh-century pictures in her crypt). In the apse of her church in Trastevere is still preserved the mosaic made under Pope Paschal, wherein she is represented in rich garments as patroness of the pope. Medieval pictures of the saint are very frequent; since the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries she is given the organ as an attribute, or is represented as playing on the organ, evidently to express what was often attributed to her in panegyrics and poems based on the Acts, viz., that while the musicians played at her nuptials she sang in her heart to God only ("cantantibus organis illa in corde suo soli domino decantabat"); possibly the *cantantibus organis* was erroneously interpreted of Cecilia herself as the organist. In this way the saint was brought into closer relation with music. When the Academy of Music was founded at Rome (1584) she was made patroness of the institute, whereupon her veneration as patroness of church music in general became still more universal; to-day Cecilian societies (musical associations) exist everywhere. The organ is now her ordinary attribute; with it Cecilia was represented by Raphael in a famous picture preserved at Bologna. In another magnificent masterpiece, the marble statue beneath the high altar of the abovementioned church of St. Cecilia at Rome, Carlo Maderna represented her lying prostrate, just as she had received the death-blow from the executioner's hand. Her feast is celebrated in the Latin and the Greek Church on 22 November. In the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" are commemorated other martyrs of this name, but of none of them is there any exact historical information. One suffered martyrdom in Carthage with Dativus in 304.

Mombritius, *Sanctuarium*, I, 186 sqq.; Bosio, *Atti di S. Cecilia* (Rome, 1600); Surius, *De vitis Sanctorum* (Venice, 1581), VI, 161 sqq.; Laderchi, *S. Cæciliæ virg. et mart. acta ac transiberina basilica* (Rome, 1722); Bollandists ed., *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina* (Brussels, 1898–99), I, 224; Simeon Metaphrastes, in *P. G.*, CXVI; Baronius, *Annales*, ad an. 821, § xv (the spurious Document of Pope Paschal I); Bollandists ed., *Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum* (Brussels, 1902), 243; *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, I, xciii sq., 143, and II, 55–57, 65; Tillemont, *Hist. ecclés.*, III, 259 sqq.; De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea*, II, xxxii sq., 113 sq.; Gueranger, *Histoire de Ste Cécile* (Paris, 1849; 2nd ed., 1852); Idem, *Ste Cécile et la société romaine* (Paris, 1878); Morse, Birks, and Hole, in *Dict. of Christian Biog.*, s. v.; Aubé, *Les chrétiens dans l'empire romain* (2nd ed., Paris, 1881), 352 sqq.; Allard, *Histoire des persécutions*, I, 427 sqq.; Erbes, *Die heilige Cäcilia im Zusammenhang mit der Papstcrypta sowie der ältesten Kirche Roms*, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, IX, 1888, 1 sqq.; P. A. Kirsch, *Die heilige Cäcilia, Jungfrau und Martyrin* (Ratisbon, 1901); Idem, *Das Todesjahr der heiligen Cäcilia*, in Στρωμάτιον Ἀρχαιολογικόν (Rome, 1900), 42–77; Kellner, *Das wahre Zeitalter der heil. Cäcilia*, in *Theologische Quartalschrift* (Tübingen, 1902), 237 sqq.; (1903), 321 sqq.; (1905), 258 sqq.; Dufourcq, *Les Gesta martyrum romains* (Paris, 1900), 116 sqq., 293 sqq.; Marucchi, *Basiliques et églises de Rome* (Rome, 1902), 438 sqq.; Bianchi-Cagliesi, *S. Cecilia e sua basilica* (Rome, 1902); Detzel, *Christl. Ikonographie* (Freiburg im Br., 1896), 220 sqq.; Rohault de Fleury, *Les saints de la Messe*, I, pl. 16–17; P. Sixtus, *Elucubrationes historico-liturgicæ de recenti quâdem sententiâ circa ætatem S. Cæciliæ martyris*, in *Ephemerides liturgicæ* (Rome, Sept.–Oct., 1907). See also the accounts in Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, 22 November.

J. P. Kirsch.

Cedar [אֶרֶז (*éréz*), *κέδρος*, *cedrus*], a coniferous tree frequently mentioned in the Bible. The Hebrew *éréz*, like the corresponding Arabic *arz*, the Greek *κέδρος*, the Latin *cedrus*, or the English *cedar*, may be applied to several different species of conifers, but usually it designates the celebrated cedar of Libanus (*Cedrus Libani*). In Lev., xiv, 4, 6, 49, 52, and Num., xix, 6, the cedar of Libanus seems out of the question, as the tree must be one whose wood the Israelites could readily obtain during their sojourn in

Cedars of Lebanon

the desert, which is plainly not the case with the cedar of Libanus. *Juniperus Phœnicea*, a species of juniper which is found in the Arabah, and probably also in the adjoining Sinaitic Peninsula, and whose wood, like that of the cedar, possesses aromatic properties, is most likely the tree meant in these texts. In Num., xxiv, 6, too, the cedar of Libanus, which thrives best on high, dry ground, can hardly be intended, unless, as has been suggested, the terms of comparison in the last two members have been accidentally transposed. In all the other passages the cedar of Libanus is referred to, though in a few cases a doubt might be raised as to whether it is meant exclusively. The cedar is described as a tree "of a high stature" (Ezech., xxxi, 3; Is., ii, 13; xxxvii, 24; IV K., xix, 23), whose "height was exalted above all the trees of the country" (Ezech., xxxi, 5; cf. Judges, ix, 15; III K., iv, 33; IV K., xiv, 9; Amos, ii, 9). It is "the cedar of God" (Ps. lxxix, 11), the tree of the Lord which He has planted [Ps. civ, 16 (Hebr.)]. It is the type of strength [Ps. xxviii, 5; Job, xl, 12 (Hebr. 17)], the symbol of lofty pride (Ps. xxxvi, 35; Is., ii, 13), the emblem of greatness and power (Jer., xxii, 7; Zach., xi, 2), and of surpassing excellence (Ecclus., xxiv, 17). It is the "glory of Libanus" (Is., lx, 13), "most beautiful for his greatness and for the spreading of his branches" (Ezech., xxxi, 3, 6, 7).

All this is verified in the cedar of Libanus, which is the stateliest and most majestic tree of Palestine. It often reaches a height of 100 feet and more, and the girth of the trunk in old trees may exceed 40 feet. The branches, with their numerous ramifications, spread out horizontally and are of such size that not infrequently the spread of the tree exceeds its height. The leaves are dark green and grow in tufts like those

of the larch, but unlike these they persist through the winter. The wood is reddish-white, fragrant, and close-grained, at least in older trees. Moreover, by reason of the resinous oil with which it is impregnated, it is proof against dry-rot and worms, and in consequence is extremely durable. Pieces found by Layard in the ruins of the palace of Assur-nasirpal were still in a good state of preservation after 2700 years. These qualities caused it to be much sought for building purposes. It was extensively used in the palaces built by David and Solomon, and especially in the first Temple (II K., v, 11; vii, 2; III K., v, 6 sq.; vi, 9 sq.; vii, 2 sq.). It was also used in the second Temple (I Esd., iii, 7). Because of its close grain and lasting qualities, statues and images were fashioned out of it (Is., xliv, 14, 15; cf. Pliny, "Hist. Nat.", XIII, ii). Young trees were made into masts (Ezech., xxvii, 5). The statement that the cedar is unsuitable for masting rests on insufficient observation; in dense growths trees suitable for masts are not uncommon. There is no reason, then, why, in the last text, "cedars from Libanus" should be referred to the Aleppo pine, which, moreover, is not special to the Libanus and could have been obtained by the Tyrians nearer home. The large forests of cedar-trees which once adorned Libanus, and from which the Hebrews drew the wood, have almost entirely disappeared. They were laid under contribution by Phœnician and Hebrew, Egyptian and Assyrian, Greek and Roman, till only a few (eleven) small groups of trees remain. The most important and best-known is situated below the summit of Dahr el-Qodîb, the highest peak of the chain, four miles from Besherre. Here are found about 400 trees, among which are some ten venerable patriarchs probably about 2000 years old, more remarkable, however, for their girth of trunk than for their height. Extensive forests exist farther north in Mt. Amanus and Mt. Taurus. There are two other varieties of cedar, considered by some botanists as distinct species; namely, *Cedrus deodara*, or deodar-tree, a native of the Himalayas, and *Cedrus Atlantica*, growing in the Atlas mountains.

The cedar is often used in Scripture for figures and comparisons. Besides the uses already indicated the following may be mentioned. Because of its luxuriant growth and length of life it is an emblem of prosperity (Ps. xci, 13), and because of its stateliness it is a figure of beauty and majesty (Cant., v, 15; Ecclus., l, 13). It is also used as the symbol of the Messias and His kingdom (Ezech., xvii, 22 sq.).

POST, *Flora of Syria* (Beirut, 1896), 751; IDEM in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bib.*, I, 364; TRISTRAM, *Nat. Hist. of the Bibl.* (London, 1889), 343 sq.; HOOKER in *Nat. Hist. Rev.* (1862), 11–18; ANDERLIND, in *Zeitschr. d. D. Pal. Ver.* (1884), 89 sq.; BOISSIER, *Flora Orient.* (Basle and Geneva, 1867–88), V, 699; MISLIN, *Les lieux saints* (Paris, 1858), I, 337; LEVESQUE in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, II, 374; FONCK in *Lexicon Bibl.*, I, 799.

F. BECHTEL.

Cedar (Heb. קדר, *Qēdār;* Gr. Κηδάρ), the name of the second son of Ismael (Gen., xxv, 13; I Par., i, 29); also of an Arabian tribe descended from him, and of the territory occupied by it. This tribe is repeatedly mentioned in the Bible and in Assyrian inscriptions; in these latter the people is called Qidrai and the country Qidri. The Cedarenes are represented as a nomadic people differing but little from the modern desert-dwelling Arabs. They lived in tents, which are called black no doubt because, like those of the bedouins, they were made of goat's and camel's hair (Jer., xlix, 29; Cant., i, 4—Heb. 5); they were gathered in *haçērîm* or encampments protected merely by a rough enclosure like the douars of the tribes of North Africa (Is., xlii, 11, Heb.); they possessed many camels and much other cattle, in which they carried on a trade with Tyre (Jer., xlix, 29; Ezech., xxvii, 21); they were a restless, warlike people and skilful archers (Ps. cxix, 5 sq.; Is., xxi, 17). These frequent references, as well as the use of Cedar for Arabia and the Arabians in general [Cant., i, 4 (5); Ps. cxix, 5], show that before they were crushed by the Assyrian power the Cedarenes were a people of considerable importance. In the Assyrian inscriptions they are associated with certain kings of the Arabs (*Aribi*). From the fact that Hazael, one of them, is once called King of Cedar in cylinder B of Assurbanipal, the conclusion has been drawn that these kings were Cedarenes, and that towards the middle of the seventh century B. C. Cedar held the hegemony among the tribes of the Syro-Arabian desert—the Arabs of the Bible and of the inscriptions. However, as a certain Ammuladi is called King of Cedar, while his contemporary Ya'uta' or Uaite' is styled King of the Arabs, it is probable that the Cedarenes were merely allies of these kings. The prophecy of Isaias, "within a year . . . all the glory of Cedar shall be taken away" (xxi, 16), probably refers to an expedition of Sennacherib against Hazael, when the latter's gods were carried by the conqueror to Ninive. Still, Cedar may possibly be used as synonymous with Arabs, in which case the prophecy may refer to the severe punishment inflicted by Sargon on some Arabian tribes.

However this may be, the Cedarenes met with disastrous reverses at the hands of Assurbanipal. When Samas-sum-ukin rebelled against his brother, Ya'uta' or Uaite', the son of Hazael, sided with him and sent a force to his aid under the Cedarene generals Abiyate' and Aimu, while he and Ammuladi, King of Cedar, invaded and plundered Syria. After the taking of Babylon and the death of Samas-sum-ukin, Assurbanipal turned his attention to the Arabs. Uaite' and Ammuladi were defeated in a series of engagements. Uaite' fled to the Nabatæans for refuge, but was given up to the Assyrians; Ammuladi was captured in Moab. Both were carried to Ninive and chained with dogs near the principal gate. In the place of Uaite' Assurbanipal appointed Abiyate', who had led the Arab contingent sent to help Samas-sum-ukin, but who, after being defeated, had surrendered and obtained pardon. Abiyate', however, in conjunction with another Uaite', for whom he seems to have resigned, soon organized a new revolt, in which the Nabatæans now also joined. Assurbanipal, hastening to the scene of rebellion by the most direct but most difficult road across the Syrian desert, crushed and almost annihilated the rebel tribes. He carried with him to Ninive a multitude of prisoners, among them Abiyate', Aimu, and Uaite', and an immense number of camels, oxen, and other cattle. The Cedarenes met with further reverses under Nabuchodonosor (Jer., xlix, 28). They never fully recovered from these heavy blows and henceforth history is silent concerning them, though their name is mentioned till the fifth century A. D. While there is no doubt that the Cedarenes dwelt in the Syro-Arabian desert, known to the ancients as *Arabia Deserta*, there is some diversity of opinion about their exact location. As both in the Bible and in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal they are mentioned in connexion with the Nabatæans (Heb. נבית, *Nebāiôth;* Assyr. *Nabaite*), they most probably lived in close proximity to these. Pliny, in fact, states (Hist. Nat., v, 12) that the Cedrei, who doubtless are the Cedarenes, were neighbours of the Nabatæans. Now before the Persian period the Nabatæans were settled south-east of Idumæa, on the northern limits of the Hidjaz, with Egra as their capital. We may therefore conclude that the Cedarenes were located in the south-western part of Arabia Deserta, or of the modern Hamad, extending perhaps into Arabia proper. They would thus have been sufficiently remote for a residence among them to convey the idea of distant exile (Ps. cxix. 5), and yet near enough to be well known to the Hebrews. Theodoret mentions (Patr. Lat., LXXX, 1878) that in his time (fifth century A.D.) they dwelt

near Babylon. The religion of the Cedarenes, like that of all pre-Islamitic Arabs, was Sabianism, or worship of the heavenly bodies. Their chief divinity was Atarsamaim, i. e. "Atar [Athtar-Astarte] of the heavens". In Judith, i, 8, instead of "Cedar" we must probably read "Galaad" with the Septuagint.

SMITH, *Hist. of Assurbanipal* (London, 1871), 256 sq., 283 sq.; *Cuneif. Inscript. of West. Asia*, III, pl. 24–28; *Records of the Past* (Ser. I), I, 93 sq., III, 115; VIGOUROUX, *La Bible et les découv. mod.* (Paris, 1889), IV, 293 sq.; DELITZSCH, *Wo lag das Paradies*, 296 sq.; GLASER, *Skizze der Gesch. Arabiens* (Berlin, 1901), II, 267 sq.; MARGOLIOUTH in HAST., *Dict. Bib.*, II, 832; HALÉVY in *Dict. de la Bible*, I, 862, 865; LEGENDRE, *ibid.*, II, 357.

F. BECHTEL.

Cedd (or CEDDA), SAINT, Bishop of the East Saxons, the brother of St. Ceadda; d. 26 Oct., 664. There were two other brothers also priests, Cynibill and Caelin, all born of an Angle family settled in Northumbria. With his younger brother Ceadda, he was brought up at Lindisfarne under St. Aidan. In 653 he was one of four priests sent by Oswiu, King of Northumbria, to evangelize the Middle Angles at the request of their ealdorman, Peada. Shortly after, however, he was recalled and sent on the same missionary errand to Essex to help Sigeberht, King of the East Saxons, to convert his people to Christ. Here he was consecrated bishop and was very active in founding churches, and established monasteries at Tilbury and Ithancester. Occasionally he revisited his native Northumbria, and there, at the request of Æthelwald, founded the monastery of Læstingæu, now Lastingham, in Yorkshire. Of this house he became the first abbot, notwithstanding his episcopal responsibilities. At the Synod of Whitby, like St. Cuthbert, he, though Celtic in his upbringing, adopted the Roman Easter. Immediately after the synod he paid a visit to Læstingæu, where he fell a victim to the prevalent plague. Florence of Worcester and William of Malmesbury in later times counted him as the second Bishop of London, but St. Bede, almost a contemporary, never gives him that title. His festival was kept on 7 January.

VEN. BEDE, *Hist. Eccl. Gentis Ang.*, III, 21–23, 25; IV, 3, practically the only source and followed by WILLIAM of MALMESBURY, *Gesta Pont.*, III (Rolls Series, 1870); CAPGRAVE, *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (1516, Oxford, 1901), and BOLLANDISTS, *Acta SS.*, I, Jan. 7; BOLLANDISTS, *Bibl. Hag. Lat.* (1899), 258; CHALLONER, *Britannia Sancta* (London, 1745), I, 10, and *Memorial of Ancient British Piety* (London, 1761); BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 7 Jan.; HOLE in *Dict. of Christian Biog.* (London, 1877), I, 430; TOUT, in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1887), IX, 413.

EDWIN BURTON.

Cedes (or CADES; Heb., קדשׁ, *Qédésh*, sanctuary; Gr., Κάδης, Κάδες or Κέδες), two cities of Palestine.

(1) A Levitical city and place of refuge in Nephtali (Jos., xix, 37; xx, 7; xxi, 32; 1 Par., vi, 76), hence called "Cedes in Nephtali" (Judges, iv, 6), or "Cedes in Galilee" (Jos., xx, 7, etc.), to distinguish it from Cedes in Issachar and Cades (Heb. *Qédésh*) in the Negeb. The form Cades occurs in the Vulg. only in Jos., xii, 22, and I Mach., xi, 63, 73. The name would indicate that it was a sacred city before the Hebrew occupation. Cedes was the home of Barac, and here he and Debbora gathered their army, consisting mainly of men of Nephtali, Zabulon and Issachar, before giving battle to Sisara, near Mt. Thabor (Judges, iv, 6, 10 sq.; v, 15). In the reign of Phacee, King of Israel, it was taken by Theglathphalasar and its inhabitants were carried captives to Assyria (IV K., xv, 29). During the Machabean wars Jonathan defeated the generals of Demetrius II, Nicanor, in its neighbourhood (I Mach., xi, 63–74). At the time of the great Jewish rebellion it was in the hands of the Tyrians, and Titus camped under its walls before taking Gischala (Joseph., Bell. Jud., II, xviii, 1; IV, ii, 3). In Josephus it appears variously as Κεδέση, Κέδασα, Κάδασα, and Κυδασά. Eusebius calls it Κυδισσός, St. Jerome, Cidissus (in de Lagarde, "Onomastica," 271, 53; 110, 8). Cedes was a city of Upper Galilee, close to and north of Asor (Jos., xix, 37; IV K., xv, 29; I Par., vi, 76; I Mach., xi, 63, 67–73; Joseph., Ant., V, i, 18, 24; IX, xi, 1; XIII, v, 6, 7). As the latter lay in the neighbourhood of Lake Ḥûleh, the Biblical "Waters of Merom", or Lake of Semechonitis of Josephus (Jos., xi, 1–10; Joseph., Ant., V, v, 1), Cedes cannot have been far distant from its shores. There can be no doubt, then, that it is to be identified with the village of Qades or Qedes, situated on a hill north-west of the lake. Here are found the foundations of an ancient wall, ruins of a temple and of a large mausoleum, a number of fine specimens of sarcophagi, some of which are double, besides pieces of broken columns, bases and capitals, scattered over the hill or imbedded in the walls of the houses. These remains show that in the Greek or Roman period, to which they are due, Cedes was an important city. Such it must always have been by reason of its strong position on one of the trade routes from Tyre to the regions across the Jordan, though after the time of the Judges it hardly figures in Hebrew history.

Exception has recently been taken by Conder, Hummelauer, Zanecchia, etc., to the common opinion which connects this Cedes with the events of Judges, iv. They would place the home of Barac at another Cedes, in the south of Nephtali, which they identify with Khirbet Qadîsh on the Lake of Genesareth, south of Tiberias. A city of Cedes existing at this point would throw light on some of the details of the narrative. It would help to explain how Barac managed to assemble a large force without interference on the part of Jabin, King of Asor, which is hard to understand if the rendezvous was at the Cedes of Upper Galilee. Its nearness to Mt. Thabor would also explain why the battle with Sisara came to be fought near that mountain. Lastly, the arrival of the flying Sisara at the tent of Jahel, apparently on the day of the battle itself, would be more readily understood. The only direct argument, however, for the existence of this second Cedes is the similarity of the name Qadîsh. The identification of Sennim (Heb. *Ça ánánnîm* or *Beçá ánánnîm*), where the tents of Haber the Cinite were pitched, with Sinn-en-Nabrah (Hummelauer) or with Khirbet Bessûm (Conder) is too uncertain to base any conclusions upon it.

(2) A Levitical city of Issachar assigned to the family of Gersom (I Par., vi, 72—Heb. 57). In the parallel list of Jos., xxi, 28 it is called Cesion. The Cades of Jos., xii, 22, commonly held to be Cedes in Galilee, is by some identified with this Cedes of Issachar.

ROBINSON, *Bibl. Research.* (London, 1856) III, 367; *Survey W. Pal., Mem.*, I, 204, 226 sq.; GUÉRIN, *Galilée* (Paris, 1874–75), II, 355 sq.; ZANECCHIA, *La Pal. d'auj.*, II, 715; BUHL, *Geog. des alt. Pal.*, 235 sq.; HUMMELAUER, *Comm. in Jos.*, 437, 442; LEGENDRE in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, II, 360.

F. BECHTEL.

Cedron, BROOK OF (Heb. נחל קדרון, *Náḥál Qídhrôn*, "Wâdi Qidron"; only once שׁדמות קדרון "fields of Qidron"; John, xviii, 1, ὁ χειμάρρος ὁ Κέδρων; in R. V., Kidron). The name designates in Holy Writ the ravine on the east of Jerusalem, between the Holy City and the Mount of Olives. The word *Cedron* is usually connected with the root קדר, Qâdár, "to be dark", and taken to refer to the colour of the stream or ravine; but its exact origin and precise meaning are really unknown. The Valley of Cedron begins with a slight depression near the Tombs of the Judges, a mile and a quarter north-west of Jerusalem. It runs first south towards the Holy City, and then turns nearly east, passing to the north of the Tombs of the Kings. Next, it bends to the right towards the south, deepening as it follows this general direction between Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives. Opposite St. Stephen's gate, it is fully 100 feet deep and about 400 feet broad; its bed is shaded

by venerable olive-trees and crossed by an old bridge. Below the bridge, the valley presents the first traces of a torrent bed. It narrows gradually and sinks more rapidly, leaving to the east the church of the Tomb of the Blessed Virgin, and next, Gethsemani. A thousand feet from the old bridge, the valley is merely a deep gulley across which another bridge is thrown, and on the banks of which are, to the right, Mohammedan tombs, and to the left, the sepulchres of Josaphat, Absalom, St. James, and the Jewish cemetery. About a thousand feet farther, there is in a cave, on the right bank, the Fountain of the Virgin, and higher up, on the left, the village of Siloe. Somewhat farther down, the Tyropœon valley falls from the right into the Cedron, which now expands down to the Valley of Hinnom. Here, the Cedron is about 200 yards wide, and has on its left the Mount of Offence. Shortly after the junction of the Valley of Hinnom with the Cedron, there is Job's well, to the south of which Sir C. Warren found, in 1868–1869, the shaft of a great rock-cut aqueduct.

On leaving the Holy City, the Valley of the Cedron runs its winding and gradually precipitous course through the Wilderness of Judea to the north-western shore of the Dead Sea. The Cedron is perfectly dry during the summer and most of the winter. North of Jerusalem, it bears the name of *Wâdi al-Jos* (Valley of Nuts); between the city and the Mount of Olives, it is known as *Wâdi Sitti Mariam* (Valley of St. Mary), or again as the Valley of Josaphat (cf. Joel, iii, 2, 12); after leaving Jerusalem, it is called *Wâdi en-Nâr* (Valley of Fire), and also *Wâdi er-Rahib* (Valley of the Monks). Its whole length is some 20 miles in a straight line, and its descent nearly 4000 feet. Its bed east of Jerusalem is now about 40 feet higher than in ancient times. The Cedron is first mentioned in Holy Scripture in connexion with David's flight from Absalom, during which he crossed it [II K. (A. V. II Samuel) xv, 23]; and next, in connexion with the prohibition to Semei against his ever crossing it [III K. (A. V. I K.) ii, 37]. It was at the torrent Cedron that King Asa burnt the filthy idol of his mother [III K., xv, 13; II Par. (A. V. II Chron.) xv, 16]. It was into it that Ezechias and Josias cast all the impurities which had polluted the House of the Lord (cf. II Par., xxix, 16; xxx, 14; IV K., xxiii, 4, 6, 12). The torrent Cedron is last mentioned in the O. T. in Jer., xxxi, 40, apparently as part of the common cemetery of Jerusalem. In the N. T. it is spoken of only once, in connexion with Christ's going forth over it to Gethsemani (John, xviii, 1). In the present day it is the desired resting-place of both Jews and Mussulmans, and the supposed scene of the Last Judgment.

ROBINSON, *Biblical Researches in Palestine* (1856), I; MISLIN, *Les Saints Livres* (3d ed., 1876), II; *Palestine Exploration Fund, Jerusalem;* BUHL, *Geog. des alten Palästina.*

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Cefalù (CEPHALŒDIUM), DIOCESE OF (CEPHALUDENSIS).—The city of the same name in the province of Palermo, in Sicily (Italy), is situated nearly in the centre of the northern coast of the island. Destroyed by the inhabitants of Messina, it was reconstructed about 1130 by King Roger I of Sicily. Its first bishop was Nicetas who, in 869, assisted at the Eighth General Council held at Constantinople for the trial of Photius. When Roger I rebuilt the city, Tocelmo was bishop. Among its bishops were: Arduino II, suffered exile twice on account of his opposition to Frederic II; Nicolò (1352) died in the prison of Castel Grassario; and Fra Francesco of the ducal house of Gonzaga (d. 1587), founder of the first seminary opened in Sicily. The cathedral was built by Roger I, and, though often restored, is a fine monument of Norman architecture. The adjoining cloister, still kept in its primitive state, is remarkable for graceful columns adorned with sculptures and arabesques. The diocese is a suffragan of Palermo, it has 22 parishes, 300 secular clergy, 265 churches, chapels, and oratories,



THE CATHEDRAL, CEFALÙ

160,320 inhabitants, and 24 houses of religious (women).

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XXI, 540; *Annuario ecclesiastico* (1907), 386–87.

U. BENIGNI.

Ceillier, RÉMI, patrologist, b. at Bar-le-Duc, 14 May, 1688; d. at Flavigny, 26 May, 1763. He received his early education in the Jesuit College at Bar-le-Duc. After completing the course of humanities and rhetoric, he entered (1705) the monastery of Moyen-Moutier in the Vosges, belonging to the Benedictine congregation of St-Vannes and St-Hydulphe. Later he was appointed professor in the same monastery, a position which he held for six years. In 1716 he was made dean of Moyen-Moutier, in 1718 prior of the monastery of Saint Jacques de Neufchâteau, in 1724 assistant to Dom Charles de Vassimont at the priory of Flavigny-sur-Moselle, and on the latter's death in 1733 prior of that monastery. Under his wise administration this monastery flourished materially, spiritually, and intellectually. His first great work, prepared while he was professor at Moyen-Moutier, was an "Apologie de la morale des Pères, contre les injustes accusations du sieur Jean Barbeyrac, professeur en droit et en histoire à Lausanne" (Paris, 1718). In this work a long dissertation of 40 pages is devoted to establishing the authority of the Fathers of the Church; afterwards the author follows step by step the arguments of Barbeyrac, and defends individually those Fathers whom he had attacked—Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Augustine, and others. The success of this work led Ceillier to undertake another, similar in character, but wider in scope, and dealing with all the sacred and ecclesiastical writings. The nature of the work can best be judged from its title, "Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques qui contient leur vie, le catalogue, la critique, le jugement, la chronologie, l'analyse et le dénombrement des différentes éditions de leurs ouvrages; ce qu'ils renferment de plus intéressant sur le dogme, sur la morale, et sur la discipline de l'Eglise; l'histoire des conciles tant généraux que particuliers et les actes choisis des martyrs". The first volume appeared in 1729, the others at various intervals, the 23d and last being published after the death of the author. The work contains an historical account of the sacred and ecclesiastical authors, lists, analyses, and critical appreciations of their writings, together with selected quotations; it was incomplete when the author died. It ends with the writings of William of Auvergne in the middle of the thirteenth century. It has passed through several editions; the latest is that of Abbé Bauzon, 17 vols. in 4to with two volumes of indexes (Paris, 1860–1869). The preparation of a

work so comprehensive in character was made possible by the assistance which Ceillier received from his confrères. The most valuable portion of the work is that dealing with the Fathers of the first six centuries. Here the author was able to draw upon the writings of Tillemont, and to use the scholarly Benedictine editions of the Fathers. Charges of Jansenism made against Ceillier in his lifetime and afterwards find no substantiation in his writings, and the treatment accorded to the author and his works by Benedict XIV shows that the pope had no doubts as to his orthodoxy.

CALMET, *Bibliothèque lorraine* (Nancy, 1751); MICHAUD, *Biographie universelle*, VII; GUILLAUME, *Notice sur le prieuré de Flavigny-sur-Moselle* (Nancy, 1877, extract from the *Mémoires de la société d'archéologie lorraine*); HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II, 1375; BEUGNET, *Etude biographique et critique sur Dom Rémi Ceillier* (Bar-le-Duc, 1891); IDEM in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, II, 2049–2051; ZIEGELBAUER, *Hist. Litteraria Ord. S. Benedicti*, I, 640, IV, 516 sq.

PATRICK J. HEALY.

Celebret, a letter which a bishop gives to a priest, that he may obtain permission in another diocese to say Mass, and for this purpose bears testimony that he is free from canonical censures. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, chap. xvi on Reform) lays down the rule that "no cleric who is a stranger shall without letters commendatory (q. v.) from his own ordinary be admitted by any bishop to celebrate the divine mysteries". Ordinarily permission is not to be given to a priest from another diocese to say Mass without this certificate signed and duly sealed. The seal is obviously the more important requisite, as it is the safer guarantee against forgery. The celebret should be officially recognized by the diocesan authority of the place where a priest may wish to say Mass. One who has his celebret in due form, or who is certainly known to be in good standing in his own diocese, may be allowed to celebrate till he has had a sufficient time to comply with this rule. A priest with proper credentials cannot reasonably be prevented from saying Mass, though he will be expected to comply with reasonable restrictions which may be imposed.

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, as a regulation against collectors of funds for other dioceses or countries, enacted a decree (No. 295) that priests on such a mission should not be allowed to celebrate Mass even once till they had received permission from the ordinary. This rule has generally been enforced in diocesan synods. The absence of the celebret does not suffice for the refusal of permission to say Mass, if persons worthy of belief bear positive testimony to the good standing of the priest. If the permission were unreasonably refused, the priest may say Mass privately, if no scandal is given. Yet the rectors of churches are not obliged to incur any expenses the celebration may involve (S. C. C., 15 Dec., 1703).

CRAISSON, *Man. Jur. Can.*, I, *De Potest. Episc.* (Poitiers, 1892), Punctum II, Numerus 1012, et sqq.; TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, St. Louis, 1906), s. v.; ANDRÉ-WAGNER, *Dict. de droit canon* (Paris, 1901).

R. L. BURTSELL.

Celenderis, a titular see of Asia Minor.—Celenderis was a port and fortress in Isauria, founded by the Phœnicians or, according to legend, by Sandacos, son of Astynoös and grandson of Phaethon. It figures in Parthey's "Notitiæ episcopatuum" as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century, as a suffragan of Seleuceia. Lequien (II, 1015) gives four titulars: Musonius in 381, Julianus, or Julius, in 451 and 458, Peter at the Trullan Council in 692, and Eustathius at Nicæa in 787. Another, whose name is unknown, was amongst the friends of Photius in 878. We must add two names: Asterius, a correspondent of Severus in 508 and 511, and Pelagius in 518 (E. W. Brooks, "The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus", II, 4; "Vita Severi", 28; "Chronique de Michel le Syrien", ed. Chabot, 267). Celenderis is to-day a little village, commonly called Kilindria, the chief centre of the caza of Gulnar in the vilayet of Adana, with 210 inhabitants, mostly Greeks. It has a pretty roadstead, but of difficult approach. There are Roman and medieval ruins, among them those of an aqueduct, a castle, beautiful sarcophagi, etc.

RAMSAY, *Hist. Geog. of Asia Minor* (London, 1890); CUINET, *Turquie d'Asie*, II, 80; ALISHAN, *Sissouan* (Venice, 1899), 384–385.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Celestine I, SAINT, POPE.—Nothing is known of his early history except that he was a Roman and that his father's name was Priscus. He is said to have lived for a time at Milan with St. Ambrose; the first notice, however, concerning him that is known is in a document of St. Innocent I, in the year 416, where he is spoken of as Celestine the Deacon. In 418 St. Augustine wrote to him (Epist. lxii) in very reverential language. He succeeded St. Boniface I as pope, 10 Sept., 422 (according to Tillemont, though the Bollandists say 3 Nov.), and died 26 July, 432, having reigned nine years, ten months, and sixteen days. In spite of the troublous times at Rome, he was elected without any opposition, as is learned from a letter of St. Augustine (Epist. cclxi), written to him shortly after his elevation, in which the great doctor begs his assistance in composing his difficulties with Antonius, Bishop of Fessula in Africa. A strong friendship seems to have existed between Celestine and Augustine, and after the death of the latter in 430, Celestine wrote a long letter to the bishops of Gaul on the sanctity, learning, and zeal of the holy doctor, and forbade all attacks upon his memory on the part of the Semipelagians, who, under the leadership of the famous ascetic, John Cassian, were then beginning to gain influence. Though his lot was cast in stormy times, for the Manichæans, Donatists, Novatians, and Pelagians were troubling the peace of the Church, while the barbarian hordes were beginning their inroads into the heart of the empire, Celestine's firm but gentle character enabled him to meet successfully all the exigencies of his position. We see him everywhere upholding the rights of the Church and the dignity of his office. In this he was aided by Placidia, who, in the name of her youthful son, Valentinian III, banished from Rome the Manichæans and other heretics who were disturbing the peace. Celestine not only excluded Cœlestius, the companion and chief disciple of Pelagius, from Italy, but procured the further condemnation of the sect from the Council of Ephesus, while through his instrumentality St. Germanus of Auxerre and St. Lupus of Troyes, who had been sent to Britain in 429, the native land of Pelagius, by the Gallic bishops, succeeded in extirpating the error from its native soil.

A firm upholder of the ancient canons, we find Celestine writing to the bishops of Illyria, bidding them observe the canons and their old allegiance to the Bishop of Thessalonica, the papal vicar, without whom they are not to consecrate any bishop or hold any council. He also writes to the Bishops of Vienne and Narbonne, whom he warns to keep the ancient canons, and, in accordance with the warning of his predecessor, to resist the pretensions of the See of Arles. Moreover they must not refuse to admit to penance those who desire it at the moment of death; bishops, too, must not dress as monks, and severe action is to be taken against a certain Daniel, a monk from the Orient who had been the cause of serious disorders in the Church of Gaul. To the Bishops of Apulia and Calabria he writes that the clergy must not remain ignorant of the canons, neither are the laity to be advanced to the episcopate over the heads of the clergy, nor is the popular will, no matter how strong, to be humoured in this matter—*populus docen-*

dus non sequendus. Moreover he threatens severe penalties for future transgressors. In upholding the rights of the Roman Church to hear and decide appeals from all quarters, he came for a time into conflict with the great Church of Africa (see APIARIUS). The African bishops, however, though manifesting some warmth, never called into question the Divine supremacy of the Holy See, their very language and actions expressed its fullest recognition; their complaints were directed rather against the sometimes indiscreet use of the papal prerogative. The last years of the pontificate of Celestine were taken up with the struggle in the East over the heresy of Nestorius (see NESTORIUS; CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA; EPHESUS, COUNCIL OF). Nestorius who had become Bishop of Constantinople in 428 at first gave great satisfaction, as we learn from the first letter addressed to him by Celestine. He soon aroused suspicions of his orthodoxy by receiving kindly the Pelagians banished from Rome by the pope, and shortly after, rumours of his heretical teaching concerning the twofold personality of Christ reaching Rome, Celestine commissioned Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, to investigate and make a report. Cyril having found Nestorius openly professing his heresy sent a full account to Celestine, who in a Roman synod (430), having solemnly condemned the errors of Nestorius, now ordered Cyril in his name to proceed against Nestorius, who was to be excommunicated and deposed unless within ten days he should have made in writing a solemn retractation of his errors. In letters written the same day to Nestorius, to the clergy and people of Constantinople, and to John of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Rufus of Thessalonica, and Flavian of Philippi, Celestine announces the sentence passed upon Nestorius and the commission given to Cyril to execute it. At the same time he restored all who had been excommunicated or deprived by Nestorius. Cyril forwarded the papal sentence and his own anathema to Nestorius. The emperor now summoned a general council to meet at Ephesus. To this council Celestine sent as legates, Arcadius and Projectus, bishops, and Philippus, a priest, who were to act in conjunction with Cyril. However, they were not to mix in discussion but were to judge the opinions of the others. Celestine in all his letters assumes his own decision as final, Cyril and the council are but to carry it out. Nestorius proving obdurate was excommunicated and deposed by the council, "compelled by the sacred canons and the letters of Our Most Holy Father, Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church."

The last official act of Celestine, the sending of St. Patrick to Ireland, perhaps surpasses all the rest in its far-reaching consequences for good. He had already sent (431) Palladius as bishop to the "Scots [i. e. Irish] believing in Christ." But Palladius soon abandoned Ireland and died the year following in Britain. St. Patrick, who had previously been refused, now received the long-coveted commission only a few days before the death of Celestine, who thus becomes a sharer in the conversion of the race that in the next few centuries was to accomplish such vast works by its countless missionaries and scholars in the conversion and civilization of the barbarian world. In the local affairs of the Roman Church, Celestine manifested great zeal. He restored and embellished the church of Santa Maria in Trastevere, which had suffered from the Gothic pillage of Rome, also the church of St. Sabina, besides decorating the Cemetery of St. Priscilla with paintings of the Council of Ephesus. The precise date of his death is uncertain. His feast is kept in the Latin Church on 6 April, the day on which his body was placed in the Catacombs of St. Priscilla, whence it was transferred in 820 by Pope St. Paschal I to the church of Sta Prassede, though the cathedral of Mantua likewise claims his relics. In the Greek Church where he is highly honoured for his condemnation of Nestorius, his feast falls on 8 April.

The extant writings of St. Celestine consist of sixteen letters, the contents of many of which have been indicated above, and a fragment of a discourse on Nestorianism delivered in the Roman Synod of 430. The "Capitula Cœlestini", the ten decisions on the subject of grace which have played such a part in the history of Augustinianism, are no longer attributed to his authorship. For centuries they were affixed as an integral part to his letter to the bishops of Gaul, but at present are considered as most probably the work of St. Prosper of Aquitaine. Anastasius Bibliothecarius attributes to him several other constitutions but with little authority. Doubtful also is the statement of the "Liber Pontificalis" that Celestine added the Introit to the Mass.

Sancti Cœlestini Epistolæ et Decreta, P. L., L; *Acta SS.*, X; HEFELE, *History of the Councils*, II, III; DUCHESNE, *Liber Pontificalis*, I; GRISAR, *Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter* (Freiburg im Br., 1898), I; CARDINAL DE NORIS, *Historia Pelagiana*; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l' histoire ecclesiastique*, XIV; NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. RONCAGLIA-MANSI, IX; MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Amplissima Collectio*, IV; RIVINGTON, *The Roman Primacy*.

J. F. X. MURPHY.

CELESTINE II, POPE, (GUIDO DEL CASTELLO, DE CASTELLIS), a native of Roman Tuscany, date of birth unknown; d. 8 March, 1144. He was a disciple of Abelard, and added to great learning the reputation of a grave and upright priest. He was made cardinal in 1128, and in 1140 legate to France where he incurred the displeasure of St. Bernard for the protection he accorded Arnold of Brescia. He succeeded Innocent II, 25 September, 1143, and at once lifted from France the interdict that his predecessor had inflicted because of the act of Louis VII in opposing his own candidate to the rightfully elected Bishop of Bourges. On the eve of a serious conflict with Roger of Sicily he died, after a short reign of about six months.

WATTERICH, *Vitæ Pontificum* (Leipzig, 1862), II, 276; JAFFÉ, *Reg. Rom. Pont.* (1888), II, 1-7; MANSI, *Vita et epistolæ* in *Coll. Conc.*, XXI, 591; BARONIUS, *Ann. eccl.* 1143-1144; VACANDARD, *Vie de S. Bernard* (Paris, 1895).

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

CELESTINE III, POPE (GIACINTO BOBONE), the first of the Roman Orsini to ascend the Chair of Peter, b. about 1106; d. at Rome, 8 January, 1198. He was forty-seven years a cardinal when, in his eighty-fifth year, he was elected (30 March, 1191) successor of Clement III; being only a deacon he was ordained priest (13 April) and consecrated bishop the next day, respectively Holy Saturday and Easter. The following day he anointed and crowned King Henry VI of Germany as emperor, and as empress his queen Constantia. The king was then on his way to Southern Italy to enforce against Tancred the claims of Constantia to the crown of the Two Sicilies. The Roman people, however, did not permit the afore-mentioned solemnities to take place until both pope and king had aided them to satisfy their wrath against the neighbouring Tusculum. The town was levelled with the ground and abandoned to the savage vengeance of the Romans. The aged pope has been blamed for this act of cruelty, in this so unlike his predecessor Innocent II who withstood (1142) a similar passionate insistence of the Romans for the destruction of Tibur (Tivoli). The responsibility, however, rests chiefly on the emperor, whose blood-thirsty Italian career was thus becomingly inaugurated. In spite of the pope the emperor proceeded southward to make good his claims to Sicily, but was defeated and compelled to retire, leaving the empress a prisoner of Tancred, who freed her at the papal petition. The aged Celestine astonished many by his longanimity in dealing

with the young and violent Henry VI who in Germany surpassed his predecessors in cruelty and oppression of the churches. The pope was also slow and cautious in threatening Henry with excommunication for his imprisonment of King Richard the Lion-Hearted whom Henry had caused to be seized (1192) by Duke Leopold of Austria, and delivered to himself, as Richard was on the way back to England, nor was the English king set free until he had paid a great ransom (£100,000). It was a violation of the law of nations that a younger and more vigorous pope would not have so long tolerated. Only in 1193 were the duke and his associates excommunicated and an attempt made to compel restitution of the ransom. Shortly after, on the death of Tancred (1194) Henry VI again crossed the Alps, resolved to finally compass the union of the German Crown with that of the Two Sicilies. Amid incredible cruelties he accomplished his purpose, defied the rights of the pope as overlord of Sicily, deceived the pope with vain promises of a crusade, and would probably have hastened by a generation the memorable conflict of Rome with his son Frederick II had not death carried off the cruel and lawless king, 28 Sept., 1197, in his thirty-sixth year, not, however, before he had induced the pope to acknowledge the aforesaid infant Frederick as King of the Two Sicilies. Celestine himself soon passed away, in the ninety-second year of his age. He showed more resolution in dealing with other princes of Europe, particularly in defence of the ecclesiastical marriage laws. He induced King Alfonso IX of Leon to abandon his project of an incestuous union with a Portuguese princess, and defended with vigour the validity of the marriage of Queen Ingeburg with Philip Augustus of France, to whom he refused a divorce, while he declared invalid the divorce accorded to Philip by the bishops of his kingdom. A serious crusade was the constant ideal of Pope Celestine; he confirmed the new military Order of Teutonic Knights (1191), and favoured greatly the Knights Templar and the Hospitallers. St. Malachy of Armagh, St. Bernward of Hildesheim, St. John Gualbert, and St. Ubaldus of Gubbio were canonized by him. (See HENRY VI.)

BARONIUS, *Annales Eccl.*, 1191-1198; MANSI, *Coll Conc.*, XXII, 593; JAFFÉ, *Reg. RR. PP.*, (1888), II, 577; HEFELE-KNÖPFLER, *Concilieng.*, V, 755; WATTERICH, *Vitæ Pontificum* (Leipzig, 1862), II, 708-48; NORGATE, *England under the Angevin Kings* (London, 1887); DUCHESNE, *Liber Pontif.* (Paris, 1892), II, 451; see also the literature on *Henry VI* in CHEVALIER, *Bio-bibliographie* (Paris, 1905), 2076-78, and the histories of the city of Rome by VON REUMONT and by GREGOROVIUS (Eng. tr.).

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

CELESTINE IV, POPE (GOFREDO CASTIGLIONI), a native of Milan, nephew of Urban III, and probably a Cistercian; d. 10 November, 1241. He was made cardinal by Gregory IX and succeeded him, 25 October, 1241, at the height of the papal warfare with Emperor Frederick II. He died after a reign of fifteen days.

LABBE AND COSSART, *Coll. Conc.*, XXIII, 1463; ARGELATI, *Biblioth. Mediolanensis* (1745), I, 1, 440; POTTHAST, *Reg. Rom. Pont.* (1874), I, 940.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

CELESTINE V, SAINT, POPE (PIETRO DI MURRONE), b. 1215, in the Neapolitan province of Molise; elected at Perugia 5 July, 1294; consecrated and crowned at Aquila, 29 August; abdicated at Naples, 13 Dec., 1294; d. in the castle of Fumone, 19 May, 1296. He was of humble parentage, became a Benedictine at the age of seventeen, and was eventually ordained priest at Rome. His love of solitude led him first into the wilderness of Monte Morone in the Abruzzi, whence his surname, and later into the wilder recesses of Mt. Majella. He took for his model the Baptist. His hair-cloth was roughened with knots; a chain of iron encompassed his emaciated frame; he fasted every day except Sunday; each year he kept four Lents, passing three of them on bread and water; the entire day and a great part of the night he consecrated to prayer and labour. As generally happens in the case of saintly anchorites, Peter's desire for solitude was not destined to be gratified. Many kindred spirits gathered about him eager to imitate his rule of life, and before his death there were thirty-six monasteries, numbering 600 religious, bearing his papal name (Cœlestini). The order was approved, as a branch of the Benedictines, by Urban IV, in 1264. This congregation of (Benedictine) Celestines must not be confounded with other (Franciscan) Celestines, extreme Spirituals whom Pope Celestine permitted (1294) to live as hermits according to the Rule of St. Francis, but were pendent of the Franciscan superiors. In gratitude they called themselves after the pope (*Pauperes eremitæ Domini Celestini*), but were dissolved and dispersed (1302) by Boniface VIII, whose legitimacy the Spirituals contested [Heimbucher, Orden und Kongregationen, (2nd. ed. Paderborn, 1907), I, 280; II, 360]. In 1284, Pietro, weary of the cares of government, appointed a certain Robert as his vicar and plunged again into the depths of the wilderness. It would be well if some Catholic scholar would devote some time to a thorough investigation of his relations to the extreme spiritual party of that age; for though it is certain that the pious hermit did not approve of the heretical tenets held by the leaders, it is equally true that the fanatics, during his life and after his death, made copious use of his name.

In July, 1294, his pious exercises were suddenly interrupted by a scene unparalleled in ecclesiastical history. Three eminent dignitaries, accompanied by an immense multitude of monks and laymen, ascended the mountain, announced that Pietro had been chosen pope by unanimous vote of the Sacred College and humbly begged him to accept the honour. Two years and three months had elapsed since the death of Nicholas IV (4 Apr., 1292) without much prospect that the conclave at Perugia would unite upon a candidate. Of the twelve Cardinals who composed the Sacred College six were Romans, four Italians and two French. The factious spirit of Guelph and Ghibelline, which was then epidemic in Italy, divided the conclave, as well as the city of Rome, into two hostile parties of the Orsini and the Colonna, neither of which could outvote the other. A personal visit to Perugia, in the spring of 1294, of Charles II of Naples, who needed the papal authority in order to regain Sicily, only exasperated the affair, hot words being exchanged between the Angevin monarch and Cardinal Gaetani, at that time the intellectual leader of the Colonna, later, as Pope Boniface VIII, their bitter enemy. When the situation seemed hopeless, Cardinal Latino Orsini admonished the fathers that God had revealed to a saintly hermit that if the cardinals did not perform their duty within four months, He would visit the Church with severe chastisement. All knew that he referred to Pietro di Murrone. The proposition was seized upon by the exhausted conclave and the election was made unanimous. Pietro heard of his elevation with tears; but, after a brief prayer, obeyed what seemed the clear voice of God, commanding him to sacrifice his personal inclination on the altar of the public welfare. Flight was impossible, even if he contemplated it; for no sooner did the news of this extraordinary event spread abroad than multitudes (numbered at 200,000) flocked about him. His elevation was particularly welcome to the Spirituals, who saw in it the realization of current prophecies that the reign of the Holy Spirit ruling through the monks was at hand; and they proclaimed him the first legitimate pope since Constantine's donation of wealth and worldly

power to "the first rich father" (Inferno, Canto XIX). King Charles of Naples, hearing of the election of his subject, hastened with his son Charles Martel, titular King of Hungary, ostensibly to present his homage to the new pope, in reality to take the simple old man into honourable custody. Had Charles known how to preserve moderation in exploiting his good luck, this windfall might have brought him incalculable benefits; as it was, he ruined everything by excessive greed.

In reply to the request of the cardinals, that he should come to Perugia to be crowned, Pietro, at the instigation of Charles, summoned the Sacred College to meet him at Aquila, a frontier town of the Kingdom of Naples. Reluctantly they came, and one by one, Gaetani being the last to appear. Seated on an humble ass, the rope held by two monarchs, the new pontiff proceeded to Aquila, and, although only three of the cardinals had arrived, the king ordered him to be crowned, a ceremony which had to be repeated in traditional form some days later, the only instance of a double papal coronation. Cardinal Latino was so grief-stricken at the course which affairs were evidently taking that he fell sick and died. Pietro took the name of Celestine V. Urged by the cardinals to cross over into the States of the Church, Celestine, again at the behest of the king, ordered the entire Curia to repair to Naples. It is wonderful how many serious mistakes the simple old man crowded into five short months. We have no full register of them, because his official acts were annulled by his successor. On the 18th of September he created twelve new cardinals, seven of whom were French, and the rest, with one possible exception, Neapolitans, thus paving the road to Avignon and the Great Schism. Ten days later he embittered the cardinals by renewing the rigorous law of Gregory X, regulating the conclave, which Adrian V had suspended. He is said to have appointed a young son of Charles to the important See of Lyons, but no trace of such appointment appears in Gams or Eubel. At Monte Cassino on his way to Naples, he strove to force the Celestine hermit-rule on the monks; they humoured him while he was with them. At Benevento he created the bishop of the city a cardinal, without observing any of the traditional forms. Meanwhile he scattered privileges and offices with a lavish hand. Refusing no one, he was found to have granted the same place or benefice to three or four rival suitors; he also granted favours in blank. In consequence, the affairs of the Curia fell into extreme disorder. Arrived in Naples, he took up his abode in a single apartment of the Castel Nuovo, and on the approach of Advent had a little cell built on the model of his beloved hut in the Abruzzi. But he was ill at ease. Affairs of State took up time that ought to be devoted to exercises of piety. He feared that his soul was in danger. The thought of abdication seems to have occurred simultaneously to the pope and to his discontented cardinals, whom he rarely consulted.

That the idea originated with Cardinal Gaetani the latter vigorously denied, and maintained that he originally opposed it. But the serious canonical doubt arose: Can a pope resign? As he has no superior on earth, who is authorized to accept his resignation? The solution of the question was reserved to the trained canonist, Cardinal Gaetani, who, basing his conclusion on common sense and the Church's right to self-preservation, decided affirmatively.

It is interesting to notice how curtly, when he became Boniface VIII, he dispatches the delicate subject on which the validity of his claim to the papacy depended. In the "Liber Sextus" I, vii, 1, he issued the following decree: "Whereas some curious persons, arguing on things of no great expediency, and rashly seeking, against the teaching of the Apostle, to know more than it is meet to know, have seemed, with little forethought, to raise an anxious doubt, whether the Roman Pontiff, especially when he recognizes himself incapable of ruling the Universal Church and of bearing the burden of the Supreme Pontificate, can validly renounce the papacy, and its burden and honour: Pope Celestine V, Our predecessor, whilst still presiding over the government of the aforesaid Church, wishing to cut off all the matter for hesitation on the subject, having deliberated with his brethren, the Cardinals of the Roman Church, of whom We were one, with the concordant counsel and assent of Us and of them all, by Apostolic authority established and decreed, that the Roman Pontiff may freely resign. We, therefore, lest it should happen that in course of time this enactment should fall into oblivion, and the aforesaid doubt should revive the discussion, have placed it among other constitutions *ad perpetuam rei memoriam* by the advice of our brethren."

When the report spread that Celestine contemplated resigning, the excitement in Naples was intense. King Charles, whose arbitrary course had brought things to this crisis, organized a determined opposition. A huge procession of the clergy and monks surrounded the castle, and with tears and prayers implored the pope to continue his rule. Celestine, whose mind was not yet clear on the subject, returned an evasive answer, whereupon the multitude chanted the Te Deum and withdrew. A week later (13 December) Celestine's resolution was irrevocably fixed; summoning the cardinals on that day, he read the constitution mentioned by Boniface in the "Liber Sextus", announced his resignation, and proclaimed the cardinals free to proceed to a new election. After the lapse of the nine days enjoined by the legislation of Gregory X, the cardinals entered the conclave, and the next day Benedetto Gaetani was proclaimed Pope as Boniface VIII. After revoking many of the provisions made by Celestine, Boniface brought his predecessor, now in the dress of a humble hermit, with him on the road to Rome. He was forced to retain him in custody, lest an inimical use should be made of the simple old man. Celestine yearned for his cell in the Abruzzi, managed to effect his escape at San Germano, and to the great joy of his monks reappeared among them at Majella. Boniface ordered his arrest; but Celestine evaded his pursuers for several months by wandering through the woods and mountains. Finally, he attempted to cross the Adriatic to Greece; but, driven back by a tempest, and captured at the foot of Mt. Gargano, he was delivered into the hands of Boniface, who confined him closely in a narrow room in the tower of the castle of Fumone near Anagni (Analecta Bollandiana, 1897, XVI, 429–30). Here, after nine months passed in fasting and prayer, closely watched, but attended by two of his own religious, though rudely treated by the guards, he ended his extraordinary career in his ninety-first year. That Boniface treated him harshly, and finally cruelly murdered him, is a calumny. Some years after his canonization by Clement V in 1313, his remains were transferred from Ferentino to the church of his order at Aquila, where they are still the object of great veneration. His feast is celebrated on 19 May.

Acta SS., May, IV, 419; *Bibl. hagiogr. Latina*, 979 sqq.; *Analecta Bollandiana* (1897), XVI, 365-92 (the oldest life of *Celestine*); CELIDONIO, *Vita di S. Pietro del Morrone, Celestino papa quinto, scritta su' documenti coevi* (Sulmona, 1896); IDEM, *La non-autenticita degli Opuscula Cælestina* (ibid., 1896; these *opuscula* edited by TELERA, Naples, 1640, may have been dictated, but not composed by Celestine); ROVIGLIO, *La rinuncia de Celestino* V (Verona, 1894); AUTINORI, *Celestino V ed il sesto anniversario della sua coronazione* (Aquila, 1894); RAYNALDUS, *Ann eccl. ad ann. 1294-96;* HEFELE, *Conciliengeschichte, V*; also the histories of the City of Rome by VON REUMONT and by GREGOROVIUS.

JAMES F. LOUGHLIN.

Celestines. See BENEDICTINE ORDER; FRANCISCANS.

Celibacy of the Clergy is the renunciation of marriage implicitly or explicitly made, for the more perfect observance of chastity, by all those who receive the Sacrament of Orders in any of the higher grades. The character of this renunciation, as we shall see, is differently understood in the Eastern and in the Western Church. Speaking, for the moment, only of Western Christendom, the candidates for orders, when they are presented for the grade of subdeacon, are solemnly warned by the bishop at the beginning of the ceremony regarding the gravity of the obligation which they are incurring. "You ought", he tells them, "anxiously to consider again and again what sort of a burden this is which you are taking upon you of your own accord. Up to this you are free. You may still, if you choose, turn to the aims and desires of the world (*licet vobis pro arbitrio ad sæcularia vota transire*). But if you receive this order (of the subdiaconate) it will no longer be lawful to turn back from your purpose. You will be required to continue in the service of God, and with His assistance to observe chastity and to be bound for ever in the ministrations of the Altar, to serve whom is to reign." By stepping forward despite this warning, when invited to do so, and by co-operating in the rest of the ordination service, the candidate is understood to bind himself equivalently by a vow of chastity. He is henceforth unable to contract a valid marriage, and any serious transgression in the matter of this vow is not only a grievous sin in itself but incurs the additional guilt of sacrilege.

Before turning to the history of this observance it will be convenient to deal in the first place with certain general principles involved. The law of celibacy has repeatedly been made the object of attack, especially of recent years (see, for example, H. C. Lea, History of Sacerdotal Celibacy, third edition, 1907, in two volumes), and it is important at the outset to correct certain prejudices thus created. Although we do not find in the New Testament any indication of celibacy being made compulsory either upon the Apostles or those whom they ordained, we have ample warrant in the language of Our Saviour, and of St. Paul for looking upon virginity as the higher call, and by inference, as the condition befitting those who are set apart for the work of the ministry. In Matt., xix, 12, Christ clearly commends those who, "for the sake of the kingdom of God", have held aloof from the married state, though He adds: "he that can take it, let him take it". St. Paul is even more explicit. "I would", he says, "that all men were even as myself; but every one hath his proper gift from God. . . . But I say to the unmarried and to the widows, it is good for them if they so continue, even as I." And further on: "But I would have you to be without solicitude. He that is without a wife is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife: and he is divided. And the unmarried woman and the virgin thinketh on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit. But she that is married thinketh on the things of this world how she may please her husband. And this I speak for your profit, not to cast a snare upon you, but for that which is decent and which may give you power to attend upon the Lord without impediment." (I Cor., vii, 7–8 and 32–35.)

Further, although we grant that the motive here appealed to is in some measure utilitarian, we shall probably be justified in saying, with the distinguished canonist George Phillips, that the principle which underlies the Church's action in enforcing celibacy upon her clergy is not limited to this utilitarian aspect but goes even deeper. From the earliest period the Church was personified and conceived of by her disciples as the Virgin Bride and as the pure Body of Christ, or again as the Virgin Mother (*παρθένος μήτηρ*), and it was plainly fitting that this virgin Church should be served by a virgin priesthood. Among Jews and pagans the priesthood was hereditary. Its functions and powers were transmitted by natural generation. But in the Church of Christ, as an antithesis to this, the priestly character was imparted by the Holy Ghost in the Divinely-instituted Sacrament of Orders. Virginity is consequently the special prerogative of the Christian priesthood. Virginity and marriage are both holy, but in different ways. The conviction that virginity possesses a higher sanctity and clearer spiritual intuitions, seems to be an instinct planted deep in the heart of man. Even in the Jewish Dispensation where the priest begot children to whom his functions descended, it was nevertheless enjoined that he should observe continence during the period in which he served in the Temple. No doubt a mystical reason of this kind does not appeal to all, but such considerations have always held a prominent place in the thought of the Fathers of the Church; as is seen, for example, in the admonition very commonly addressed to subdeacons of the Middle Ages at the time of their ordination. "With regard to them it has pleased our fathers that they who handle the sacred mysteries should observe the law of continence, as it is written 'be clean ye who handle the vessels of the Lord'" (Maskell, Monumenta Ritualia, II, 242).

On the other hand, such motives as are dwelt upon in the passage just quoted from the Epistle to the Corinthians are of a kind which must appeal to the intelligence of all. The more holy and exalted we represent the state of marriage to be, the more we justify the married priest in giving the first place in his thoughts to his wife and family and only the second to his work. It would be hard to find more unexceptionable testimony to this point of view than that of Dr. Döllinger. No scholar of this generation was more intimately acquainted with the by-ways of medieval history. No one could have supplied so much material for a *chronique scandaleuse* like that which Dr. Lea has compiled in his history of celibacy. Moreover, when Dr. Döllinger severed his connexion with the Church after the Vatican Council, he had absolutely no motive to influence his judgment in favour of Rome's traditional discipline, if it were not that he believed that the lesson both of the past and the present was clear. Nevertheless, when the Old Catholics abolished compulsory celibacy for the priesthood, Dr. Döllinger, as we are told by an intimate friend of his, an Anglican, was "sorely grieved" by the step, and this seems to have been one of the principal things which kept him from any formal participation in the Old Catholic communion. In reference to this matter he wrote to the same Anglican friend:—

"You in England cannot understand how completely engrained it is into our people that a priest is a man who sacrifices himself for the sake of his parishioners. He has no children of his own, in order that all the children in the parish may be his children. His people know that his small wants are supplied, and that he can devote all his time and thought to them. They know that it is quite otherwise with the married pastors of the Protestants. The pastor's income may be enough for himself, but it is not enough for his wife and children also. In order to maintain them he must take other work, literary or scholastic, only a portion of his time can be given to his people; and they know that when the interests of his family and those of his flock collide, his family

must come first and his flock second. In short, he has a profession or trade, a *Gewerbe*, rather than a vocation; he has to earn a livelihood. In almost all Catholic congregations, a priest who married would be ruined; all his influence would be gone. The people are not at all ready for so fundamental a change, and the circumstances of the clergy do not admit of it. It is a fatal resolution." (A. Plummer in "The Expositor", December, 1890, p. 470.) A testimony given under such circumstances carries more weight than long explanations would do. Neither was it the only occasion on which the historian so expressed himself. "When a priest", Döllinger wrote in a letter to one of his Old Catholic friends in 1876, "can no longer point to the personal sacrifice which he makes for the good of his people, then it is all over with him and the cause which he represents. He sinks to the level of men who make a trade of their work [*Er rangiert dann mit den Gewerbetreibenden*]." (See Michael, Ignaz von Döllinger, ed. 1894, p. 249.)

Supposing always that the vow of celibacy is faithfully kept, the power which this practical lesson in disinterestedness must lend to the priest's exhortations when addressing his people is too obvious to need insisting upon. Numberless observers, Protestant and Agnostic as well as Catholic, have borne witness to the effect so produced. On the other side, the obstacles to really confidential relations and more especially to confession in the case of the married clergy—even if this difficulty is often quite unfairly exaggerated in the many current stories of Anglican clergymen sharing the secrets of the confessional with their wives—are certainly real enough. When the once famous Père Hyacinthe (M. Loyson) left the Church and married, this was the first point which at once struck a free-thinker like George Sand. "Will Père Hyacinthe still hear confessions?" she wrote. "That is the question. Is the secrecy of the confessional compatible with the mutual confidences of conjugal love? If I were a Catholic, I would say to my children: 'Have no secrets which cost too much in the telling and then you will have no cause to fear the gossip of the vicar's wife'."

Again, with regard to missionary work in barbarous countries, the advantages which lie with a celibate clergy can hardly need insisting upon and are freely admitted both by indifferent observers and by the non-Catholic missionaries themselves. The testimonies which have been gathered in such a work as Marshall's "Christian Missions" are calculated perhaps, from their juxtaposition, to give an exaggerated impression, while the editor's bantering tone will sometimes wound and repel; but the indictment is substantially accurate, and the materials for a continuation of this standard work, which have been collected from recent sources by the Rev. B. Wolferstan, S. J., in every respect bear out Marshall's main contention. Over and over again the admission is made by well-qualified observers, who are themselves either indifferent or opposed to the Catholic Faith, that whatever genuine work of conversion is done, is effected by the Catholic missionaries whose celibate condition permits them to live among the natives as one of themselves. See, for example, to speak only of China, Stoddart, "Life of Isabella Bird" (1906), pp. 319–320; Arnot Reid, "Peking to Petersburgh" (1897), p. 73; Professor E. H. Parker, "China Past and Present" (1903), pp. 95–96.

The comparatively slight cost of the Catholic missions with their unmarried clergy need not be dwelt upon. To take a single example, the late Anglican Bishop Bickersteth, the much-respected Bishop of South Tokio, Japan, describes in one of his published letters how he had "a good deal of talk" with a Catholic vicar Apostolic, who was on his way to China. Whereupon Bickersteth remarks that "Roman Catholics certainly can teach us much by their readiness to bear hardships. This man and his priests are at times subject to the most serious privations I should fear. In Japan a Roman priest gets one-seventh of what the Church Missionary Society and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel allow to an unmarried deacon. Of course they can only live on the food of the country." (See "The Life and Letters of Edward Bickersteth", 2nd ed., London, 1905, p. 214.) With regard again to the effect upon a priest's work the following candid testimony from a distinguished married clergyman and professor of Trinity College, Dublin, is very striking. "But from the point of view of preaching", writes Professor Mahaffy, "there can be little doubt that married life creates great difficulties and hindrances. The distractions caused by sickness and other human misfortunes increase necessarily in proportion to the number of the household; and as the clergy in all countries are likely to have large families the time which might be spent in meditation on their discourses is stolen from them by other duties and other cares. The Catholic priest when his daily round of outdoor duties is over, comes home to a quiet study, where there is nothing to disturb his thoughts. The family man is met at the door by troops of children welcoming his return and claiming his interest in all their little affairs. Or else the disagreements of the household demand him as an umpire and his mind is disturbed by no mere speculative contemplation of the faults and follies of mankind but by their actual invasion of his home." (Mahaffy, The Decay of Modern Preaching, London, 1882, p. 42.)

To these general considerations various replies are urged. In the first place, it is asserted that celibacy is a mere specious device invented to ensure the subjection of the clergy to the central authority of the Roman See. Such writers as Heigl (Das Cölibat, Berlin, 1902) contend that the deprivation of home and family ties tends to rob the priest of all national feeling and of standing in the country, and consequently to render him a willing tool in the hands of the spiritual autocracy of the popes. The historical summary which follows will help to do justice to this objection. But for the moment, we may note that St. Dunstan, who more than any other character in early English history is identified with the cause of a celibate clergy, was Archbishop of Canterbury from 960 to 988, a period during which the papacy was subjected to oppression and disorder of the worst kind. In fact the practice of celibacy was almost universally enjoined long before the resolute energy of Gregory VII (Hildebrand) built up what it has of late years been the fashion to call the papal monarchy. Again, the consistently nationalist tone of such a chronicler as Matthew Paris, not to speak of countless others, lets us see how mistaken it would be to suppose that celibates are devoid of patriotism or inclined to lay aside their racial sympathies in deference to the commands of the pope. And a similar lesson might be drawn from the Gallicanism of the French clergy in the seventeenth century, which seemingly was not inconsistent with at least ordinary fidelity to their vows of continence.

Another objection which has been urged against sacerdotal celibacy is that the reproduction of the species is a primary function and law of man's nature, and therefore constitutes an inalienable right of which no man can deprive himself by any vow. In view of the fact that social conditions of every sort, as well as the moral law, necessitate celibacy on the part of millions of the race, no one takes this objection seriously. So far as any justification of this position has been attempted, it has been found in the analogy of the animal or vegetable kingdom, in which the reproduction of its own kind has been represented as the main object of its

created existence. But such a comparison applied to an intellectual being like man is hardly more than puerile, and if the argument is pressed we might answer that, as horticulturists are well aware, some of the most beautiful and highly-developed of the natural products of our flower-gardens are only to be obtained at the sacrifice of their fertility. The argument if anything tells the other way. The one serious objection against the law of clerical celibacy is the difficulty which its observance presents for all but men of exceptionally strong character and high principle.

Such writers as Dr. H. C. Lea and M. Chavard have set themselves to gather up all the scandalous excesses which have been charged against a celibate priesthood since the beginning of the Middle Ages. It has been their aim to show that the observance of continence in a much-exposed life is beyond the strength of the average man, and that consequently to bind the rank and file of the clergy by such a law is only to open the door to irregularities and abuses far more derogatory to the priestly character than the toleration of honourable marriage could possibly be. They urge that, in point of fact, the law during long periods of time has become a dead letter throughout the greater part of Christendom, and that its only result has been to force the priest into courses of licence and hypocrisy which have robbed him of all power to influence men for good. As to the historical evidence upon which such charges are based, there will probably always be much difference of opinion. The anti-clerical animus which prompts a certain type of mind to rake these scandals together, and to revel in and exaggerate their prurient details, is at least as marked as the tendency on the part of the Church's apologists to ignore these uncomfortable pages of history altogether. In any case, it may be said in reply, that the observance of continence with substantial fidelity by a numerous clergy, even for centuries together, is assuredly not beyond the strength of human nature when elevated by prayer and strengthened by Divine grace. Not to speak of such countries as Ireland and Germany, where, it might be contended, the admixture with other creeds tends to put the Catholic clergy unduly upon their mettle, we might turn to the example of France or Belgium during the last century. No candid student of history who reviews this period will hesitate to admit that the immense majority of many thousands of secular priests in these two countries have led lives which are clean and upright, in accordance with their professions. We prove it not only by the good report which they have enjoyed with all moderate men, by the tone of respectable novelists who have portrayed them in fiction, by the testimony of foreign residents, and by the comparatively rare occurrence of scandals, but, what is most striking of all, we argue from the tributes paid to their integrity by former associates who have themselves severed their connexion with the Catholic Church, men, for example, like M. Loyson (Père Hyacinthe) or M. Ernest Renan. Speaking of the wholesale charges of incontinence often levelled against a celibate priesthood, M. Renan remarks: "The fact is that what is commonly said about the morality of the clergy is, so far as my experience goes, absolutely devoid of foundation. I spent thirteen years of my life under the charge of priests, and I never saw the shadow of a scandal [*je n'ai pas vu l'ombre d' un scandale*]; I have known no priests but good priests. The confessional may possibly be productive of evil in some countries, but I saw no trace of it in my life as an ecclesiastic" (Renan, Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse, p. 139).

Similarly M. Loyson, when seeking to justify his own marriage, does not attempt to suggest that the obligation of celibacy was beyond the strength of the average man, or that the Catholic clergy lived otherwise than chastely. On the contrary, he writes: "I am well aware of the true state of our clergy. I know of the self-sacrifice and virtues within its ranks." His line of argument is that the priest needs to be reconciled with the interests, the affections, and the duties of human nature; which seems to mean that he ought to be made less spiritual and more earthly. "It is only", he says, "by tearing himself away from the traditions of a blind asceticism, and of a theocracy still more political than religious, that the priest will become once more a man and a citizen. He will find himself at the same time more truly a priest." We are not contending that the high moral standard conspicuous in the clergy of France and Belgium is to be found in an equally-marked degree all over the world. Our argument is that the observance of celibacy is not only possible for the few called to be monks and enjoying the special safeguards of the monastic life, but that it is not beyond the strength of a great body of men numbered by tens of thousands, and recruited, as the French and Belgian clergy mostly are, from the ranks of the industrious peasantry. We have no wish to deny or to palliate the very low level of morality to which at different periods of the world's history, and in different countries calling themselves Christian, the Catholic priesthood has occasionally sunk, but such scandals are no more the effect of compulsory celibacy than the prostitution, which is everywhere rampant in our great cities, is the effect of our marriage laws. We do not abolish Christian marriage because so large a proportion of mankind are not faithful to the restraints which it imposes on human concupiscence. No one in his heart believes that civilized nations would be cleaner or purer if polygamy were substituted for monogamy. Neither is there any reason to suppose that scandals would be fewer and the clergy more respected if Catholic priests were permitted to marry.

History of Clerical Celibacy.—*First Period.*—Turning now to the historical development of the present law of celibacy, we must necessarily begin with St. Paul's direction (I Tim., iii, 2, 12, and Titus, i, 6) that a bishop or a deacon should be "the husband of one wife". These passages seem fatal to any contention that celibacy was made obligatory upon the clergy from the beginning, but on the other hand, the Apostle's desire that other men might be as himself (I Cor., vii, 7–8, already quoted) precludes the inference that he wished all ministers of the Gospel to be married. The words beyond doubt mean that the fitting candidate was a man who, amongst other qualities which St. Paul enunciates as likely to make his authority respected, possessed also such stability of character as was shown, in those days of frequent divorce, by remaining faithful to one wife. The direction is therefore restrictive, not injunctive; it excludes men who have married more than once, but it does not impose marriage as a necessary condition. This freedom of choice seems to have lasted during the whole of what we may call, with Vacandard, the first period of the Church's legislation, i.e. down to about the time of Constantine and the Council of Nicæa.

A strenuous attempt has indeed been made by some writers, of whom the late Professor Bickell was the most distinguished, to prove that even at this early date the Church exacted celibacy of all her ministers of the higher grades. But the contrary view, represented by such scholars as Funk and Kraus, seems much better founded and has won general acceptance of recent years. It is not, of course, disputed that at all times virginity was held in honour, and that in particular large numbers of the clergy practised it or separated from their wives if they were already married. Tertullian comments with admiration upon the number of those in sacred orders who have embraced continence (De exhortatione castita-

tis, cap. xiii), while Origen seems to contrast the spiritual offspring of the priests of the New Law with the natural offspring begotten in wedlock by the priests of the Old (In Levit. Hom. vi, § 6). Clearly, however, there is nothing in this or similar language which could be considered decisive, and Bickell, in support of his thesis, found it needful to appeal mainly to the testimony of writers of the fourth and fifth century. Thus Eusebius declares that it is befitting that priests and those occupied in the ministry should observe continence (Demonst. Evangel., I, c. ix), and St. Cyril of Jerusalem urges that the minister of the altar who serves God properly holds himself aloof from women (Cat. xii, 25). St. Jerome further seems to speak of a custom generally observed when he declares that clerics, "even though they may have wives, cease to be husbands".

But the passage most confidently appealed to is one of St. Epiphanius where the holy doctor first of all speaks of the accepted ecclesiastical rule of the priesthood (*κάνονα τῆς ἱεροσύνης*) as something established by the Apostles (Hær., xlviii, 9), and then in a later passage seems to describe this rule or canon in some detail. "Holy Church", he says, "respects the dignity of the priesthood to such a point that she does not admit to the diaconate, the priesthood, or the episcopate, no nor even to the subdiaconate, anyone still living in marriage and begetting children. She accepts only him who if married gives up his wife or has lost her by death, especially in those places where the ecclesiastical canons are strictly attended to" (Hær., lix, 4). Epiphanius goes on, however, to explain that there are localities in which priests and deacons continue to have children, but he argues against the practice as most unbecoming and urges that the Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost has always in the past shown her disapproval of such procedure. But we need hardly insist that all this is very inadequate evidence (even when supplemented by some few citations from St. Ephraem and other Orientals) to support the contention that a general rule of celibacy existed from Apostolic times. Writers in the fourth century were prone to describe many practices (e. g. the Lenten fast of forty days) as of Apostolic institution which certainly had no claim to be so regarded. On the other hand, there are facts which tell the other way. The statement of Clement of Alexandria at an earlier date is open to no ambiguity. After commenting on the texts of St. Paul noted above, and expressing his veneration for a life of chastity, Clement adds: "All the same, the Church fully receives the husband of one wife whether he be priest or deacon or layman, supposing always that he uses his marriage blamelessly, and such a one shall be saved in the begetting of children" (Stromateis, III, xiii).

Not less explicit is the testimony given by the church historian, Socrates. He declares that in the Eastern Churches neither priests nor even bishops were bound to separate from their wives, though he recognized that a different custom obtained in Thessaly and in Greece (H. E., Bk. V, cap. xxii). Further, in his account of the Council of Nicæa (Bk. I, cap. xi) Socrates tells the story of Paphnutius rising in the assembly and objecting to an enactment which he considered too rigorous in behalf of celibacy. It would be sufficient, he thought, that such as had previously entered on their sacred calling should abjure matrimony according to the ancient tradition of the Church, but that none should be separated from her to whom, while yet unordained, he had been united. And these sentiments he expressed although himself without experience of marriage. Some attempt has been made to discredit this story, but nearly all modern scholars (notably Bishop von Hefele, with his most recent editor, Dom H. Leclercq) accept it without reserve. The fact that the attitude of Bishop Paphnutius differs but little from the existing practice of the Eastern Churches is alone a strong point in its favour. These testimonies, it will be observed, are from Eastern sources and indicate, no doubt, the prevailing Oriental discipline. Wernz expresses the opinion that from the earliest days of the Church the custom, if not the law, was for bishops, priests, and all in major orders, to observe celibacy.

Second Period.—In the history of clerical celibacy conciliar legislation marks the second period during which the law took definite shape both in the East and in the West. The earliest enactment on the subject is that of the Spanish Council of Elvira (between 295 and 302) in canon xxxiii. It imposes celibacy upon the three higher orders of the clergy, bishops, priests, and deacons. If they continue to live with their wives and beget children after their ordination they are to be deposed. This would seem to have been the beginning of the divergence in this matter between East and West. If we may trust the account of Socrates, just quoted, an attempt was made at the Council of Nicæa (perhaps by Bishop Osius who had also sat at Elvira) to impose a law similar to that passed in the Spanish council. But Paphnutius, as we have seen, argued against it, and the Fathers of Nicæa were content with the prohibition expressed in the third canon which forbade *mulieres subintroductas*. No bishop, priest, or deacon was to have any woman living in the house with him, unless it were his mother, sister, or aunt, or at any rate persons against whom no suspicion could lodge. But the account of Socrates at the same time shows that marriage on the part of those who were already bishops or priests was not contemplated; in fact, that it was assumed to be contrary to the tradition of the Church. This is again what we learn from the Council of Ancyra in Galatia, in 314 (canon x), and of Neo-Cæsarea in Cappadocia, in 315 (canon i). The latter canon absolutely forbids a priest to contract a new marriage under the pain of deposition; the former forbids even a deacon to contract marriage, if at the moment of his ordination he made no reservation as to celibacy. Supposing, however, that he protested at the time that a celibate life was above his strength, the decrees of Ancyra allow him to marry subsequently, as having tacitly received the permission of the ordaining bishop. There is nothing here which of itself forbids even a bishop to retain his wife, if he were married before ordination. In this respect the law, as observed in the Eastern Churches, was drawn gradually tighter. Justinian's Code of Civil Law would not allow anyone who had children or even nephews to be consecrated bishop, for fear that natural affection should warp his judgment. The Apostolic Constitutions (c. 400), which formed the principal factor of the church law of the East, are not particularly rigid on the point of celibacy, but whether through imperial influence or not the Council of Trullo, in 692, finally adopted a somewhat stricter view. Celibacy in a bishop became a matter of precept. If he were previously married, he had at once to separate from his wife upon his consecration. On the other hand, this council, while forbidding priests, deacons, and subdeacons to take a wife *after* ordination, asserts in emphatic terms their right and duty to continue in conjugal relations with the wife to whom they had been wedded previously. This canon (xiii of Trullo) still makes the law for the great majority of the Churches of the East, though some of the Uniat communions have adopted the Western discipline.

In Latin Christendom, however, everything was ripe for a stricter law. We have already spoken of the Council of Elvira, and this does not seem to have been an isolated expression of opinion. "As a rule", remarks Bishop Wordsworth from his anti-celibate standpoint, "the great writers of the fourth and fifth century pressed celibacy as the more excellent way

with an unfair and misleading emphasis which led to the gravest moral mischief and loss of power in the Church." (The Ministry of Grace, 1902, p. 223.) This, one would think, must be held to relieve the papacy of some of the onus which modern critics would thrust upon it in this matter. Such writers as St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Hilary, etc., could hardly be described as acting in collusion with the supposed ambitious projects of the Holy See to enslave and denationalize the local clergy. Although it is true that at the close of the fourth century, as we may learn from St. Ambrose (De Officiis, I, 1), some married clergy were still to be found, especially in the outlying country districts, many laws then enacted were strong in favour of celibacy. At a Roman council held by Pope Siricius in 386 an edict was passed forbidding priests and deacons to have conjugal intercourse with their wives (Jaffe-Löwenfeld, Regesta, I, 41), and the pope took steps to have the decree enforced in Spain and in other parts of Christendom (Migne, P. L., LVI, 558 and 728). Africa and Gaul, as we learn from the canons of various synods, seem to have been earnest in the same movement, and though we hear of some mitigation of the severity of the ordinance of Elvira, seeing that in many localities no more severe penalty was enforced against transgressors than that if they took back their wives they were declared incapable of promotion to any higher grade, it may fairly be said that by the time of St. Leo the Great the law of celibacy was generally recognized in the West. With regard to subdeacons, indeed, the case was not clear. Pope Siricius (385–398) seems to rank them with acolytes and not to require separation from their wives until after the age of thirty when they might be ordained deacons if they had previously, during some short period of trial, given proof of their ability to lead a life of stricter continence. Writers like Funk and Wernz regard them as bound to celibacy in the time of Pope Leo the Great (446). The Council of Agde in Gaul, in 506, forbade subdeacons to marry, and such synods as those of Orléans in 538 and Tours in 567 prohibited even those already married from continuing to live with their wives. As other councils took an opposite line, the uncertainty continued until King Pepin, in 747, addressed a question upon the subject to Pope Zachary. Even then the pope left each locality in some measure to its own traditions, but he decided clearly that once a man had received the subdiaconate he was no longer free to contract a new marriage. The doubtful point was the lawfulness of his continuing to live with his wife as her husband. During this Merovingian period the actual separation of the clergy from the wives which they had previously married was not insisted on. A law of the Emperor Honorius, in 420, forbids that these wives should be left unprovided for, and it even lays stress upon the fact that by their upright behaviour they had helped their husbands to earn that good repute which had made them worthy of ordination. However, this living together in the relation of brother and sister cannot have proved entirely satisfactory, even though it had in its favour such illustrious examples as those of St. Paulinus of Nola, and of Salvinianus of Marseilles.

At any rate the synods of the sixth and seventh centuries, while fully recognizing the position of these former wives and according them even the formal designation of bishopess, priestess, deaconess, and subdeaconess (*episcopissa, presbytera, diaconissa, subdiaconissa*), laid down some very strict rules to guide their relations with their former husbands. The bishopess, as a rule, did not live in the same house with the bishop (see the Council of Tours in 567, can. xiv). For the lower grades actual separation does not seem to have been required, although the Council of Orléans in 541, can. xvii, ordained: "ut sacerdotes sive diaconi cum conjugibus suis non habeant commune lectum et cellulam"; while curious regulations were enforced requiring the presence of subordinate clergy in the sleeping apartment of the bishop, archpriest, etc., to prevent all suspicion of scandal (see, e. g., the Council of Tours, in 567, canons xiii and xx). A good deal seems to have been done at the beginning of the Carlovingian epoch to set things upon a more satisfactory footing. To this St. Chrodegang (q. v., formerly the chancellor of Charles Martel, and after 742 Bishop of Metz, contributed greatly by his institution of canons. These were clergy leading a life in common (*vita canonica*), according to the rule composed for them by St. Chrodegang himself, but at the same time not precluded by their hours of study and prayer from giving themselves like ordinary secular priests to the pastoral duties of the ministry. This institution developed rapidly and met with much encouragement. In a slightly modified form the Rule of St. Chrodegang was approved by the Council of Aachen, in 816, and it formed the basis of the cathedral chapters in most of the dioceses throughout the dominions of Charlemagne.

The influence both of these canons who devoted themselves principally to the public recitation of the Office, as also of those who lived with the bishop in the *episcopium* and were busied with parochial work, seems to have had an excellent effect upon the general standard of clerical duty. Unfortunately, "the Iron Age", that terrible period of war, barbarism, and corruption in high places which marked the break-up of the Carlovingian Empire, followed almost immediately upon this revival. "Impurity, adultery, sacrilege and murder have overwhelmed the world", cried the Council of Trosly in 909. The episcopal sees, as we learn from such an authority as Bishop Egbert of Trier, were given as fiefs to rude soldiers, and were treated as property which descended by hereditary right from father to son (Imbert de la Tour, Les élections épics., I, vii; III, iv). A terrible picture of the decay both of clerical morality and of all sense of anything like vocation is drawn in the writings of St. Peter Damian, particularly in his "Liber Gomorrhianus". The style, no doubt, is rhetorical and exaggerated, and his authority as an eyewitness does not extend beyond that district of Northern Italy, in which he lived, but we have evidence from other sources that the corruption was widespread and that few parts of the world failed to feel the effect of the licence and venality of the times. How could it be otherwise when there were intruded into bishoprics on every side men of brutal nature and unbridled passions, who gave the very worst example to the clergy over whom they ruled? Undoubtedly during this period the traditions of sacerdotal celibacy in Western Christendom suffered severely, but even though a large number of the clergy, not only priests but bishops, openly took wives and begot children to whom they transmitted their benefices, the principle of celibacy was never completely surrendered in the official enactments of the Church.

With Pope St. Leo IX, St. Gregory VII (Hildebrand), and their successors, a determined and successful stand was made against the further spread of corruption. For a while in certain districts where effective interference appeared hopeless, it would seem that various synodal enactments allowed the rural clergy to retain the wives to whom they had previously been married. See, for example, the Councils of Lisieux in 1064 (Delisle in the "Journal des Savants", 1901, p. 517), Rouen in 1063 and 1072, and Winchester, this last presided over by Lanfranc, in 1076. In all these we may possibly trace the personal influence of William the Conqueror. But despite these concessions, the attitude of Gregory VII remained firm, and the reform which he consolidated has never subse-

quently been set aside. His determined attitude brought forth a whole literature of protests (see the Libelli de Lite, 3 vols., in Mon. Germ. Hist.), amongst others the letter "De Continentiâ" which Dr. H. C. Lea (Celibacy, 1907, I, 171) is not ashamed even now to attribute to St. Ulric of Augsburg, though every modern scholar admits it to be a forgery, fabricated more than a hundred years after St. Ulric's death. The point is of importance because the evidence seems to show that in this long struggle the whole of the more high-principled and more learned section of the clergy was enlisted in the cause of celibacy. The incidents of the long final campaign, which began indeed even before the time of Pope St. Leo IX and lasted down to the First Council of Lateran in 1123, are too complicated to be detailed here. We may note, however, that the attack was conducted along two distinct lines of action. In the first place, disabilities of all kinds were enacted and as far as possible enforced against the wives and children of ecclesiastics. Their offspring were declared to be of servile condition, debarred from sacred orders, and, in particular, incapable of succeeding to their fathers' benefices. The earliest decree in which the children were declared to be slaves, the property of the Church, and never to be enfranchised, seems to have been a canon of the Synod of Pavia in 1018. Similar penalties were promulgated later on against the wives and concubines (see the Synod of Melfi, 1189, can. xii), who by the very fact of their unlawful connexion with a subdeacon or clerk of higher rank became liable to be seized as slaves by the over-lord. Hefele (Conciliengeschichte, V, 195) sees in this the first trace of the principle that the marriages of clerics are *ipso facto* invalid.

As regards the offenders themselves, the strongest step seems to have been that taken by Nicholas II in 1059, and more vigorously by Gregory VII in 1075, who interdicted such priests from saying Mass and from all ecclesiastical functions, while the people were forbidden to hear the Masses which they celebrated or to admit their ministrations so long as they remained contumacious. In the controversies of this time the Masses said by these incontinent priests were sometimes described as "idolatrous"; but this word must not be pressed, as if it meant to insinuate that such priests were incapable of consecrating validly. The term was only loosely used, just as it was also sometimes applied at the same period to any sort of homage rendered to an antipope. Moreover the wording of a letter of Urban II (Ep. cclxxiii) enforcing the decree makes an exception for cases of urgent necessity, as, for example, when Communion has to be given to the dying. Clearly, therefore, the validity of the sacraments when consecrated or administered by a married priest was not in question. Finally, in 1123, at the First Lateran Council, an enactment was passed (confirmed more explicitly in the Second Lateran Council, can. vii) which, while not in itself very plainly worded, was held to pronounce the marriages contracted by subdeacons or ecclesiastics of any of the higher orders to be invalid (contracta quoque matrimonia ab hujusmodi personis disjungi . . . judicamus—can. xxi). This may be said to mark the victory of the cause of celibacy. Henceforth all conjugal relations on the part of the clergy in sacred orders were reduced in the eyes of the canon law to mere concubinage. Neither can it be pretended that this legislation, backed, as it were, by the firm and clear pronouncements of the Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215, and later by those of the Council of Trent, remained any longer a dead letter. Laxity among the clergy at certain periods and in certain localities must undoubtedly be admitted, but the principles of the canon law remained unshaken, and despite all assertions to the contrary made by unscrupulous assailants of the Roman system the call to a life of self-denying continence has, as a rule, been respected by the clergy of Western Christendom.

In England.—A few words may here be added in particular about the history of clerical celibacy upon English soil. Very extreme views have been put forward by various Anglican writers. Passing over Dr. Lea as quite untrustworthy, the following statement of a more sober writer, the Bishop of Salisbury (John Wordsworth), may be taken as a specimen. After declaring that during the Anglo-Saxon period the English clergy were undisguisedly married, he adds: "It would be easy to multiply evidence for the continuance of a practically married clergy in this country up to the time of the Reformation. Sometimes I believe that they were privately but still legally married so that their wives and children might have the benefit of their property after their death. For all marriages properly performed in England were valid according to the civil law, unless they were voided by action in the Bishop's Court, down to the passing of Lord Lyndhurst's Act in 1835, however much they might be contrary to law" (Ministry of Grace, p. 236). It can only be said that this is a quite gratuitous assertion, unsupported by any evidence yet produced, and founded in the main upon that strange misconception, so well exposed in Professor Maitland's "Roman Canon Law in the Church of England", that ecclesiastical law in England differed from, and was independent of, the *jus commune* (i. e. the canon law) of the Catholic Church. Objectors may safely be challenged to produce a single case during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in which a clerk in sacred orders went through the marriage ceremony with any woman, or in which his wife or the children born after his ordination claimed to inherit his property upon his death. On the other hand, the denunciations of all such unions as mere concubinage are innumerable, and the evidence for any great prevalence of these irregular connexions, despite the rhetorical exaggerations of such writers as Gower or Langland, is relatively slight. Unfortunately, nearly all the best-known popular histories (Trevelyan's "Age of Wicliffe" might be cited as a specimen) are written with a strong anti-Roman or anti-sacerdotal bias, particularly disastrous in matters in which there can be no question of comparative statistics, but only of general impressions.

With regard to the Saxon and Angevin period again, careful study of the evidence has convinced the present writer that a very exaggerated estimate has been formed of the prevalence of marriage or concubinage among the secular clergy. Two points deserve especially to be remembered. First, that the Anglo-Saxon word *preost* does not necessarily mean a priest but simply a cleric. The ordinary word for priest in the sense of *sacerdos*, was *maesse-preost*. This is continually ignored, but the evidence for it is quite unmistakable and is fully admitted in Bosworth-Toller's "Dictionary" and in the important monograph, "The Influence of Christianity upon the Vocabulary of Old English" (1902) by the American scholar Dr. H. MacGillivray. To take one illustration, Abbot Ælfric writes: "Gemaenes hades preostum is alyfed . . . thaet hi syferlice sincipes brucon"—i. e. "To clerics [*preostum*] of the common order [i. e. to clerks in minor orders] it is permitted that they enjoy marriage soberly"; and then he continues: "but in sooth to the others that minister at God's altar, that is to say to mass-priests and deacons (*maessepreostum* and *diaconum*), all conjugal relations are forbidden" (Ælfric, Homilies, ed. Thorpe, II, 94). Similarly, where Bede speaks of St. Wilfrid receiving the tonsure, the Anglo-Saxon translation, as in many similar cases, renders it, "he waes to preost gesceoren", i. e. he was shorn into a cleric (*preost*). Wilfrid's ordination as priest did not take place until several years later. Now the importance of this will be appreciated when we find a well-known historian

writing thus: "Celibacy was avowedly not practised by the northern clergy [in Anglo-Saxon England]. The law of the Northumbrian Priests declares 'if a priest forsake a woman and take another let him be excommunicate'. A priest might therefore take a wife and cleave to her without rebuke". (Hunt, The English Church to the Norman Conquest, 1899, p. 383.) Now this piece of evidence is quite inconclusive; the word *preost* which is here used, may or may not mean a cleric in sacred orders. We have no right to assume that it refers to any other class of *preost*, i. e. cleric, than those in minor orders who were always entirely free to marry. The second point which it is equally important to remember is that clerics in minor orders were a very numerous class in Saxon, Norman, and Angevin times. With us there are, practically speaking, no clerics but those who are immediately preparing for ordination to the priesthood, while such candidates now from their earliest years lead a life apart from the world in the seclusion of colleges and seminaries. In the medieval Church things were very different. Almost all young men with any little education preferred to enroll themselves in the ranks of the clergy by receiving the tonsure, hoping that some chance of employment or of a benefice might come their way. They were still free to marry and sometimes they married openly. But often, it seems, they entangled themselves in rather ambiguous relations which in the then state of the marriage law might easily be legitimized afterwards, but which also might be repudiated and broken off if they desired to receive ordination.

All this, which up to a certain point was not inconsistent with good faith, unfortunately prepared the way for easy relapses into incontinence, and generated a public opinion in which it was not accounted a reproach to be known as the son of a priest. Undoubtedly the sons of priests formed a large class. There was a natural tendency to bring them up also as clerics, and there was no doubt an immense amount of scheming, not unfrequently successful, to secure their promotion to the benefices held by their fathers. But it would be a great mistake to regard these sons of priests as all necessarily born in flagrant violation of the canons. The situation was a very complicated one, and it is impossible to pronounce any sober opinion upon its moral aspects without a careful study, on the one hand, of the conditions of social, and particularly of student, life, which in many respects contradict all the usages with which we are now familiar; and secondly, without an appreciation of the ambiguities of the marriage law, as regards which the difficulties raised by the *sponsalia de præsenti* have long been the despair of canonists (see Freisen, Geschichte des kanonischen Eherechts, 2nd ed., 1893). One of the Constitutions of the Legate Otho, issued in 1237, is particularly instructive in this connexion. He has learnt, he declares, on good authority that "many clerics [not yet priests, be it noted] forgetful of the salvation of their souls, after contracting a clandestine marriage, do not fear to retain the churches (to which they may previously have been appointed) without putting away their wives, and to acquire fresh ecclesiastical benefices and to be promoted to sacred orders contrary to the provisions of the sacred canons, and finally in due course of time after children have been reared from this union, to prove at the proper moment, by means of witnesses and documents, whether they themselves be still living or have passed away, that a marriage had really been contracted between the parties". (Wilkins, I, 653.) To meet this, Otho decrees that any married clerk in possession of a benefice, loses all title to it *ipso jure*, and secondly, that all property in possession of such clerks or priests who have been clandestinely married before their promotion to Holy orders, is to go to the Church and none of it to their children. But the whole legal aspect of the celibacy question in England can best be studied in the pages of Lyndewode's "Provinciale". (See particularly pp. 16 sqq. and 126–130, of the standard edition of 1679.) The one thing which Lyndewode makes clear, contrary to the statement of Bishop Wordsworth, quoted above, is that the English Church in the fifteenth century refused to recognize the existence of any such entity as a priest's "wife". It knew of nothing but *concubinæ* and denied to these any legal right whatever or any claim upon the property of the partner of their guilt.

Present Position.—With regard to the law of celibacy and its canonical effects in the Western Church at the present day, only one or two points can be briefly touched upon. For the details the reader must be referred to such a work as that of Wernz, "Jus Decretalium", II, 295–321. Clerks in minor orders, as already stated, are free to marry, and by such marriages they forfeit the *privilegia canonis* and the *privilegia fori* only in part, provided they observe the required conditions (cf. Decreta Conc. Trid., Sess XXIII, cap. vi); though in our day such observance is practically impossible; but they are incapable of being promoted to sacred orders unless they separate from their wives, and make a vow of perpetual continence. Further, if as clerks they held any benefice or ecclesiastical pension, these are at once forfeited by marriage, and they become incapable of acquiring any new benefice. Historically there has been some little variation of practice with regard to married clerks, and the severe measures enacted in their regard by Pope Alexander III were subsequently mitigated by Boniface VIII and the Council of Trent. As regards ecclesiastics in sacred orders (i. e. the subdiaconate and those that follow), the teaching of both theologians and canonists alike, for many centuries past, has been unanimous as regards the facts, though some little divergence has existed regarding the manner of explaining them. All are agreed that the subdeacon in presenting himself of his own free will for ordination binds himself by a tacit vow of chastity (see Wernz, IV, n. 393), and that this even constitutes a diriment impediment in view of any subsequent marriage. The idea of this *votum annexum* seems to be traceable in one form or another as far back as the time of Gregory the Great. Although the opposition to the law of celibacy frequently took the form of open agitation, both in the earlier Middle Ages and again at the Reformation period, only one such movement calls for notice in modern times. This was an association formed principally in Würtemberg and Baden in the early part of the nineteenth century to advocate the mitigation or repeal of the law of celibacy. The agitation was condemned by an Encyclical of Pope Gregory XVI, on 15 August, 1832, and no more permanent harm seems to have resulted than the publication of a certain amount of disaffected literature, such as the pretentious but extremely biassed and inaccurate work on compulsory celibacy by the brothers Theiner, a book which was at once prohibited by authority and repudiated by Aug. Theiner before he was reconciled to the Church (see bibliogr.).

Law of Celibacy in Oriental Churches.—Upon this head something has already been said above, and the general principle has been stated that in the Oriental Churches deacons and priests are free to retain the wives to whom they have been wedded before ordination, but are not allowed to contract any new marriage when once they are ordained. A few details may here be added about the practice of the different Churches, taking first the schismatical communions and then those united to the Holy See.

In the Greek Churches acknowledging the jurisdiction of the schismatic Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, etc., lectors and cantors, who are clerics in minor orders, are still free to marry, but if they contract a second marriage they can be promoted to no

higher grade, and if they are guilty of incontinence with any other person or marry a third time, they are no longer allowed to exercise their functions. Subdeacons seem to be able to marry a second time without being deposed, but in that case they cannot be promoted to the priesthood. Again, a priest who before his ordination has contracted an unlawful marriage, even unwittingly, is no longer permitted to exercise his priestly functions when the fact is discovered. Priests and deacons are bidden to practise continence during the time of their service of the altar. In 1897 there seem to have been 4025 parish churches in Greece, and these were served by 5423 married and 242 unmarried priests.

In the Russian Church, though a previous marriage seems to be, practically speaking, a *conditio sine quâ non* for ordination in the case of the secular clergy, still their canonists deny that this is a strict obligation. The candidate for orders must either be already married or must formally declare his intention of remaining celibate. Any marriage attempted after the reception of the subdiaconate is invalid and the ecclesiastic so offending renders himself liable to severe penalties. Further, to have been already married, or to have married a widow, or to have contracted any other marriage which offends against the canons—e. g. with a near relative, an unbeliever, or person of notoriously loose character, e. g. an actress —constitutes a disqualification for ordination. Formerly the priest who lost his wife was required to retire into a monastery. He is still free to do so and in this way may qualify for higher functions, e. g. for the episcopate, etc., the bishops in the Greek and Russian Church being selected exclusively from the monastic clergy. Since the beginning of the eighteenth century, widower priests are no longer compelled to retire into monasteries, but they need the permission of the Synod to continue to discharge their parochial functions.

In the Armenian Church, again, clerics in minor orders are still free to contract marriage, and such marriage is required as a condition for ordination to the simple secular priesthood. Besides monks and the ordinary clergy, the Armenian Church recognizes a class of *Vartapeds*, or preachers, who are celibate priests of higher education. From their ranks the bishops and higher clergy are as a rule selected. It is only by exception that a monk is chosen to the episcopate.

Amongst the Nestorians celibacy is not so much honoured as amongst most of the Oriental Churches. Priests and deacons may marry even after ordination, and if their wife should die they may marry a second or even a third time. Still, bishops are required to live as celibates, though formerly this does not seem to have been the case.

The Copts and also the Abyssinian Monophysites resemble the Greek Church in their laws regarding clerical marriage. A marriage contracted after the reception of Holy orders, or any second marriage, involves deposition. All the Coptic bishops are chosen from the monastic clergy. Among the Syrian Jacobites similar rules prevail. Bishops, as a rule, are chosen from the monks and a second marriage is forbidden to a priest who is left a widower. If, however, he marries, the marriage is regarded as valid though he is deprived of his clerical functions.

Turning now to the Oriental Churches in communion with the Holy See, we may note that as a general principle married clerics are not ineligible for the subdiaconate, diaconate, and priesthood. As in the Russian Church they must either be married in accordance with the canons (i. e. not to a widow, etc.), or else as a preliminary to ordination they are asked whether they will promise to observe chastity. The full recognition of the right of the Oriental clergy to retain their wives will be found in the Constitution of Benedict XIV, "Etsi pastoralis", 26 May, 1742. There has, however, been a strong movement of recent years among the Oriental Uniat Churches favouring conformity with Western Christendom in this matter of celibacy. For example, the Armenian Church dependent upon the Patriarch of Cilicia, even as far back as July, 1869, passed a resolution that celibacy should be required of all the higher orders of the clergy. Again the Synod of Scharfa in Syria, in 1888, decreed that "the celibate life which is already observed by the great majority of the priests of our Church should henceforth be common to all", although the deacons and priests who were already married were allowed to continue as before, and though a certain power of dispensation in cases of necessity was left with the patriarch. Similarly in 1898 a synod of the Uniat Copts at Alexandria decreed that henceforth all candidates for any of the higher orders must be celibate "according to the ancient discipline of the Church of Alexandria and the other Churches of God".

Historical.—VACANDARD in *Dict. de Théologie*, s. v. *Célibat;* IDEM in *Etudes de Critique* (Paris, 1905), 71–120; PHILLIPS in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Cölibat;* FUNK, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen* (Paderborn, 1897), I, 121–155 and 450–455; HEFELE, *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte*, I; BICKELL in *Zeitschrift f. Kath. Theologie* (Innsbruck, 1878–1879); THOMASSIN, *Vetus et Nova Eccles. Disciplina*, I, Bk. II, c. 60–67; ZACCARIA, *Storia Polemica del Celibato Sacro* (Fuligno, 1785); FRIEDBERG in *Realencyk. f. prot. theol.*, IV, s. v. *Cölibat;* PAVY, *Du célibat ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1852); CARRY, *Le célibat ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1901).

Canon Law.—WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1905), II, 295–321, and IV, 574–607; ROSKOVÁNY, *Cœlibatus et Breviarium* (17 vols., Pesth, 1861–1890); LAURIN, *Der Cölibat der Geistlichen nach canonischen Rechte* (Wien, 1880); DILGSKRON, in *Analecta Ecclesiastica* (1893, 1894); GAUGUSCH, *Ehehindernis der höhern Weihe* (1902).

Oriental Churches.—MILÂSCH, *Das Kirchenrecht der Morgenländischen Kirche* (2nd ed., Mostar, 1905), 267, 598; SILBERNAGEL, *Verfassung und gegenwärtiger Bestrand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (Freiburg, 1903); PAPP-SZILAGYI, *Encheiridion Juris Eccl. Orientalis Catholici: Collectio Lacensis*, II.

Opponents of Celibacy.—LEA, *History of Sacerdotal Celibacy* (2 vols., London, 1907, 3rd ed.); WORDSWORTH, *The Ministry of Grace* (London, 1901), 206–256; WHARTON, *On Celibacy;* THEINER, *Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit* (3 vols., 1892, 3rd ed.).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Cella, one of the names by which the small memorial chapels sometimes erected in the Christian cemeteries of the first age were known; these edifices are also referred to as *memoriæ martyrum, confessiones*, etc. The term *cella* in this sense occurs in a very interesting inscription of Cæsarea in Mauretania quoted by De Rossi (Bullet., April, 1864):—

AREAM AT [AD] SEPULCHRA CULTOR VERBI
CONTULIT,
ET CELLAM STRUXIT SUIS CUNCTIS SUMPTIBUS.

[This cemetery (*area*) was given by a worshipper of the Word, who also erected a chapel (*cella*) at his own expense.] It is the general opinion of archæologists that the edifices erected in the Roman cemeteries by Pope Fabian (236–250) [*Multas fabricas per cymeteria fieri præcepit* (Lib. Pont., I, 148)] were memorial *cellæ* constructed primarily as places for the celebration of the funeral *agapæ* or anniversaries by friends of the deceased, when the *oblatio pro dormitione*, or Mass for the dead, was offered. Two such *cellæ*, or cemeterial basilicas, dedicated respectively to Sts. Sixtus and Cecilia and St. Soter, may still be seen in the cemetery of St. Callistus. In form they belong to the class of edifices known as *cellæ trichoræ*, each consisting of a rectangular nave terminating in three semicircular apses, the chords of which form three sides of a square. In other instances *cellæ* terminate in a single apse. Originally each of these *cellæ* consisted of three apses alone which probably served as a choir or sanctuary for the clergy during the celebration of the liturgy, while the congregation assisted at the services from the adjacent lawn. Owing to the great respect of the Roman civil authorities for

places of interment, it is conjectured that, except in the more rigorous persecutions, the Christians may have sometimes held their regular Sunday liturgical services in the manner described, under the pretext of memorial services for the dead.

VENABLES in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v.; KRAUS, *Gesch. der christl. Kunst* (Freiburg, 1896), I; KAUFMANN, *Handbuch der christl. Archäologie* (Paderborn, 1905).

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Cellier, ELIZABETH, a noted London midwife, who came into prominence through the pretended "Meal-Tub Plot" of 1680. Nothing seems known of her life till her marriage with Peter Cellier, a Frenchman, and her conversion from Anglicanism. In 1678 the prisons were filled with Catholics in consequence of the national alarm caused by the fabricated plots of Titus Oates. Mrs. Cellier's charity led her to visit and relieve these prisoners, and as her profession procured for her the acquaintance of many leading Catholic ladies, she often became the channel of their charity towards the prisoners. Among these ladies was the Countess of Powis, whose kindness was shown to, among others, a clever impostor, Thomas Dangerfield. Becoming aware of this man's true character, Lady Powis ceased to assist him further, and he, in revenge, decided to denounce her to the Government as concerned in a new popish plot. His story was that he had been released from prison through the good offices of Lady Powis and Mrs. Cellier, on condition that he would assassinate the king, Lord Shaftesbury, and others. He further pretended that he was to be engaged in manufacturing false plots to be foisted on those who were known to be unfavourable to the Catholic cause. One of these shams was to be based on a document which, he alleged, was hidden in a meal-tub in Mrs. Cellier's house. Search was made, and in a meal-tub the paper in question was found. It charged with treason most of the leading Protestants, including the king's natural son, the Duke of Monmouth, the Earl of Shaftesbury, and Sir Thomas Waller, who was the very official charged with the search. In consequence of Dangerfield's accusation founded on this document, Lady Powis and Mrs. Cellier were arrested, as well as some other Catholics, among them the Earl of Castlemain. Mrs. Cellier's trial took place on 11 June, 1680. She was charged with high treason, but practically the only evidence against her was that of Dangerfield himself, and she had little difficulty in proving him a witness entirely unworthy of credence. She was found not guilty, and Dangerfield himself was arrested on account of a felony, for which he had been previously outlawed. After her acquittal she published a brief relation of the whole affair, under the title of "Malice Defeated". This led not only to a long series of pamphlets for and against her, but also to her second prosecution. The charge this time was that of libel against the king and ministry, because she alleged that two witnesses in the Edmundbury Godfrey case had been tortured. But the real object of this prosecution, according to Roger North, was to prevent her from giving evidence in favour of the imprisoned Catholic peers. For this she was sentenced to pay a fine of £1,000 and to stand three times in the pillory. During the reign of James II she planned the foundation of a corporation of skilled midwives and a foundling hospital. It is stated that she is buried in Great Missenden Church, Buckinghamshire. She wrote: (1) "Malice Defeated; or a brief relation of the Accusation and Deliverance of Elizabeth Cellier" (London, 1680); (2) "A scheme for the Foundation of a Royal Hospital and raising a revenue of £5000 or £6000 a year by and for the maintenance of a Corporation of skilful midwives" (London, 1687), printed in the "Harleian Miscellany" (IV, 142) and in the "Somers Tracts" (II, 243); (3) "To Dr. ———, An answer to his Queries concerning the College of Midwives" (London, 1687–88).

Trial and Sentence of Elizabeth Cellier for writing, printing, and publishing a scandalous libel called Malice Defeated (London, 1680); LINGARD, *History of England* (London, 1883), IX, 461; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1885), I, 441; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1887), IX, 417.

EDWIN BURTON.

MORSE MADE FOR CLEMENT VII BY CELLINI
(From a contemporary drawing, British Museum)

Cellini, BENVENUTO, goldsmith, medallist, and sculptor, b. in Florence 3 November, 1500; d. there 13 February, 1571. He came of old Florentine stock, his father being Giovanni Cellini, an architect and musician, and his mother Elizabetta Granacci. Benvenuto's musical education was begun very early by his father, but since the boy's ambitions and longings were all for plastic art, he was permitted, at the age of fourteen, to enter on a career that made him the most famous goldsmith of the world. It was not until his fortieth year that he commenced his efforts in statuary. Cellini was ever a dutiful son and unselfishly devoted to his brother and sister. He was brave, generous, self-reliant, notoriously hot-tempered, and quick to avenge a slight or an insult. His self-confessed crimes are mostly street fights, where his ungovernable temper overmastered him, as, for instance, when the taunts of Pompeo, with his band of friends, provoked a blow from Cellini that proved immediately fatal. It was a street brawl, not unusual among the Florentines of the sixteenth century, and the blow was meant to wound but not to kill. Pope Paul III investigated the affair and Cellini was pardoned.

To please his old father, Cellini did not discontinue his musical studies, and became for a time a member of Pope Clement's band of musicians, but all his energies were given to the goldsmith's art. He became "unique in his profession" (Pope Paul III). He began his studies under Marcone and Francesco Salimbene in Florence, and continued them at Rome under Giovanni, called "Il Firenzuola", with whom he quarrelled, choosing, later, Pagolo Arsago as a master. With Arsago he remained two years and then went back to Florence and his old master Salimbene. He wrote treatises on the goldsmith's art, sculpture, and bronze-casting; he composed verses, and acquired world-wide fame by his minute and lengthy autobiography. In his

"Life" he shows himself, with intense reality of self-delineation, to be a vain and boastful man, and while the style is simple, even plebeian, there abound dramatic movement and Florentine wit, which make the book "more amusing than any novel" (Walpole). This wonderful romance has great historical value, and sixteenth-century Rome and Florence are therein vividly portrayed. Goethe translated it into German.

Cellini was a soldier, and did yeoman duty at the sack of Rome in 1527; it was claimed he aimed the gun that killed the enemies' leader, Constable Bourbon. Accused of stealing the Church's funds, Cellini was arrested and imprisoned in the Castle of Sant' Angelo from 1537 until 1539, when he made his escape. After his recapture he was treated with a harshness out of all proportion to the crime. Indeed, the evidence distinctly pointed to his innocence, and in 1540 the pope granted him a full pardon. Cellini was admitted to the Florentine nobility in 1554. Without pledging himself to enter into religion, he took the first tonsure in 1558, but gave up his aspirations to the priesthood two years later. At the age of sixty-four he married Piera, daughter of Salvadore Parigi who, with a son and daughter, survived him. In 1564 occurred the obsequies of Michelangelo, and, with Ammanati, Cellini represented Sculpture in the funeral procession. Beset with many worries and physical ills he died, and was buried with public honours in the church of the Annunziata, an oration being then delivered "praising him for his life and work". He was a man of sincere faith and, as he says, "took all his difficulties to God".

Cellini's marvellous work in precious metals made him famous throughout Europe. His services in gold, his flagons, rings, and jewels exhibit the highest skill, the perfection of execution, and the widest range of invention. Cellini made the dies for the mints of Pope Paul III and Pope Clement VII, and designed the coins for Duke Alessandro de' Medici of Florence. Everything minted under his direction attained the highest artistic excellence. And, too, his work in alto-rilievo was as fine as that in basso-rilievo. His small figures in gold are beautiful, a morse for Pope Clement's cope, on which the figure of God the Father surmounts a diamond, surrounded by a group of cherubs, and a foil for the pope's diamond being two of his greatest achievements. If there be any fault in his productions, it is a tendency to be luxuriant.

In 1540 Cardinal Ferrara, his benefactor, who obtained his release from prison, took Cellini to Paris, to the Court of Francis I. Here he made a colossal statue of Mars and a silver Jupiter. He began casting life-size and gigantic figures in bronze, and was supremely successful. He consummated his career in 1545, when he returned to Florence to model and cast in bronze for Cosimo de' Medici, the famous "Perseus". The sturdy demi-god, with tense muscles, stands firmly, holding aloft in his left hand the head of Medusa, his right tightly gripping a short sword. His calmly triumphant gaze rests on the torso prostrate beneath his foot. In the wax model the body of Perseus is not so short and thick, and his limbs are not as coarse as in the finished bronze. The casting of this celebrated statue, which is still in Florence, was "the acme of technical dexterity, "the metal filling the mould from the head of Medusa to the foot of Perseus". Cellini's last important work was the crucifix in white marble presented to Philip II of Spain by the Duke of Florence, and now in the Escorial. Among his other works still preserved are a golden salt-cellar (Vienna) and a shield, elaborately wrought (Windsor Castle).

PLON, *Benvenuto Cellini, Orfèvre, Médailleur, Sculpteur* (Paris, 1883); *The Life of Benvenuto Cellini*, tr. SYMONDS (London, 1901).

LEIGH HUNT.

Cellites. See ALEXIANS.

Celsus. See NAZARIUS AND CELSUS.

Celsus the Platonist, an eclectic Platonist and polemical writer against Christianity, who flourished towards the end of the second century. Very little is known about his personal history except that he lived during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, that his literary activity falls between the years 175 and 180, and that he wrote a work entitled ἀληθὴς λόγος ("The True Word", "or "The True Discourse"), against the Christian religion. He is one of several writers named Celsus, who appeared as opponents of Christianity in the second century; he is probably the Celsus who was known as a friend of Lucian, although some doubt this, because Lucian's friend was an Epicurean, and the author of the "True Discourse" shows himself a Platonist. It is generally supposed that Celsus was a Roman. His intimate acquaintance, however, with the Jewish religion and his knowledge, such as it was, of Egyptian ideas and customs incline some historians to think he belonged to the Eastern portion of the empire. Those who believe him to have been a Roman explain his knowledge of Jewish and Egyptian matters by assuming that he acquired that knowledge either by travelling, or by mingling with the foreign population of Rome.

Celsus owes his prominence in the history of Christian polemics not so much to the pre-eminent character of his work, as to the circumstance that about the year 240 a copy of the work was sent to Origen by his friend Ambrosius, with a request to write a refutation of it. This Origen, after some hesitation, consented to do, and embodied his answer in the treatise "Against Celsus" (κατὰ Κέλσου). So careful is Origen to cite the very words of his opponent that it is possible to reconstruct the text of Celsus from Origen's answer, a task which was accomplished by Jachmann in 1836, and more successfully by Keim in 1873. The original of Celsus's treatise having perished, the text reconstructed from Origen (about nine-tenths of the original has in this way been recovered) is our only primary source.

Celsus's work may be divided as follows: a preface, an attack on Christianity from the point of view of Judaism, an attack on Christianity from the point of view of philosophy, a refutation of Christian teachings in detail, and an appeal to Christians to adopt paganism. In the preface Celsus forecasts the general plan of his attack by describing in the first place the general character of Christianity and then proceeding to accuse both Christian and Jew of "separatism", that is to say, of arrogating to themselves a superior wisdom, while in reality their ideas concerning the origin of the universe, etc., are common to all peoples and to the wise men of antiquity. In the second portion, Celsus argues that Christ did not fulfil the Messianic expectations of the Hebrew people. Christ, he says, claimed to be of virgin birth; in reality, He was the son of a Jewish village woman, the wife of a carpenter. The flight into Egypt, the absence of any divine intervention in favour of the Mother of Jesus, who was driven forth with her husband, and other arguments are used to show that Christ was not the Messias. During the course of His public ministry Christ could not convince His countrymen that His mission was divine. As followers He had ten or twelve "infamous publicans and fishermen". Such is not the company that befits a god. (This is one out of many instances in which Celsus suddenly passes from the Jewish to the pagan point of view.) As to the miracles ascribed to Christ, some, said Celsus, were merely fictitious narratives, the others, if they did really take place, are not more wonderful than the deeds of the Egyptians and other adepts in the magic arts. He next proceeds (cf. Orig., "Contra Celsum", II) to upbraid those Jews who, "abandoning the law of their fa-

OBVERSE
MEDAL OF CLEMENT VII

HAND BELL OF CLEMENT VII
ROTHSCHILD COLLECTION

REVERSE
FIGURE OF PEACE

SEAL OF HIPPOLYTE CARDINAL
D'ESTE

SEAL OF HERCULES OF
GONZAGA

BENVENUTO CELLINI, FROM A PORTRAIT
PAINTED ON PORPHYRY

BUST OF COSMO DE' MEDICI
FLORENCE

SILVER COIN VALUE OF TWO
CARLINS. PORTRAIT OF
CLEMENT VII



ARMOUR OF CHARLES IX OF SWEDEN
STOCKHOLM

BENVENUTO CELLINI

thers", allowed themselves to be deceived by one whom their nation had condemned, and changed their name from Hebrew to Christian. Jesus did not fulfil His promises to the Jews; instead of succeeding as they should have expected the Messias to succeed, He failed even to keep the confidence and loyalty of His chosen followers. His alleged prediction of His death is an invention of His Disciples, and the fable of His Resurrection is nothing new to those who remember the similar stories related of Zamolxis, Pythagoras, and Rhampsinit. If Christ rose from the dead, why did He appear to His Disciples only, and not to His persecutors and to those who mocked Him?

In the third portion (cf. Origen, op. cit., III) Celsus inaugurates a general attack on Christianity from the point of view of philosophy. He upbraids both Jews and Christians with their ridiculous disagreement in matters of religion, whereas, in fact, both religions rest on the same principles: the Jews revolted from the Egyptians and the Christians from the Jews; sedition was in both cases the true cause of separation. Next, he upbraids the Christians with lack of unity among themselves; so many sects are there, and so different, that they have nothing in common save the name Christian. Like almost all the pagan opponents of Christianity he finds fault with Christians because they exclude from their fellowship the "wise and good", and consort only with the ignorant and sinful. He misunderstands the Christian teaching regarding the Incarnation, "as if", he says, "God could not by His own power accomplish the work which He sent Christ on earth to accomplish". With this misunderstanding is connected Celsus's false view of the Christian teaching on the subject of Divine Providence and God's special care of mankind as compared with the plants and animals. The world, he says, was not "made for man's use and benefit", but for the perfection and completion of God's plan of the universe. In the fourth part of his "True Discourse" (cf. Origen, op. cit., V) Celsus takes up the teachings of the Christians in detail and refutes them from the point of view of the history of philosophy. Whatever is true in the doctrines of the Christians was borrowed, he contends, from the Greeks, the Christians having added nothing except their own perverse misunderstanding of the tenets of Plato, Heraclitus, Socrates, and other Greek thinkers. "The Greeks", he says, "tell us plainly what is wisdom and what is mere appearance, the Christians ask us at the outset to believe what we do not understand, and invoke the authority of one who was discredited even among his own followers." In like manner the Christian teaching concerning the Kingdom of God is merely a corruption of Plato's doctrine; when the Christians tell us that God is a spirit, they are merely repeating the saying of the Stoics that God is "a spirit penetrating all and encompassing all". Finally, the Christian idea of a future life is borrowed from the Greek poets and philosophers; the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is simply a corruption of the world-old idea of transmigration of souls. In the fifth, and last, portion of his work (cf. Origen, op. cit., VII, lxii sqq.; VIII) Celsus invites the Christians to abandon their "cult" and join the religion of the majority. He defends the worship of idols, the invocation of demons (δαίμονες), the celebration of popular feasts, urging among other considerations, that the Christian who enjoys the bounties of nature ought, in common gratitude, to render thanks to the powers of nature. He concludes his treatise by an appeal to Christians to abandon their "vain hope" of establishing the rule of Christianity over all the earth; he invites them to give up their "life apart", and take their place among those who by word and deed and active service contribute to the welfare of the empire. In an epilogue he promises another work (whether it was ever written we do not know) in which he is to explain in detail how those who would and could follow his philosophy of life should live.

The aim of Celsus's work is different from that of the other opponents of Christianity in the early centuries. He exhibits comparatively little of the bitterness which characterized their attacks. He does not descend to the lower level of pagan polemics. For instance, he omits the customary accusation of atheism, immorality, "Thyestian feasts and Œdipodean gatherings", accusations which were very commonly urged against the Christians for the purpose of rousing popular indignation. His aim was, perhaps, eirenic. His appeal to his Christian contemporaries to abandon their separatism and make common cause with the pagan subjects of the empire may have been more than a rhetorical device. It may have been inspired by a sincere wish to "convert" the Christians to an appreciation and adoption of the pagan philosophy of life. Indeed, Origen acknowledges that his opponent is not blind to the unfavourable side of pagan religion, especially to the abuses of particular cults and the absurdities of popular mythology. It is only just to Celsus, therefore, to ascribe to him all possible sincerity in his wish to "help all men", and to bring all men to the ideal of "one religion". On the other hand, Celsus's attitude towards the Christian religion was, it hardly need be said, that of a pagan not well informed on all points and devoid of that sympathy which alone would enable him to understand the meaning of the most essential tenets of Christianity. He was remarkably well read in pagan literature, and, besides, was acquainted with the religious ideas of the "barbarous" peoples.

His knowledge of Judaism and Christianity was such as could not have been obtained from books alone. He must have consorted with Jewish and Christian teachers, and with the representatives of the Gnostic sects. Hence arose the danger of confounding with the official doctrine of Christianity the tenets of a particular school of Gnostic interpretations, a danger which Celsus did not succeed in escaping, as is evident in many passages of his work, and as Origen was very careful to point out. He was acquainted with the Old Testament only in part. He used the "books of the Christians", the Gospels and, possibly, some of the Pauline Epistles, but on the latter point there is room for doubt. Celsus may have obtained his knowledge of St. Paul's teaching by conversation with Christians. There can be no doubt, however, that he used the Gospels, not merely some proto-evangelical documents, but the four narratives substantially as we have them to-day. Celsus took pains to make himself acquainted with the beliefs of his Christian contemporaries, and he is unquestionably conscious of his knowledge of Christianity. Yet, he has no suspicion of the distinction between the universally accepted teachings of the "great Church" of the Christians and the doctrines peculiar to Ophites, Marcionites, and other heretical sects. Moreover, he is, if indeed well-intentioned, yet a partisan; he adopts the current Roman notion that Christianity is merely an offshoot of Judaism; in regard to the person of Christ he exhibits none of that respect which the later Platonists manifested towards the founder of Christianity; towards the miracles ascribed to Christ he shows a sceptical spirit, at one time describing them as fables invented by the Disciples, at another paralleling them with the wonders wrought by Egyptian sorcerers; he looks upon the Resurrection of Christ as either a silly story invented by the followers of Jesus, or a ghost-apparition such as is narrated of many of the heroes of antiquity. Above all, he fails to attain a correct understanding of the doctrine of Incarnation and atonement. When he comes to speak of the manner of life of his Christian neighbours, he, in common with all his pagan fellow-writers, cannot see the reasonable-

ness of Christian humility, nor can he reconcile with the Christian hope of conquering the world to Christ, the fact that Christian proselytizers shun encounters with the learned and powerful and seek out the poor and the sinful, women, children, and slaves, and preach the Gospel to them. His manner too, in spite of the probable eirenic scope of his work, is that of a special pleader for paganism who uses all the resources of dialectic and rhetoric, all the artifices of wit and sarcasm to make his opponents seem ridiculous. Perhaps the secret of his efforts to render Christianity ridiculous is betrayed in his open disapproval of the attitude of aloofness which Christians adopted towards the interest and welfare of the empire. "You refuse to serve the state," he says, "in peace or in war; you wish its downfall; you use all the force of your magic arts to accomplish the ruin of mankind".

Celsus anticipated in his criticism of the New Testament the objections which have in our own time become identified with the names of Strauss and Renan. Similarly, in the objections which he urged from the point of view of philosophy he anticipated in a striking manner the arguments used by modern rationalists and evolutionists. Too much stress has, perhaps, been laid on the last point. Nevertheless, it is interesting, to say the least, to find a second-century opponent of Christianity off-setting the Christian idea of a direct divine origin of man by the theory that men and animals have a common natural origin, and that the human soul is sprung from the animal soul.

Celsus is generally described as a Platonist in philosophy. This is correct, if not understood in a too exclusive sense. Although he antedates Plotinus, the first great neo-Platonist, by almost half a century, he belongs to the age of syncretism in which Greek philosophy, realizing the inadequacy of its own resources, developed an eclectic spiritualism which welcomed and strove to assimilate the religious teachings of the various Oriental peoples. This syncretic tendency was resorted to as a remedy against the materialism and scepticism in which philosophy had, as it were, run to seed. Thus Celsus draws his philosophy not only from the genuine works of Plato, but also from the pseudo-Platonic writings, especially the so-called letters of Plato, from Heraclitus, Empedocles, the Stoics, the Epicureans, and from the religious systems of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, Hindus, etc. The fundamental principles, however, on which he builds this syncretic system, are Platonic. God, he teaches, is the ineffable, unknowable One, the Source of all things, Himself without source, the All-pervading Logos, the World-Soul. God is a spirit, and whatever has come directly from His hands is spirit. Material things He made through the agency of created gods. The substance of material things is eternal matter; all force is spirit (angel or demon) indwelling in matter. The human soul is divine in its origin; it was placed in the body on account of some primordial sin. All change, all growth and decay in the universe, is not the result of chance or violence but part of a plan of development in which spirits minister to the design of an all-seeing, infinitely beneficent spirit. Even the vicissitudes of the idea of God, the various religions of ancient and modern times, are, says Celsus, part of the divinely appointed scheme of things. For no matter how the religions of the world may differ among themselves, they all hold that there is one God who is supreme. Moreover, the various mythological concepts must be understood to mean the same powers (*δυνάμεις*) which are worshipped in different countries under different names. Those are the beneficent powers which give increase and fruit to the tiller of the soil. Christians are, therefore, ungrateful for the gifts of nature when they refuse to worship the deities who symbolize the forces of nature. Finally these powers, spirits, or demons, mediate between God and man, and are the immediate source of prophecy and wonder-working. This last point is important. To understand Celsus's criticism of the Gospel narrative it is necessary to remember that he was a firm believer in the possibility of cures by magic.

Celsus's treatise is contained in Origen's work; for the Greek text cf. KOETSCHAU, *Origenes Werke* (Leipzig, 1899), also MIGNE, P. G., XI. A German translation of the treatise is published by KEIM, *Celsus' wahres Wort* (Zurich, 1873); PATRICK, *The Apology of Origen in reply to Celsus* (Edinburgh, 1897); BIGG, *Neoplatonism* (London, 1895); GEM, *Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (Oxford, 1886); LIGHTFOOT, *Apostolic Fathers*, Part II, II (London, 1885); FAIRWEATHER, *Origen* (New York, 1901); CRUTWELL, *Literary History of Early Christianity* (London, 1893), II, 498 sqq.; KAYSER, *La philosophie de Celse* (Strasburg, 1843); PÉLAGAUD, *Etude sur Celse* (Paris, 1878); BUHL, *La polémique de Celse* (Strasburg, 1844); EHRHARD, *Altchristliche Litteratur*, Part I (Freiburg, 1900), 335 sqq.; HARNACK, *Gesch. der altchristlichen Litteratur* (Berlin, 1897), II, pt. I, 314-5; BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchlichen Litteratur* (Freiburg, 1892), I, 158 sqq.; FUNK, *Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandl. u. Untersuch.* (Paderborn, 1899), II, 152 sqq.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Celtes, CONRAD (properly CONRAD PICKEL, or MEISEL; called also in Lat. PROTUSIUS), a German Humanist, b. at Wipfeld in Lower Franconia, 1 February, 1459; d. at Vienna, 4 February, 1508. He pursued his studies at Cologne (1477) and Heidelberg (1484), and at the latter university received the stimulating instruction of such men as Dalberg and Agricola. After this he wandered about for a time as a "travelling scholar", delivering humanistic lectures at Erfurt, Rostock, and Leipzig. While at Leipzig he issued his first work, "Ars versificandi et carminum" (1486), as well as an edition of Seneca. In 1486 he went to Rome, where he had friendly relations with Pomponius Lætus; travelling through Italy he became acquainted at Florence with Marsilio Ficino, at Bologna with Beroaldus, and at Venice with Sabellicus and the celebrated printer, Aldus Manutius.

D M S
FLETE PII VATES ET TVNDITE PECTORA PALMIS
VESTER ENIM HIC CELTIS FATA SVPREMA TVLIT
MORTVVS ILLE QVIDEM SED LONGV VIVVS IN EVVM
COLOQVTVR DOCTIS PER SVA SCRIPTA VIRIS
CHVNCEL·PROVIENNE LAVREE CVSTOS E COLLATOR
HIC IN CHRISCVTESCIT VIXIT AN·LXI·SAL·SESQVIMIL·
SVB DIVO MAXIMIL·AVGVST·
ET VIR

CONRAD CELTES
(Wood engraving by Burckmair)

On the return of Celtes to Germany Frederick III, at the instance of the Elector Frederick of Saxony, crowned him Poet Laureate. This ceremony took place with much pomp at Nuremberg, and he received, at the same time, a doctor's degree. Soon after this Celtes made a wandering tour throughout the whole of Germany. In the course of his travels he went to Cracow (c. 1488), where he busied himself with mathematics and the natural sciences, and formed friendships with a number of able Humanists, such as Lorenzo Rab and Bonacursius. In imitation of the Roman Academy (see ACADEMIES, ROMAN) he founded at Cracow a learned society called the *Sodalitas Litterarum Vistulana*, and another, entitled the *Sodalitas Litterarum Hungarorum* in Hungary, to which country he proceeded by way of Prague and Olmütz. The name of this latter association was afterwards changed to *Sodalitas Litterarum Danubiana*, and its seat transferred to Vienna (1494). On the return journey Celtes stopped at Passau, Ratisbon, and Nuremberg, and went as far as Mainz and Heidelberg, where the *Sodalitas Litterarum Rhenana* was founded.

On a second tour, in 1491, he reached Lübeck, where his efforts to form an association of scholars proved unsuccessful. In 1494 he became professor at Ingolstadt; this position, however, put no check on his propensity for wandering, and when the pest raged at Ingolstadt he was at Heidelberg as tutor to the Palatine princes. In 1497 the emperor called him to Vienna, where he gave humanistic and historical lectures, some of which were on the works of classic writers, as Apuleius, Cicero, Tacitus, etc.

The lectures of Celtes were as permanent in their effects on the advancement and spread of the spirit of humanistic learning as was the founding of his various learned associations. Especially was he of great importance for the science of history, in that he was the first to treat the history of the world as a whole, and to bring the history of the empire into connexion with that of other nations. His greatest labour, however, the "Germania Illustrata", a work in which he desired to preserve the results both of his long journeys and of his researches in the history of the empire, remained a fragment. He gained a name for himself in the literary world by the discovery and publication of the writings of the nun Roswitha (Hroswitha). Although Aschbach's assumption that Celtes had forged these works excited for a time serious discussion, yet Köpke and others succeeded in clearing him of this charge (Ottonische Studien, II). Still further literary credit is due Celtes for his publication of the "Ligurinus" of Gunther, and for the discovery of the "Tabula Peutingeriana" (a map of the military roads of the Roman Empire). No less creditable to his literary sagacity is the collection of Greek and Latin manuscripts which he made as librarian of the imperial library founded by Maximilian I at Vienna. He also won fame as a poet, and was the guiding spirit of the Poets' Academy at Vienna, the first institution of this kind to be established. Nevertheless his "IV Libri Amorum", "IV Libri Odarum", and "V Libri Epigrammatum" are works of no great merit; their contents are in part very free, if not erotic. Celtes was an Epicurean, and, like many of the more free-thinking Humanists, in his concept of the standards of life he placed a higher value on the ancient heathen, than on the Christian, ideal. On this point he was obliged to bear much blunt reproof from his friend, Charitas Pirkheimer.

Klüpfel, *De vitâ et scriptis C. Celtis* (Freiburg, 1827), 2 vols., contains an exhaustive list of his writings; Ruith, *C. Celtes* (1852); Aschbach, *Die früheren Wanderjahre des C. Celtes* in *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad., philos.-hist. Klasse* (1868), LX, 75–150, and in *Gesch. der Universität Wien*, II, 189–270; Hartfelder, *Celtes als Lehrer* in *Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Päd.*, 128, 299, and in *Zeitschr. f. vergleichende Literaturgesch.* (1890); new series, 3, 331 sqq.; Geiger, *C. Celtes in seinen Beziehungen zur Geographie* (Munich, 1896).

Joseph Sauer.

Celtic Church. See Ireland.

Celtic Rite, The.—This subject will be treated under the following seven heads: I. History and Origin; II. MS. Sources; III. The Divine Office; IV. The Mass; V. The Baptismal Service; VI. The Visitation, Unction, and Communion of the Sick; VII. The Consecration of Churches; VIII. Hymns.

I. History and Origin.—The term "Celtic Rite" is generally, but rather indefinitely, applied to the various rites in use in Great Britain, Ireland, perhaps in Brittany, and sporadically in Northern Spain, and in the monasteries which resulted from the Irish missions of St. Columbanus in France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy, at a time when rites other than the then existing rite of Rome were used, wholly or partially, in those places. The term must not be taken to imply any necessary homogeneity, for the evidence, such as it is, is in favour of considerable diversity. This evidence is very scanty and fragmentary, and much of what has been written about it has been largely the result of conjectures based upon very insecure foundations, and has been influenced by controversial motives. The beginning of the period is vague. There is no evidence before the fifth century and very little even then. The extreme end of it may be taken as 1172, when the Synod of Cashel finally adopted the Anglo-Roman Rite. The existence of a different rite in Britain and Ireland has been used to prove that the Christianity of these islands had an origin independent of Rome, though, even if it were true, it is not easy to see how that should prove anything more than the fact itself. In reality the existence of a Celtic Rite has no bearings, one way or the other, on the Anglo-Roman controversy. In the period before the eighth century diversity of rites was the rule rather than the exception. Rome, though when its advice was asked it might naturally recommend its own way of doing things, did not then make the smallest attempt to force uniformity on any local church. With a very complete unity of faith, and at times a considerable amount of intercourse between different parts of the Western Church, there existed great diversity of practice in things in which diversity, as St. Gregory's answer to St. Augustine seems to imply, was not considered to matter very much. Gradually, no doubt, the influence of important centres, such as Rome itself on one side, and Toledo on another, tended to lessen the diversity and to draw divergent Churches together into larger liturgical districts, so that by the time of the final fusion, which happened in the Charlemagne period, the Roman Rite with its Ambrosian variant, the Romanized Celtic Rite, and the Hispano-Gallican Rite, now represented by the Mozarabic survival, were practically all that were left, but we must beware of antedating this classification. The essential unity of the Roman Empire was such that whether Christianity came to Britain from Rome, from Gaul, or from the East in the first instance, the fact would have no bearings on the origin and spread of the liturgical customs, which certainly developed at a later period than its first introduction. In the fourth century we find an apparently organized British Church, with bishops who represent it at the Council of Arles in 314, perhaps at Nicæa in 325, and at Sardica in 347, and certainly at Rimini in 359. This Church was evidently in close communication with the Church in Gaul, as may be inferred from the dedication to St. Martin of the two churches at Whithern and at Canterbury, and from the mission of Victricius of Rouen in 396, and those of Sts. Germanus and Lupus in 429, and Sts. Germanus and Severus in 447, directed against that heresy of Pelagius which had its origin in Britain. It is not unreasonable to suppose that at the period when liturgies were beginning to be differentiated more or less by districts and provinces the liturgy of the Church of Britain should resemble that of the neighbouring Church of Gaul, and it is possible to infer from St. Augustine's question to St. Gregory, concerning the different customs of Masses observed in Rome and in Gaul, that he found Gallican customs prevailing in Britain. But St. Augustine may only be referring to the use of Queen Bertha's Frankish chaplain, Bishop Luidhard, at Canterbury, and there is no evidence one way or the other as to what liturgy was in use among the Romanized Britons themselves.—The passage attributed to Gildas (Haddan and Stubbs, I, 112), "Britones toti mundo contrarii, moribus Romanis inimici, non solum in missâ sed in tonsurâ etiam", is probably of the seventh century.—Yet upon this frail foundation of conjecture an elaborate theory has been built and still remains almost an article of faith with so large and important a school of Anglican controversialists that it is impossible to ignore its existence, though it has been given up by all serious liturgiologists. This theory (for which see also Ambrosian Liturgy and Rite) is to the effect that St. Irenæus, the disciple of St. Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John the

Divine, brought the Rite of Ephesus to Provence, whence it spread through Gaul and to Britain. This so-called "Ephesine" Rite (a term often used as synonymous with "Hispano-Gallican"), say the supporters of the theory, was the foundation of the Sarum Rite, and from this is derived a belief that the Church of England had an origin independent of Rome. It is hardly necessary to assert here that the Sarum Rite is merely a local variety of the Roman, and that the influence of the Gallican Rite upon it is no greater than upon any other Roman variety, so that the deductions, which have recently been reasserted with great certainty by the Bishop of Chichester in his "Story of the English Prayerbook", are quite unwarranted by facts. But on examination it will be seen that the Ephesine origin of the Gallican Rite rests only upon the assertion of an eighth-century Irish writer (in Cott. MS. Nero A. II in the British Museum), who, by the way, derives the Celtic Rite, as far as the Divine Office is concerned, from Alexandria, and on a statement by Colman at the Synod of Whitby, in 664, respecting the origin of the Celtic Easter, which, as St. Wilfrid pointed out at the time, was certainly incorrect. The theory seems to have been first put forward in modern times by Sir William Palmer in his "Origines Liturgicæ", on the authority of the said Irish writer, and has found its way into many Anglican textbooks. Yet the only points of difference between the British Church of St. Augustine's time and the Roman of which we can be certain are: (1) The rule of the keeping of Easter; (2) the tonsure; (3) some difference in the manner of baptizing.

(1) *The Easter question.*—The Britons adhered to the old Roman cycle of 84 years instead of the newer cycle of 19 years. They counted the third week of the moon, on the Sunday of which Easter must fall, from the 14th to the 20th instead of from the 15th to the 21st, and they took March 25th instead of March 21st as the vernal equinox. Until 457, when the 532-years cycle of Victorius of Aquitaine was adopted at Rome, Britain agreed with Rome in its differing from Alexandria and the East. In 525 Rome altered its rule again to the 19-years cycle of Dionysius Exiguus, to conform to the Eastern usage, and from that time until the change of style in 1582 Rome and the East agreed in their rule of Easter, and even now calculate by the same rule, though the fact that the Greek 21st of March is only an imaginary vernal equinox, thirteen days later than the real one, makes the actual Greek Easter generally fall on a different day from the Roman. Yet it is still argued (e. g. in Archbishop Nuttall's Catechism; S. P. C. K., 1907) that the Easter difference proves the Eastern origin of the British Church. If it proves anything it is the exact opposite. Colman at the Synod of Whitby evidently had some vague memory of the long extinct Quartodeciman controversy in his mind when he claimed an Ephesian origin for his Easter, and St. Wilfrid rightly pointed out that the essence of the Quartodeciman rule was that Easter might be kept on any day of the week, whereas the Celts kept theirs on Sunday only. St. Aldhelm, in his letter to King Geruntius of Cornwall, seems to charge the Cornish with Quartodecimanism, but he also mistook the point of that controversy. The Easter question was eventually settled at various times in different parts of the Celtic Church. The following dates are derived from Haddan and Stubbs: South Ireland, 626–8; North Ireland, 692; Northumbria (converted by Celtic missions), 664; East Devon and Somerset, the Celts under Wessex, 705; the Picts, 710; Iona, 716–8; Strathclyde, 721; North Wales, 768; South Wales, 777. Cornwall held out longest of any, perhaps even, in parts, to the time of Bishop Aedwulf of Crediton (909).

(2) *The form of the tonsure.*—The Britons were accustomed to shave the whole head in front of a line drawn from ear to ear, instead of using the coronal tonsure of the Romans. This, though there is no real evidence that it was the practice of the Druids, was nicknamed *tonsura magorum.* (*Magus* was accepted as equivalent to *druid*, and to this day the Μάγοι of St. Matt., ii, are *druidhean* in the Scottish Gaelic Bible.) Later, the Roman party jeered at it as the *tonsura Simonis Magi*, in contradistinction to their "tonsure of St. Peter". This is mentioned in the passage attributed, probably wrongly, to Gildas (Haddan and Stubbs, I, 113).

(3) *Some unspecified difference in the manner of baptizing.*—It has been conjectured, on no real evidence, that the British Church resembled the Spanish in baptizing with a single immersion. But this form had been allowed by Rome in the case of Spain. It would seem, however, from a letter from Pope Zacharias to St. Boniface (1 May, 748, Haddan and Stubbs, III, 51), that an unnamed English synod had forbidden any baptism except in the name of the Trinity, and had declared that whoever omits the Name of any Person of the Trinity does not truly baptize. Spelman and Wilkins put this synod at London in the time of St. Augustine, 603. Mansi makes its date the first year of Theodore of Tarsus, 668. It would seem by this that it was the formula that was at fault, and certainly in the time of Theodore the possibility of priests, presumably Celtic, having been invalidly baptized was considered. "Si quis presbiter ordinatus deprehendit se non esse baptizatus, baptizetur et ordinetur iterum et omnes quos prius baptizavit baptizentur", says the "Pœnitentiale Theodori" (Lib. II, cap. iii, 13), and in cap. ix of the same book, after ordering the reordination of those ordained by Scottish and British bishops, "qui in Pascha et tonsura catholici non sunt", and the asperging of churches consecrated by them, Theodore adds: "Et qui ex horum similiter gente vel quicunque de baptismo suo dubitaverit, baptizetur".

Thus it may be seen that, with these exceptions, and excepting also one statement by Gildas (to the effect that certain lessons, differing from those of any known rite, were read at ordinations), and a possible allusion by him to the anointing of hands at ordination, we have no information about the rites of the British Church. They may have been Gallican, but they may just as well have been Roman in type, or, if the Christianity of Britain preceded the construction of definite liturgies, they may have been indigenous, with or without foreign influences. The Britons were quite capable of composing their own liturgy on that nucleus which was common to all Christendom; but we do not know whether they did so or not.

One part of Britain, indeed, derived a great part of its Christianity from post-Patrician Irish missions. St. Ia and her companions, and St. Piran, St. Sennen, St. Petrock, and the rest of the Irish saints who came to Cornwall in the late fifth and early sixth centuries, found there, at any rate in the West, a population which had perhaps relapsed into Paganism, under the Pagan King Teudar. When these saints introduced, or reintroduced, Christianity, they probably brought with them whatever rites they were accustomed to, and Cornwall certainly had its own separate ecclesiastical quarrel with Wessex in the days of St. Aldhelm, which, as appears by a statement in Leofric's Missal, was still going on in the early tenth century, though the details of it are not specified.

The rites of the Irish Church stand on firmer ground, though even there the information is scanty. There were Christians in Ireland before St. Patrick, but we have no information as to how they worshipped, and their existence is ignored by the "Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniæ", attributed to the seventh-century Tirechan. This interesting document, which, though its dates need not be accepted too exactly, is worthy of general credit, divides the

saints of Ireland into three orders, each of which orders is stated to have lasted during the reigns of four kings, the three orders covering, between them, a period of about 225 years, from the coming of St. Patrick in 440, in the reign of Laoghaire MacNeil, to the reign of Blathmac and Diarmait, sons of Aodh Slaine, in 665. Symmetry is attained by omitting about six intervening reigns, but the outside dates of each period are clear enough, and the liturgiological value of the document consists in the statements, very probably true in the main, respecting the customs of the saints of these orders as to Masses and *celebrationes*, i. e. the Divine Office, and the Easter and tonsure questions. (*Celebratio*—"Divine Office"; Irish, *Celebrad*. Dr. MacCarthy in his edition of the Stowe Missal gives several instances of this use of the word.) The first order was in the time of St. Patrick. They were all bishops, 350 in number, founders of churches. They had one Head, Christ; one leader, Patrick; one Mass, and one tonsure from ear to ear, and they celebrated one Easter "quarta decima luna post æquinoctium vernale". All these bishops were sprung from the Romans, the French (i. e. the Gauls), the Britons, and the Scots. Their period is given, from the reign of Laoghaire to that of Tuathal Moelgarbh (c. 440–544). The second order were a few bishops and many priests, 300 in number. They had one head, Christ, they celebrated different Masses and "diversas regulas", they had one Easter, the fourteenth of the moon after the equinox, and one tonsure from ear to ear. They received a Mass from the Britons, David, Gilla (Gildas), and Docus (Cadoc). It may be noted that the "Vita Gildæ" tells how King Ainmerech sent for Gildas to restore ecclesiastical order in his kingdom, "quia pæne catholicam fidem in ipsâ insulâ omnes reliquerant". The second order lasted from the end of the reign of Tuathal to that of Aodh MacAinmerech (c. 544–99). The third order were priests and a few bishops, 100 in number, "qui in locis desertis habitabant et oleribus et aquâ et eleemosynis vivebant. propria devitabant", evidently hermits and monks. They had different Masses, different rules, and different tonsures, "alii enim habebant coronam, alii cæsariem", and celebrated different Easters, some on the fourteenth, some on the sixteenth, of the moon, "cum duris intentionibus"—which perhaps means "obstinately". These lasted from the reign of Æda Allain (Aodh Slaine) to that of his two sons (Blathmac and Diarmait, c. 599–665). The meaning seems to be that the first order celebrated a form of Mass introduced by St. Patrick, the second and third orders used partly that Mass and partly one of British origin, and in the case of the third order Roman modifications were also introduced. Though we have no direct evidence one way or the other, it would seem probable that St. Patrick, who was the pupil of St. Germanus of Auxerre and St. Honoratus of Lérins, brought with him a Mass of the Gallican type, and it is clear that the British Mass introduced by Sts. David, Gildas, and Cadoc differed from it, though to what extent we have no means of knowing. The "unam celebrationem" of the first order and the "diversas regulas" of the second and third probably both refer to the Divine Office, and we may take the authority of the eighth-century tract in Cott. MS. Nero A. II for what it is worth in its not improbable statement that St. Germanus taught the "Cursus Scottorum" to St. Patrick, who certainly was under his instruction for some time. The wording of the "Catalogus" seems to imply that the first and second orders were Quartodecimans, but this is clearly not the meaning, or on the same argument the third order must have been partly *Sextodecimans*—if there were such things—and moreover we have the already mentioned statement of St. Wilfrid, the opponent of the Celtic Easter, at the Synod of Whitby, that such was not the case. Tirechan can only mean what we know from other sources: that the fourteenth day of the moon was the earliest day on which Easter could fall, not that it was kept on that day, Sunday or weekday. It was the same ambiguity of expression which misled Colman in 664 and St. Aldhelm in 704. The first and second orders used the Celtic tonsure, and it seems that the Roman coronal tonsure came partly into use during the period of the third order. After that we have an obscure period, during which the Roman Easter, which had been accepted in South Ireland in 626–28, became universal, being accepted by North Ireland in 692, and it seems probable that a Mass on the model of the Carlsruhe and Piacenza fragments and the Stowe and Bobbio Missals, that is to say a Roman Canon with some features of a non-Roman type, came into general use. But it was not until the twelfth century that the separate Irish Rite, which, according to Gilbert, Bishop of Limerick (1106–39), was in use in nearly all Ireland, was abolished. St. Malachy, Bishop of Armagh (1134–48), began the campaign against it, and at the Synod of Cashel, in 1172, a Roman Rite "juxta quod Anglicana observat Ecclesia" was finally substituted.

In Scotland there is very little information. The intercourse with Ireland was considerable, and the few details that can be gathered from such sources as Adamnan's Life of St. Columba and the various relics of the Scoto-Northumbrian Church point to a general similarity with Ireland in the earlier period. Of the rite of the monastic order of the Culdees (*Céli Dé* or *Giollidhe-Dé*, servants of God, or possibly *Cultores Dei*) very little is known, but they certainly had a rite of their own, which may have been similar to the Irish. The Roman Easter and tonsure were adopted by the Picts in 710, and at Iona in 716–18, and much later, in about 1080, St. Margaret of Scotland, wife of King Malcolm III, wishing to reform the Scottish Church in a Roman direction, discovered and abolished certain peculiar customs of which Theodoric, her chaplain and biographer, tells us less than we could wish. It seems that the Scots did not begin Lent on Ash Wednesday, but on the Monday following. This is still the Ambrosian practice. They refused to communicate on Easter Day, and the arguments on the subject make it seem as if the laity never communicated at all. In some places they celebrated Mass "contra totius Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, nescio quo ritu barbaro". The last statement may be read in connexion with that in the Register of St. Andrew's (drawn up 1144–53), "Keledei in angulo quodam ecclesiæ, quæ modica nimis est, suum officium more suo celebrabant". How much difference there may have been cannot be judged from these expressions. Scotland may have retained a primitive Celtic Rite, or it may have used the greatly Romanized Stowe or Bobbio Mass. The one fragment of a Scottish Rite, the Office of the Communion of the Sick, in the Book of Deer, probably eleventh century, is certainly non-Roman in type, and agrees with those in the extant Irish books.

In 590 St. Columbanus and his companions invaded the Continent and established monasteries throughout France, South Germany, Switzerland, and North Italy, of which the best known were Luxeuil, Bobbio, St. Gallen, and Ratisbon. It is from the Rule of St. Columbanus that we know something of a Celtic Divine Office. These Irish missionaries, with their very strict rule, were not altogether popular among the lax Gallican clergy, who tried to get them discouraged. At a council at Mâcon, in 623, certain charges brought by one Agrestius were considered. Among them is the following: "In summâ quod a cæterorum ritu ac normâ desciscerent et sacra mysteria sollemnia orationum et collectarum multiplici varietate celebrarent". There has been more than one interpre-

tation of this phrase, some holding, with Pope Benedict XIV, that it refers to the use of many collects before the Epistle, instead of the one collect of the then Roman Missal, others that it implies a multiplicity of variables in the whole Mass, analogous to that existing in the Hispano-Gallican Rite. The Columbanian monasteries gradually drifted into the Benedictine Order.

The ultimate origin of the various prayers, etc., found in the fragments of the Celtic Rite and in the books of private devotion, such as the Book of Cerne, Harl. MS. 7653, and MS. Reg. 2. A. xx, which are either Irish or have been composed under Irish influence, is still under discussion. The Turin Fragment and the Bangor Antiphoner (see BANGOR, ANTIPHONARY OF) contain for the most part pieces that are either not found elsewhere or are only found in other Irish books. The Book of Cerne is very eclectic, and pieces therein can also be traced to Gelasian, Gregorian, Gallican, and Spanish origins, and the Stowe Missal has pieces which are found not only in the Bobbio Missal, but also in the Gelasian, Gregorian, Gallican, Spanish, and even Ambrosian books. The general conclusion seems to be that, while the Irish were not above borrowing from other Western nations, they originated a good deal themselves, much of which eventually passed into that composite rite which is now known as Roman. This seems to be a rough statement of the opinion of Mr. Edmund Bishop, who is the soundest English authority on the subject, which involves the much larger question of the origin and development of all the Western rites.

II. MS. SOURCES.—The following MSS. contain fragments of the Celtic Rite:—

i.—*British*, i. e. Welsh, Cornish, or Breton: *None*. There is a Mass in Bodl. MS. 572 (at Oxford), in honour of St. Germanus, which appears to be Cornish and relates to "Ecclesia Lanaledensis", which has been considered to be the monastery of St. Germans, in Cornwall, a few miles on the western side of the Tamar. There is no other evidence of the name, which was also the Breton name of Aleth, now part of Saint-Malo. The MS., which contains also certain glosses, possibly Cornish or Breton—it would be impossible to distinguish between them at that date—but held by Professor Loth to be Welsh, is probably of the ninth century, and the Mass is quite Roman in type, being probably written after that part of Cornwall had come under Saxon influence. There is a very interesting Proper Preface.

ii.—*Irish*, whether insular or continental: (1) *The Turin Fragment.*—A MS. of the seventh century in the Turin Library. It was published by W. Meyer, with a dissertation comparing it with the Bangor Antiphoner, in the Göttingen "Nachrichten" of 1903. Mayer considers the fragment to have been written at Bobbio. It consists of six leaves and contains the canticles, "Cantemus Domino", "Benedicite", and "Te Deum", with collects to follow those and the Laudate psalms (cxlviii–cl) and the "Benedictus", the text of which is not given, two hymns with collects to follow them, and two other prayers. There is a facsimile of one page and a description in "Collezione paleografica Bobbiese", Vol. I.

(2) *The Bangor Antiphoner.*—A MS. from the monastery of Bangor, in Down, written or copied from a MS. written during the time of Abbot Cronan (680–91). It is now in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. It has been edited, in facsimile, for the Henry Bradshaw Society (1895–96), by F. E. Warren, having been already printed in Muratori's "Anecdota Bibl. Ambros.", IV, pp. 121–59, in Migne's "Patrologia Lat.", LXXII, 579, and in the "Ulster Journal of Archæology", 1853. It contains a large collection of canticles, hymns, collects, and antiphons, all, with very few exceptions, relating to the Divine Office. All but two of the twenty-one pieces in the Turin fragment are found in this MS. also. (See BANGOR, ANTIPHONARY OF.)

(3) *The Bobbio Missal.*—A MS. of the seventh century found by Mabillon at Bobbio in North Italy, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Lat. 13,246). Published by Mabillon (Lit. Rom. Vet., II) and by Neale and Forbes (Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church). There is an analysis of it by Dom Cagin in "Paléographie musicale", V. By Neale and Forbes it is entitled "Missale Vesontionense seu Sacramentarium Gallicanum", its attribution to Besançon being due to the presence of a Mass in honour of St. Sigismund. Monseigneur Duchesne appears to consider it to be more or less Ambrosian, but Mr. Edmund Bishop (liturgical note to Kuypers' "Book of Cerne") considers it to be "an example of the kind of book in vogue in the second age of the Irish Saints", and connects it with the undoubtedly Irish Stowe Missal. It contains a "Missa Romensis cottidiana" and Masses for various days and intentions, with the Order of Baptism and the "Benedictio Cerei".

(4) *The Stowe Missal.*—A MS. of the late eighth or early ninth century, with alterations in later hands, most of them written by one Moelcaich, who signs his name at the end of the Canon, and whom Dr. MacCarthy identifies, not very convincingly, with Moelcaich MacFlann, c. 750. It was discovered abroad, in the eighteenth century, by John Grace of Nenagh, from whom it passed to the Duke of Buckingham's library at Stowe. It was bought by the late Earl of Ashburnham in 1849, and from his collection it went to the Royal Irish Academy. It contains part of the Gospel of St. John, probably quite unconnected with what follows, bound up with the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass, three Masses, the Order of Baptism and of the Visitation, Unction, and Communion of the Sick, and a treatise in Irish on the Mass, of which a variant is found in the "Leabhar Breac". The liturgical parts are in Warren's "Celtic Church". It was edited for the Royal Irish Academy in 1885 by Dr. B. MacCarthy, and is now being re-edited (a facsimile having been already issued) for the Henry Bradshaw Society, by Mr. G. F. Warner, to whose work the present writer is indebted for much help. A translation, by J. Charleson, of the Ordinary and Canon of the Mass appeared in the "Transactions" of the Glasgow Ecclesiological Society, in 1898.

(5) *The Carlsruhe Fragment:* A.—Four pages in an Irish hand of the late eighth or early ninth century in the Library of Carlsruhe. It contains parts of three Masses, one of which is "pro captivis". The arrangement resembles that of the Bobbio Missal, in that the Epistles and Gospels seem to have preceded the other variables under the title of "lectiones ad misam".

(6) *The Carlsruhe Fragment:* B.—Four pages in an Irish hand probably of the ninth century. It contains fragments of Masses, and includes a variant of the intercessions inserted in the Intercession for the Living in the Stowe Missal and in Witzel's extracts from the Fulda MS. There are also some fragments of Irish in it.

(7) *The Piacenza Fragment.*—Four pages (of which the two outer are illegible) in an Irish hand, possibly of the tenth century. The two inner pages contain parts of three Masses, one of which is headed "ordo missæ sanctæ mariæ". In the others are contained the Prefaces of two of the Sunday Masses in the Bobbio Missal, one of which is used on the eighth Sunday after the Epiphany in the Mozarabic.

[The text of these three fragments (5–7), with a dissertation on them by the Rev. H. M. Bannister, is given in the "Journal of Theological Studies", October, 1903.]

(8) *The Book of Dimma.*—A MS. probably of the eighth century now at Trinity College, Dublin. It contains the Four Gospels and has an order for the Unction and Communion of the Sick written between the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John. This last is printed in Warren's "Celtic Church".

(9) *The Book of Mulling.*—A MS., probably of the eighth century, in Trinity College, Dublin. It contains the Four Gospels, an Office for the Unction and Communion of the Sick, and a fragmentary directory or plan of a service. These have been printed, with a dissertation, in Lawlor's "Chapters on the Book of Mulling", and the Unction and Communion Office in Warren's "Celtic Church".

(10) *The St. Gall Fragments.*—These are eighth- and ninth-century fragments in MSS. 1394 and 1395 in the Library of St. Gallen. The first book (1394) contains part of an ordinary of the Mass, which as far as it goes resembles that in the Stowe Missal. The second (1395) contains the confession and litany, which also begin the Stowe Missal, a fragment of a Mass of the Dead, a prayer at the Visitation of the Sick, and three forms for the blessing of salt and water. All these are given in Warren's "Celtic Church".

(11) *The Basle Fragment* (A. vii. 3 in the Basle Library).—This is a ninth-century Greek Psalter with a Latin interlinear translation. On a fly-leaf at the beginning are two hymns in honour of Our Lady and of St. Bridget, a prayer to Our Lady and to the Angels and Saints, and a long prayer "De conscientiæ reatu ante altare". The last is printed in Warren's "Celtic Church".

(12) *The Zurich Fragment* (Public Library, Zurich).—This is a tenth-century leaf containing part of an office for the profession of a nun. It is written in an Irish hand. The fragment is printed in Warren's "Celtic Church".

(13) *The Liber Hymnorum.*—This is not exactly a liturgical book, but a collection of forty hymns in Latin and Irish, almost all of Irish origin, with canticles and "ccclxv orationes quas beatus papa Gregorius de toto psalterio congregavit". There are explanatory prefaces in Irish or Latin to each hymn. Some of the hymns are found in the Bangor Antiphoner, the *Leabhar Breac*, and the Book of Cerne. There are two MSS. of this collection, not agreeing exactly, one in Trinity College, Dublin, of the eleventh century, and one in the Franciscan Convent at Dublin, of somewhat later date. A combination of both MSS. has been edited for the Henry Bradshaw Society (1897–98) by Dr. J. H. Bernard and Dr. R. Atkinson.

iii.—*Scottish: The Book of Deer.*—A Book of the Gospels of the tenth century formerly belonging to the Monastery of Deer in Buchan, and now in the Cambridge University Library. It contains part of an order for the Communion of the Sick, with a Gaelic rubric, written in a hand of perhaps the end of the eleventh century. This is printed in Warren's "Celtic Church". The whole MS. was edited by Dr. Stuart for the Spalding Club in 1869.

Besides these MSS. there are certain others bearing on the subject which are not liturgical, and some of which are not Celtic, though they show signs of Celtic influences. Among these are: (1) *The Book of Cerne*, a large collection of prayers, etc., for private use, associated with the name of Æthelwald the Bishop, possibly a Bishop of Lindisfarne (721–40), but perhaps a later Bishop of Lichfield (818–30). This late eighth- or early ninth-century MS., which once belonged to the Abbey of Cerne in Dorset, but is now in the University Library at Cambridge, though actually Northumbrian or Mercian in origin, is full of Irish, Gelasian, and Hispano-Gallican matter. It has been edited (with a most valuable "Liturgical Note" by Mr. E. Bishop) by Dom A. B. Kuypers (Cambridge, 1902). (2) *Harl. MS. 7653, British Museum.*—A fragment of seven leaves of an Irish MS. of the ninth century, containing a litany, the Te Deum, and a number of private devotions. It has been edited by Mr. W. de G. Birch, with The Book of Nunnaminster, for the Hampshire Record Society (1889), and by Mr. Warren in his monograph on the Bangor Antiphoner (Vol. II, p. 83). (3) *Reg. 2. A. xx, British Museum.*—An eighth-century MS. of probably Northumbrian origin, containing selections from the Gospels, collects, hymns, canticles, private devotions, etc. It has been fully described in Mr. Warren's "Bangor Antiphoner" (Vol. II, p. 97). (4) *The Leabhar Breac, or Speckled Book.*—An Irish MS. of the fourteenth century, belonging to the Royal Irish Academy, and containing a very large collection of ecclesiastical and religious pieces in Irish. The contents are not as a rule of a liturgical character, but the book contains a variant of the Irish tract on the Mass which is also in the Stowe Missal. This has been printed, with a translation, in Dr. MacCarthy's edition of the Stowe Missal, and in "Transactions of the Aberdeen Ecclesiological Society", with translation and notes by Mr. D. Macgregor (1898). The whole book has been published in facsimile, but without transliteration or translation, though with a detailed table of contents, by the Royal Irish Academy (1876), and the Passions and Homilies contained in it have been edited with a translation and glossary by Dr. R. Atkinson in the Todd Lecture series of the same Academy (1887).

III. The Divine Office.—The chief evidences as to the nature and origin of the Celtic Divine Office are found in the Rule of St. Columbanus, in the Turin fragment and the Bangor Antiphoner, in the eighth-century tract in Cott. MS. Nero A. II., and in allusions in the "Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniæ". The Rule of St. Columbanus gives directions as to the number of psalms to be recited at each hour, the Turin fragment and the Bangor Antiphoner give the text of canticles, hymns, collects, and antiphons, and the Cottonian tract gives what was held in the eighth century to be the origin of the "Cursus Scottorum". (*Cursus psalmorum* and *Synaxis* are terms used for the Divine Office in the Rule of St. Columbanus.) The last differentiates between the "Cursus Gallorum", which it derives imaginatively from Ephesus and St. John, through St. Polycarp and St. Irenæus, and this "Cursus Scottorum", which, according to this writer, probably an Irish monk in France, originated with St. Mark at Alexandria. With St. Mark it came to Italy. St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Basil, and the hermits St. Anthony, St. Paul, St. Macarius, St. John, and St. Malchus used it. St. Cassian, St. Honoratus, and St. Porcarius of Lérins, St. Cæsarius of Arles, St. Germanus, and St. Lupus also used it, and St. Germanus taught it to St. Patrick, who brought it to Ireland. There "Wandilochus Senex" and "Gomogillus" (Comgall) used it, and St. Wandilochus and St. Columbanus brought it to Luxeuil. The part of the story from St. Germanus onwards may possibly be founded on fact. The other part is not so probable. The statements of the "Catalogus" concerning "unam celebrationem" in the first, and "diversas regulas" during the second and third, ages of the saints probably refer to the original *cursus* of St. Patrick and to the introduction of other *cursus*, partly (perhaps with the Mass of Sts. David, Gildas, and Cadoc) from Britain; and it does not quite follow that what St. Columbanus carried to Gaul was the same as that which St. Patrick had brought from Gaul in an earlier age. The Rule of St. Columbanus and the Bangor book distinguish eight Hours, "ad duodecimam" [Vespers, called "ad Vespertinam" and "ad Vesperum" in the Bangor book. Adamnan's Life of St. Columba calls it once (iii, 23) "Vespertinalis missa"], "ad initium noctis" (answering to Complin), "ad nocturnam", or "ad

medium noctis", "ad matutinam" (Lauds), "ad secundam" (answering to Prime), "ad tertiam", "ad sextam", and "ad nonam". At the four lesser Hours St. Columbanus orders three psalms each; at Vespers, "ad initium noctis", and "ad medium noctis" twelve each, and "ad matutinam", a very curious and intricate arrangement of psalmody varying in length with the longer and shorter nights. On Saturdays and Sundays from 1 November to 25 March, seventy-five psalms were recited on each day, under one antiphon for every three psalms. From 25 March to 24 June these were diminished by three psalms weekly to a minimum of thirty-six psalms. It would seem, though it does not say so, that the minimum was used for about five weeks, for a gradual increase of the same amount arrives at the maximum by 1 November. On other days of the week there was a maximum of thirty-six and a minimum of twenty-four. The Rule does not say how the Psalter was distributed, but from the Bangor book it seems that the "Laudate" psalms (cxlviii-cl) were said together, doubtless, as in all other rites, Eastern or Western, except certain eighteenth-century French uses, at Lauds, and that "Domine, Refugium" (Ps. lxxxix) was said "ad secundam". Adamnan mentions that St. Columba sang Ps. xliv, "Eructavit cor meum", at Vespers on one occasion. The psalms at the lesser Hours were to be accompanied by a number of intercessory versicles. In the Bangor book these, somewhat expanded from the list in the Rule, but certainly to be identified with them, are given in the form of one, two, or three antiphons and a collect for each intercession. There are six canticles given in the Bangor Antiphoner:—

1.—"Audite, cœli", headed "Canticum Moysi". This has no antiphons, but a repetition of the first verse at intervals, after the manner of the Invitatory to the "Venite" in the Roman Rite.

2.—"Cantemus Domino", also headed "Canticum Moysi".

3.—"Benedicite", called "Benedictio trium Puerorum".

4.—"Te Deum", preceded by Ps. cxii, 1, "Laudate, pueri".

5.—"Benedictus", also called "Evangelium".

6.—"Gloria in excelsis", followed by psalm and other verses similar to those which, with it, make up the Δοξολογία μεγάλη of the Greek Rite. It is ordered to be used "ad vesperum et matutinam", resembling the Greek Rite use of it at Complin (Ἀπόδειπνον) and Lauds (Ὄρθρος). When the Stowe Missal was written the Irish used this canticle at Mass also, in its Roman position.

The Bangor Antiphoner gives sets of collects to be used at each hour. One set is in verse (cf. the Mass in hexameters in the Reichenau Gallican fragment). It also gives several sets of collects, not always complete, but always in the same order, to be said after certain canticles and after the hymn. The Turin fragment gives some of the same sets in the same order. It may be conjectured that these sets show some sort of skeleton of the Bangor Lauds. The order always is: (1) "Post canticum" (evidently from the subjects, which, like those of the first ode of a Greek canon, refer to the Crossing of the Red Sea, "Cantemus Domino"); (2) "Post Benedictionem trium Puerorum"; (3) "Post tres Psalmos", or "Post Laudate Dominum de cœlis" (Ps. cxlvii-cl); (4) "Post Evangelium" (clearly meaning "Benedictus", which is the only Gospel canticle in the book and the only one not otherwise provided for. The same term is often applied—e. g. in the York Breviary—to "Benedictus", "Magnificat", and "Nunc Dimittis"); (5) "Super hymnum"; (6) "De Martyribus".—The last may perhaps be compared with the commemorations which come at the end of Lauds in, for instance, the present Roman Divine Office. There are also sets of antiphons, "super Cantemus Domino et Benedicite", "super Laudate Dominum de cœlis", and "De Martyribus". In the Bangor book there are collects to go with the "Te Deum", given apart from the preceding, as though they formed part of another Hour; but in the Turin fragment they, with the text of the "Te Deum", follow the "Benedicite" and its collects, and precede the "Laudate Dominum de cœlis". In the Book of Mulling there is a fragment of a directory, or plan, of some service. Dr. Lawlor seems to think it to be a plan of a daily Office used morning and evening, but the editors of the "Liber Hymnorum" take it to be a special penitential service and compare it with the penitential office sketched out in the "Second Vision of Adamnan" in the *Leabhar Breac*, which, as interpreted by them, it certainly resembles. The plan in the Book of Mulling is: (1)—illegible; (2) "Magnificat"; (3) stanzas 4, 5, 6 of St. Columba's hymn, "Noli pater"; (4) a lesson from St. Matt., v; (5) the last three stanzas of the hymn of St. Secundinus, "Audite omnes"; (6) two supplementary stanzas; (7) the last three stanzas of the hymn of Cumma in Fota, "Celebra Juda"; (8) antiphon "Exaudi nos Deus", appended to this hymn; (9) last three stanzas of St. Hilary's hymn, Hymnum dicat"; (10) either the antiphon "Unitas in Trinitate" or (as the sketch of Adamnan seems to show) the hymn of St. Colman MacMurchon in honour of St. Michael, "In Trinitate spes mea"; (11) the Creed; (12) the Paternoster; (13)—illegible, but possibly the collect "Ascendat oratio".

IV. The Mass.—Two books, the Bobbio and the Stowe Missals, contain the Irish Ordinary of a daily Mass in its late Romanized form. Many of the variables are in the Bobbio book, and portions of some Masses are in the Carlsruhe and Piacenza fragments. A little, also, may be gleaned from the St. Gall fragments, the Bangor Antiphoner, and the order for the Communion of the Sick in the Books of Dimma, Mulling, and Deer. The tract in Irish at the end of the Stowe Missal and its variant in the *Leabhar Breac* add something more to our knowledge. The Stowe Missal gives us three somewhat differing forms, the original of the ninth century, in so far as it has not been erased, the correction by Moelcaich, and, as far as it goes, the Mass described in the Irish tract. From its size and contents it would seem to be a sort of *Missale Itinerantium*, with an Ordinary that might serve for almost any occasion, a general Common of Saints and two Masses for special intentions (for penitents and for the dead). The addition of the Order of Baptism, not, as in the Bobbio book or in the "Missale Gothicum" and "Missale Gallicanum", as part of the Easter Eve services, but as a separate thing, and of the Visitation of the Sick, points to its being intended to be a convenient portable minimum for a priest. The pieces said by the people are in several cases only indicated by beginnings and endings. The Bobbio book, on the other hand, is a complete Missal, also for a priest only, of larger size, with Masses for the Holy Days through the year.

The original Stowe Mass approaches nearer to that of Bobbio than the revised form does. The result of Moelcaich's version is to produce something more than a Gelasian Canon inserted into a non-Roman Mass. It has become a mixed Mass, Gelasian, Roman, or Romano-Ambrosian for the most part, with much of a Hispano-Gallican type underlying it, and perhaps with some indigenous details. It may be taken to represent the latest type of Irish Mass of which we have any information. The title of the Bobbio daily Mass is "Missa Romensis cottidiana", and the same title occurs before the Collect "Deus qui culpa offenderis" at the very end of the "Missale Gothicum". This collect, which is in the Gregorian Sacramentary, occurs in both the Bobbio and the Stowe, and in the latter has before it the title,

"Orationes et preces missæ æcclesiæ romane", so that it is evident that the Roman additions or substitutions were recognized as such.

The Order of the daily Mass, founded on that in the Stowe Missal, is:—

i. *Præparatio Sacerdotis.*

1.—Confession of sins, beginning "Peccavimus, Domine, peccavimus". This and the Litany which follows are found also in the St. Gall fragments, but not in the Bobbio book.

2.—Litany of the Saints. In the original hand there are only thirteen invocations (Our Lady, ten Apostles, St. Mark, and St. Luke). Moelcaich added thirty-one more, of which twenty-four are Irish. The MS. is wrongly bound, so that these additions look as if they were associated with the diptychs in the Canon.

3.—"Oratio Augustini": "Rogo te Deus Sabaoth". This is found in various ninth- and tenth-century French books (see Warren's "Celtic Church").

4.—"Oratio Ambrosi": "Ante conspectum divinæ majestatis". Inserted by Moelcaich. Found in several French books.

5.—Collect: "Ascendat oratio nostra". This occurs after the Creed and Paternoster in the "Liber Hymnorum".

ii. *The Mass itself.*

1.—From the Irish tracts it seems that the chalice was prepared before the Introit, a very usual practice in both East and West in early times. It is still the Eastern practice, and is retained to this day by the Dominicans at low Mass, and in the Mozarabic Rite (see Dr. Legg's Ecclesiological Essays, pp. 91–178). Water was poured in first with the words "Peto (*Leabhar Breac*, Quæso) te, Pater, deprecor te, Fili, obsecro te, Spiritus Sancte". The *Leabhar Breac* directs that a drop shall be poured at naming each Person. The wine was similarly poured on the water, with the words, "Remittit pater, indulget Filius, miseretur Spiritus Sanctus".

2.—The Introit. Mentioned in the Irish tracts, but not given in the Ordinary or elsewhere in either Missal. Probably it was sung from a Psalter.

3.—Collect. That in the Stowe and Bobbio Ordinaries is "Deus qui de beato Petro", the collect for St. Peter's Day, "iii Kal Julias" in the Gelasian Sacramentary. In the Stowe a corrector, not Moelcaich, has prefixed "in solemnitatibus Petri et Christi [*sic*]".

4.—"Imnus angelicus", i. e. "Gloria in excelsis". Begun in the original hand, continued by Moelcaich on an inserted slip. This comes after the conclusion of the "Missa Romensis cottidiana" in the Bobbio book and is preceded by a prayer "post Aios", which probably means the Trisagion (Ἅγιος ὁ Θεός, κ. τ. λ.), or the Greek of the Sanctus, as used elsewhere in the Mozarabic, one or other of which may have come at this point, as it did (according to St. Germanus of Paris) in the Gallican Rite. This in the last was followed by Kyrie eleison and "Benedictus", the latter being called "Prophetia". There are collects styled "post Prophetiam" in the Bobbio Missal at the beginnings of several Masses. After the Gloria in the Bobbio there is a collect "post Benedictionem", which means after the "Benedicite". This was said in the Gallican, as part is still said in the Mozarabic, after the Epistle. The collects "post Precem", according to Mabillon, mean the same, but that seems improbable, and this name may possibly refer to the prayers after the Bidding Prayer Litany, which has been known as "Prex".

5.—Collect, "Deus qui diligentibus te", given as a Sunday collect in the Gelasian. It is written by Moelcaich over erased matter (probably the original continuation of "Gloria in excelsis"), and another hand has prefixed a direction for its use, "in cotidianis diebus", instead of that which follows.

6.—Collect "Deus qui culpa offenderis". In the original hand, with inserted heading already mentioned, and "hæc oratio prima Petri". It follows the St. Peter collect in the Bobbio Ordinary.

7.—"Hic augmentum". Inserted by Moelcaich. This, whatever it may mean, is mentioned in the Irish tract as *tormach* (increase, expansion) coming before the "Lesson of the Apostle". Later, at the Offertory, one finds "secunda pars augmenti hic super oblata". Probably it means additional proper collects. St. Columbanus uses the word, in the sense of *addition*, with reference to the petitions added to the psalms at the day hours, "cum versiculorum augmento intervenientium".

8.—The Epistle. In the Stowe daily Mass, I Cor., xi, 26–52. On certain days the Bobbio has a lesson from the Old Testament or Apocalypse before the Epistle.

9.—The Gradual. The tract calls it *salm digrad.* If everything between the Epistle and Gospel may be included under that name, the construction is: (a) Prayer, "Deus qui nos regendo conservas", added, but not by Moelcaich. Found in the later Gelasian MSS. (b) Prayer, "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui populum tuum". An Easter collect in the Bobbio Missal, given also by Gerbert as Ambrosian. (c) Psalm civ, vv. 4, 1–3, 4. (d) Prayer, "Grata sint tibi Domine". The *secreta* of an Advent Mass in the Gelasian. (e) Alleluia. Ps. cxvii, 14. (f) Prayer, "Sacrificiis præsentibus, Domine". The *secreta* of another Advent Mass in the Gelasian. (g) "Deprecatio Sancti Martini pro populo". (The title added by Moelcaich.) This is a Bidding Prayer Litany or *Prex* resembling very closely the Great Synapte of the Greek Rite and the litany used on the first four Sundays of Lent instead of "Gloria in excelsis" in the Ambrosian. (h) Prayer, "Sacrificium tibi, Domine". The *secreta* of another Advent Mass in the Gelasian. Perhaps it is here an "Oratio post Precem" of the Gallican type. (i) Prayer, "Ante oculos tuos, Domine". It occurs in the same place in the Mass published by M. Flaccus Illyricus (Martène, I, 182). (k) *Lethdirech sund* [a half uncovering (of the chalice and paten) here]. This is referred to in the tract as *indinochtad corrici leth inna oblæ agus incailich* (the uncovering as far as half of the oblation and chalice), and is associated there with the singing of the Gospel and *Allóir*. Earlier it is mentioned as following the Gradual. (l) Psalm cxl, 2, sung thrice. (m) "Hic elivatur lintiamen calicis". Dr. Legg (Ecclesiological Essays, p. 133) mentions that this lifting of the veil was the practice in England just before the Reformation, and in the Dioceses of Coutances and St.-Pol-de-Leon much later. (n) Prayer, "Veni Domine sanctificator". Nearly the "Veni sanctificator" of the present Roman Offertory.

[Of these (a) to (h) are in the original hand, part of (i) is inserted by Moelcaich, possibly over erasures, the rest of (i) and (k) to (n) are written by Moelcaich on added leaves. The psalm verses are only indicated by their beginnings and endings. It may be that the prayers were said, and the ceremonies with the chalice veil were gone through by the priest while the congregation sang the psalms and Alleluia. Nothing of all this is in the Bobbio. Possibly, judging from the collect "Post Benedictionem", which is the collect which follows the "Benedictus es" (Dan., iii) on Ember Saturdays in the Roman Missal, either the "Benedicite" or this "Benedictus" came between the Epistle and Gospel, as in the Gallican of St. Germanus's description.]

10.—The Gospel. In the Stowe Mass, St. John, vi, 51–57. This begins in Moelcaich's hand on an in-

serted sheet and ends in the original hand. The tracts say that the Gospel was followed by the *Alldir*, which Dr. Stokes translates "Alleluia", but Mr. Macgregor takes to mean "Blessing" and compares with the "Per evangelica dicta", etc., of the Roman Rite.

11.—"Oratio Gregorii super evangelium". On an inserted slip in Moelcaich's hand. In the Gregorian Sacramentary on the second Saturday and third Sunday of Lent, but not in connexion with the Gospel.

12.—The Creed. In the original hand, with the "Filioque" inserted between the lines, possibly by Moelcaich.

13.—The Offertory. The order in the Stowe Missal is: (a) *Landirech sund* (a full uncovering here). In Moelcaich's hand. (b) "Ostende nobis, Domine, misericordiam", etc. thrice. (c) "Oblata, Domine, munera sanctifica, nosque a peccatorum nostrorum maculis emunda." This is in the Bobbio Missal (where it is called "post nomina") and in the Gelasian and Gregorian. It is the *secreta* of the third Mass of Christmas Day in the present Roman Missal. According to the tract, the chalice was elevated while this was sung, after the full uncovering. The *Leabhar Breac* says that it was elevated "quando canitur Imola Deo sacrificium laudis". (d) Prayer, "Hostias quæsumus, Domine". This occurs in one set of "Orationes et preces divinæ" in the Leonine Sacramentary. It is written here by Moelcaich over an erasure which begins with "G", probably, as Mr. Warner conjectures, the prayer "Grata sit tibi", which follows "Oblata, Domine" in the Bobbio Missal. In Moelcaich's correction this in an amplified form occurs later. (e) Prayer, "Has oblationes et sincera libamina". In Moelcaich's hand. This prayer, which includes an intercession "pro animabus carorum nostrorum N. et cararum nostrarum quorum nomina recitamus", is evidently a relic of the former reading of the diptychs at this point, as in the Hispano-Gallican liturgies. It and the next prayer in its Stowe form, as Mr. Warren points out, resemble Gallican or Mozarabic "Orationes post nomina". (f) "Secunda pars augmenti hic super oblata". Probably refers to additional proper prayers, analogous to the Roman *secreta* (see 7, *supra*). (g) Prayer, "Grata sit tibi hæc oblatio". An expanded form of the prayer which followed "Oblata" in the original writing. A long passage referring to the diptychs is inserted. Most of this prayer is on the first page of an inserted quire of four leaves in Moelcaich's hand. In the Bobbio, only "Oblata" and "Grata sit tibi" are given at the Offertory, one being called "Post nomina", the other "Ad Pacem". Perhaps the Pax came here in the seventh century, as in the Gallican and Mozarabic.

14.—The "Sursum Corda", not preceded by "Dominus vobiscum".

15.—The Preface. Unlike the Bobbio daily Preface, which, like that of the Roman Missal, goes straight from "per Christum Dominum nostrum" to "Per quem", this inserts a long passage, reminding one, at the beginning and near the end, of the Trinity and Sunday Preface of the Roman Missal, but otherwise being peculiar to itself. At the end of this passage is a direction in Irish to the effect that here the *dignum* of the addition (*dignum in tormaig*), i. e. the Proper Preface, comes in, if it ends with "Per quem". After the "Per quem" clause there is a similar direction if the "addition" ends with "Sanctus".

16.—The Sanctus, with a Post-Sanctus, resembling somewhat that in the Mozarabic Missal for Christmas Day, and that for Christmas Eve in the "Missale Gothicum". There is a Post-Sanctus also in the first of the three Masses given in the Stowe. It is followed by "Qui pridie", as though the Gelasian Canon were not used in that case.

17.—"Canon dominicus papæ Gilasi". This is the Gelasian Canon (as given in Mr. H. A. Wilson's edition) with certain variations, the most noticeable of which are: (a) "Te igitur" adds, after "papa nostro", "episcopo sedis apostolicæ", and after "fidei cultoribus", "et abbate nostro n. episcopo". "Sedis apostolicæ" is added also in the Bobbio. (b) A direction follows, "Hic recitantur nomina vivorum". (c) "Memento etiam domine", contains a long list of intercessions for various classes of persons. This is also found in Carlsruhe Fragment B, but not in the Bobbio. (d) "Communicantes". Variants for Christmas, Circumcision (called *Kalendis*), "Stellæ" (i. e. Epiphany—cf. Welsh, *Dydd Gwyl Ystwyll;* Cornish, *Degi Stul;* and "in stilla domini" in the St. Cuthbert Gospels. The actual variant here is *natalis calicis*, i. e. Maundy Thursday, the end of one and the beginning of the other having dropped out in copying), Easter, *Clausula pasca* (i. e. Low Sunday), Ascension, and Pentecost. The inserted quire ends with the second of these, and the others are on a whole palimpsest page and part of another. The original hand, now partly erased, begins with part of the first clause of the Canon, "tuum, dominum nostrum supplices te rogamus", and contained all but the first line of the "Te igitur" and "Memento" clauses, without the long intercessory passage, the "nomina vivorum" direction, or the variants. (e) The original hand begins "Et memoriam venerantes", continuing as in the present Roman Canon without variation until the next clause. The Bobbio Canon includes Sts. Hilary, Martin, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, and Benedict. (f) "Hanc igitur oblationem" contains an interpolation referring to a church "quam famulus tuus . . . ædificavit", and praying that the founder may be converted from idols. There are many variables of the "Hanc igitur" in the Gelasian. In the daily Mass the Bobbio inserts "quam tibi offerimus in honorem nominis tui Deus" after "cunctæ familiæ tuæ", but otherwise is the ordinary Gelasian and Gregorian. (g) In "Quam oblationem" and "Qui pridie" there are only a few variations, *egit* for *agens*, *accepit* [*calicem*] for *accipiens* (as also in the Bobbio book), and "calix sancti sanguinis mei" (*sancti* is erased in the Bobbio), until the end, when Moelcaich has added the Ambrosian phrase "passionem meam predicabitis, resurrectionem meam adnuntiabitis, adventum meum sperabitis, donec iterum veniam ad vos de cœlis". Similar endings occur also in the Liturgies of St. Mark and St. James and in several Syrian liturgies. The tracts direct the priest to bow thrice at "accipit Jesus panem" and after offering the chalice to God to chant "Miserere mei Deus" (*Leabhar Breac*) and the people to kneel in silence during this, the "perilous prayer". Then the priest takes three steps backwards and forwards. (h) "Unde et memores" has a few evident mistakes, and is Gelasian in adding *sumus* after *memores*. (i) "Supplices te rogamus" adds *et petimus* and omits *cœlesti*. (k) "Memento etiam Domine et eorum nomina qui nos præcesserunt cum signo fidei et dormiunt in somno pacis." This clause, omitted in the Gelasian, agrees with the Bobbio. In the latter the words "commemoratio defunctorum" follow. In the Stowe there is an intercessory interpolation with a long list of names of Old Testament saints, Apostles, and others, many of whom are Irish. The list concludes with the phrase, used also in the Mozarabic, "et omnium pausantium". Moelcaich's addition to the "Præparatio" Litany is wrongly inserted before these names. (l) "Nobis quoque" differs from the Gelasian in the order of the names

of the female saints, agreeing with the Bobbio, except that it does not add *Eugenia*. (m) After "Per quem hæc omnia" Moelcaich has added "ter canitur" and an Irish direction to elevate the principal Host over the chalice and to dip half of It therein. Then follows in the original hand "Fiat Domine misericordia tua", etc. (Ps. xxxii, 22), to which "ter canitur" probably refers.

18.—The Fraction. Moelcaich adds an Irish direction, "It is here that the Bread is broken". The original hand has "Cogno[v]erunt Dominum in fractione panis. Panis quem frangimus corpus est D. N. J. C. Calix quem benedicimus sanguis est D. N. J. C. in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum", interspersed with six Alleluias. Then, over an erasure, Moelcaich inserts "Fiat Domine misericordia, etc. Cognoverunt Dominum, Alleluia", and a prayer or confession of faith, "Credimus, Domine, credimus in hac confractione". This responsory answers to the Ambrosian *Confractorium* and the Mozarabic *Antiphona ad Confractionem panis*. "Fiat misericordia", etc., is the actual Lenten Mozarabic antiphon. The prayer "Credimus", etc., has a slight likeness to the recitation of the Creed at this point in the Mozarabic. The tract directs an elaborate fraction, varying according to the day, and resembling that of the Mozarabic Rite and the arrangement (before Consecration) in the Eastern Office of the Prothesis, and like these having mystical meanings. The common division is into five, for ordinary days; for saints and virgins, seven; for martyrs, eight; for "the oblation of Sunday as a figure of the nine households of heaven and nine grades of the Church", nine; for the Apostles, eleven; on the Circumcision and Maundy Thursday twelve; on Low Sunday (*minchasc*) and Ascension, thirteen; and on Easter, Christmas, and Whitsunday, the sum of all the preceding, sixty-five. Directions are given to arrange the particles in the form of a cross within a circle, and different parts are apportioned to different classes of people. The *Leabhar Breac* omits all this and only speaks (as does the Stowe tract earlier) of a fraction in two halves, a reuniting and a commixture, the last of which in the Stowe Canon comes after the Pater Noster. There is nothing about any fraction or commixture in the Bobbio, which, like the Gelasian, goes on from the "Per quem hæ comnia" clause to the introduction of the Pater Noster. In the Ambrosian Rite both the Fraction and Commixture occur at this point, instead of after the Pater Noster, as in the Roman. [In the St. Gall fragment there are three collects (found in the Gelasian, Leonine, and Gregorian books), and a "Collectio ante Orationem Dominicam", which ends with the same introduction to the Pater Noster as in Stowe and Bobbio. These are all that come between the Preface and Pater Noster.] The rest onward to the end of the Communion is in Moelcaich's hand.

19.—The Pater Noster, preceded by the introduction: "Divino magisterio edocti [instead of the Roman "Præceptis salutaribus moniti"] et divina institutione formati audemus dicere". This is the same in the Bobbio and the St. Gall fragment. There is nothing to show that this and the Embolism which follows were variable, as in the Gallican (cf. Missale Gothicum and others) and the present Mozarabic. The Embolism in the Stowe is nearly exactly the Gelasian, except that it omits the name of Our Lady and has "Patricio" for "Andrea". The Bobbio Embolism does not omit Our Lady, but has neither St. Andrew nor St. Patrick. The St. Gall fragment agrees with the Stowe. The Pater Noster in the Books of Deer, Dimma, and Mulling has a different introduction and Embolism and in the Communion of the Sick in the Stowe there is yet another.

20.—The Pax. "Pax et caritas D. N. J. C. et communicatio sanctorum omnium sit semper nobiscum. Et cum spiritu tuo." This is in the St. Gall fragment, in the same place. Prayer, "Pacem mandasti, pacem dedisti", etc.

21.—The Commixture. "Commixtio corporis et sanguinis D. N. J. C. sit nobis salus in vitam perpetuam." These words are not in the Bobbio or the St. Gall fragment, but in the latter the commixture is ordered to be made here (*mittit sacerdos sancta in calicem*), and then the Pax to be given. In St. Germanus's description a form very like the Pax formula of the Stowe was said here by a priest, instead of a longer (and variable) benediction by a bishop. These were not in any way associated with the Pax, which in the Gallican, as now in the Mozarabic, came just before "Sursum corda". The two ideas are mixed up here, as in the Roman and Ambrosian.

22.—The Communion. "Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollis [*sic*] peccata mundi." These words are not in the Bobbio or the St. Gall. They are nearly the words said before the Communion of the people in the Roman Rite of to-day. In the St. Gall the rubric directs the Communion of the people after the Pax. Probably these words had the same association in the Stowe as at present. Then follows in the Stowe, "Pacem meam do vobis, Pacem relinquo vobis [John, xiv, 27]. Pax multa diligentibus legem tuam Domine, Et non est in illis scandalum. Regem cœli cum pace, Plenum odorem vitæ, Novum carmen cantate, Omnes sancti venite. Venite comedite panem meum, Et bibite vinum quod miscui vobis. Dominus regit me" [Ps. xxii, 1], with *Alleluia* after each clause. (The St. Gall has only the quotation from St. John, xiv, 27, before Ps. xxii, but "Venite comedite" comes later. In the Bangor Antiphoner is a hymn of eleven four-lined stanzas, "Sancti venite, Christi corpus sumite", entitled "Ymnus quando comonicarent sacerdotes".) Then follow in the Stowe, the St. Gall, and in the Communion of the Sick in the Stowe, and in the Books of Deer, Dimma, and Mulling, a number of Communion antiphons. The Bangor Antiphoner also gives a set. No two sets are alike, but some antiphons are common to nearly all. There is a resemblance to the Communion responsory, called "Ad accedentes", of the Mozarabic Rite, and similar forms are found in Eastern liturgies, sometimes with the same words. Possibly the *Tricanum* of St. Germanus was something of the same sort. At the end of these in the Stowe is the colophon "Moelcaich scripsit", with which Moelcaich's corrections and additions to the Mass end.

23.—The Post-Communion, "Quos cœlesti dono satiasti". This is a Sunday post-communion in the Gelasian, for the Sixth Sunday after Pentecost in the Gregorian and for the Sixth Sunday after Trinity in the Sarum. It is given in the daily Mass in the Bobbio with the title "Post communionem", and in the St. Gall. There are post-communions to the three Masses which follow later. Two are Gelasian, and the third is in the form of a Gallican "Præfatio" or Bidding Prayer.

24.—"Consummatio missæ". This is the title in the Bobbio to the prayer, "Gratias tibi agimus . . . . . qui nos corporis et sanguinis Christi filii tui communione satiasti", which ends the Mass there, in the Stowe and in the St. Gall. It seems to be compounded of two prayers in the Leonine (Jul. xxiv, and Sept. iii.) In the Gallican books it is a variable prayer. The dismissal formula in the Stowe is "Missa acta est in pace".

The non-Roman elements in the Stowe Mass are: (1) The Bidding Litany between the Epistle and Gospel, which, however, came after the Gospel in the

Gallican. (2) The Post-Sanctus. (3) The Responsory of the Fraction. (4) The position of the Fraction before the Pater Noster. (5) The elaborate Fraction. (6) The Communion Antiphons, and Responsory. In the "Missa apostolorum et martirum et sanctorum et sanctarum virginum", in the Stowe, the Preface and Sanctus are followed by a Post-Sanctus of regular Hispano-Gallican form, "Vere sanctus, vere benedictus", etc., which modulates directly into the "Qui pridie", with no place for the intervention of "Te igitur" and the rest of the first part of the Gelasian Canon. This may represent an Irish Mass as it was before the Gelasian interpolation. In the other two Masses this is not shown.

In the Bobbio the Masses throughout the year seem to be Gallican in arrangement up to the Preface, and Gelasian Roman afterwards. They contain at their fullest, besides Epistle, Gospel, and sometimes a lesson from the Old Testament or the Apocalypse (the *Prophetia* of the Ambrosian Rite), the following variables: (1) Collects, sometimes called "Post Prophetiam", sometimes not named. (2) Bidding Prayer, sometimes called by its Gallican name, "*Præfatio*". This is followed by one or more collects. (3) Collect "post nomina". (4) Collect "Ad Pacem". (5) Sometimes *secreta*, but whenever this title is used the Mass is wholly Roman and has no "*Præfatio*", "Post nomina", nor "Ad Pacem", but only one collect preceding it. (6) "Contestatio", in one case called "Immolatio missæ". This is the *Præfatio* in the Roman sense. Here the Mass ends, with apparently no variable post-communion, though these are given in the three Masses in the Stowe. The Masses are: three for Advent; Christmas Eve and Day; St. Stephen; Holy Innocents; Sts. James and John; Circumcision; Epiphany; St. Peter's Chair; St. Mary; the Assumption (this and St. Peter's Chair are given in the Martyrology of Oengus on 18 Jan., evidently its place here); five for Lent; "In symboli traditione"; Maundy Thursday; Easter Eve and Day; two Paschal Masses; Invention of Cross; Litany days; Ascension; Pentecost (called "in Quinquaginsimo"); St. John Baptist; "in S. Johannis passione"; Sts. Peter and Paul; St. Sigismund; Martyrs; one Martyr; one Confessor; St. Martin; one Virgin; for the Sick; Dedication; St. Michael; for travellers; for the priest himself; "Missa omnimoda"; four votive Masses; for the Living and the Dead; "in domo cujuslibet"; seven Sunday Masses; for the king; two daily Masses; for a dead priest; for the Dead—sixty-one in all. The Mass "in symboli traditione" includes the *traditio* and *expositio symboli*, that for Maundy Thursday is followed by the Good Friday *Lectio Passionis*, and the Easter Eve Mass is preceded by *preces* and intercessory *orationes* similar to those now used on Good Friday, by the "Benedictio cerei" (for which a hymn and a prayer occur in the Bangor Antiphoner), here only represented by "Exultet", and by the order of Baptism.

V. The Baptismal Service.—There are two Celtic orders of baptism extant: one in the seventh-century Bobbio Missal and one in the ninth-century part of the Stowe Missal. They differ considerably from one another in the order of the ceremonies, though they have a good deal of their actual wording in common. The Stowe is the longest of any early form, and on the whole has most in common with the Gelasian and Gregorian. In some of its details it has the appearance of a rather unskilful combination of two orders, for the Exorcism, the Renunciation, and the Confession of Faith come twice over, and the long Blessing of the Font and Baptismal Water is a combination of the Gelasian and Gregorian forms. The actual formula of baptism is not given in the Stowe, but in the Bobbio it reads: "Baptizo te in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti unam habentem [*sic*] substantiam ut habeas vitam æternam partem cum sanctis." This form resembles those in the "Missale Gothicum", the "Vetus Gallicanum", and the eleventh-century Mozarabic "Liber Ordinum", in adding "ut habeas vitam æternam", though all differ in other additions. Both the Stowe and the Bobbio have the Gallican washing of the feet after Baptism, with words very similar to those in the "Gothicum" and "Vetus Gallicanum".

The Bobbio form is: —

1.—"Ad Christianum faciendum". (a) First Exorcism. (b) *Signum Crucis.* (c) Insufflation.
2.—Blessing of Font. (a) Exorcism of water. (b) Two collects. (c) "Sursum Corda" and Preface. (d) Chrismation of Font.
3.—Second Exorcism: "Exorcidio te spiritus immunde".
4.—"Ephpheta". The form is "Effeta, effecta est hostia in odorem suavitatis". Cf., later, the Stowe form.
5.—Unction with oil of catechumens on nose, ears, and breast. The form is "Ungo te oleo sanctificato sicut unxit Samuel David in regem et prophetam".
6.—Renunciation. The three renunciations of the Stowe (and general Roman) form, combined under one answer.
7.—Confession of Faith, with full Creed.
8.—Baptism.
9.—Chrismation, with which is said the form "Deus D. N. J. C. qui te regeneravit", etc.
10.—Vesting with white robe.
11.—Washing of Feet.
12.—"Post Baptismum", two collects.

The Stowe form is:—

1.—Exorcism and *Signum Crucis.* Three prayers. The first is in Moelcaich's hand and includes the signing, the second occurs also in the Bangor Antiphoner as "Collectio super hominem qui habet diabolum", and the third "Deus qui ad salutem" is repeated later before the Blessing of the Font.
2.—*Consecratio salis*, with an exorcism from the Gelasian.
3.—Renunciation. Three separate answers.
4.—Confession of Faith. The Creed in its shortest possible form, a simple profession of faith in each Person of the Trinity.
5.—Insufflation, without words.
6.—First Unction on breast and back with oil and chrism, saying, "Ungo te oleo sanctificato in nomine", etc.
7.—Second Renunciation, in the same words as before.
8.—Four prayers of exorcism, two of which are Gelasian and two Gregorian.
9.—Irish rubric. "It is here that salt is put into the mouth of the child."
10.—"Ephpheta". The form is: "Effeta quod est apertio effeta est hostia in honorem [*sic*] suavitatis in nomine" etc. The Gelasian and Gregorian (like the modern Roman) have, "Effeta quod est adaperire in odorem suavitatis, tu autem effugare Diabole, appropinquabit enim judicium Dei". The play upon the words *effeta* and *effecta* is peculiar to the Bobbio and Stowe. In other books "Ephpheta" is not associated with the giving of the salt, as it appears to be here, but with the touching of the nose and ears with spittle.
11.—Prayer, "Domine sancte Pater omnipotens æterne Deus, qui es et qui eras et qui venturus es". This occurs in the Gelasian as "Ad catechumenum ex Pagano faciendum", and is said in the present Roman Baptism of Adults before the giving of the salt in the case of converts from Paganism.
12.—Prayer, "Deus qui ad salutem humani generis". This, which forms part of the "Benedictio Aquæ" in the Gelasian, Gregorian, and modern Roman, is repeated here for the second time, having been said already with the first exorcism.

13.—Prayer, "Exaudi nos Domine . . . . . et mittere dignare". The prayer used at the "Asperges" in the modern Roman Rite.
14.—The Second Unction. "Huc usque catechumenus. Incipit oleari oleo et crismate in pectus et item scapulas antequam baptizaretur."
15.—The Litany. "Circa fontem canitur." The text is not given. In the Ambrosian Rite the Litany is said after the Baptism, and in the modern Roman on Easter Eve after the Blessing of the Font.
16.—Two psalms (or rather verses of two psalms): "Sitivit anima mea usque vivum, quemadmodum. Vox Domini super aquas multas. Adferte." This is an inverted way of expressing Ps. xli, 2, and Ps. xxviii, 3. The whole of Ps. xli is said in the Ambrosian, and Ps. xxviii in the Roman (Baptism of Adults).
17.—The Blessing of the Font. The first part consists of exorcisms which, though they occur in various parts of the existing Gelasian books, are always connected with the Blessings of the Font, or of water therein. The last part consists, with a few verbal variations, of the prayer "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, adesto magnæ pietatis tuæ mysteriis", and the Preface and prayers that follow in the Gelasian, Gregorian, and modern Roman Easter Eve ceremonies, down to the pouring of chrism into the Font. The direction which follows orders the chrism to be poured "in modum crucis"—"et quique voluerit implet vasculum aqua benedictionis ad domos consecrandas et populus præsens aspergitur aqua benedicta".
18.—The Confession of Faith repeated, but with a slightly amplified form.
19.—The Baptism. A triple immersion or aspersion is ordered, but no formula is given.
20.—The Chrismation. The anointing is *in cerebrum in fronte*. The prayer is "Deus omnipotens Pater D. N. J. C. qui te regeneravit", etc. This is found in the Gelasian, Gregorian, modern Roman, and Ambrosian, and in the Bobbio and "Vetus Gallicanum". The formula is "Ungo te de oleo et de Chrismate salutis et sanctificationis in nomine . . . . nunc et per omnia in sæcula sæculorum", and "operare creatura olei operare in nomine", etc.
21.—The Vesting with the White Robe by the deacon, with the usual words (said by the priest), "Accipe vestem candidam", etc.
22.—The Signing of the Hand. The priest says, "Aperiatur manus pueri", and, "Signum crucis Christi accipe in manum tuam dexteram et conservet te in vitam æternam." Mr. Warren finds an instance of this ceremony in an eleventh-century Jumièges Ritual, but otherwise it does not seem to be known.
23.—The Washing of the Feet. This ceremony is peculiarly Gallican and Celtic, and is not found in Roman books. An order was made in Spain by the Council of Elvira, in 305, that it should be performed by clerks, not by priests. The Stowe form begins with verses from the Psalms, "Lucerna pedibus" and others, with Alleluias. Then follow a formula and a prayer, both referring to Christ washing the feet of His Disciples.
24.—The Communion. "Corpus et sanguinis [*sic*] D. N. J. C. sit tibi in vitam æternam", followed by thanksgivings for both Communion and Baptism. At the end are a Blessing of Water (found also in the Gregorian) and an Exorcism (found also in Gallican and Ambrosian books, and, in a slightly varied form, in the eleventh-century Mozarabic "Liber Ordinum"). These, if they belong to the Baptism, are clearly out of place, rendered unnecessary, as Mr. Warren suggests, by the introduction of the larger Roman "Benedictio Fontis". It is possible, however, that they belong to the Visitation of the Sick, which follows immediately without any break in the MS. That service in the Book of Mulling has a "Benedictio Aquæ" at the beginning.

VI. The Visitation, Unction, and Communion of the Sick.—There are four extant specimens of these services: in the Stowe Missal and in the Books of Dimma, Mulling, and Deer. The Stowe and Dimma are the longest and most complete, and agree very closely. The Mulling differs in the preliminary bidding prayers and in adding at the beginning a "Benedictio aquæ" and "Benedictio hominis", the latter of which comes, in the Stowe and Dimma, at the end, though in a different form, and it agrees with the Dimma in inserting a recitation of the Creed, which is not in the Stowe. The Deer form has only the Communion, which agrees substantially with the other three. The order in the Stowe is:—

1.—"Benedictio Aquæ." "Benedic, Domine, hanc creaturam aquæ" (Gregorian) and "Exorcizo te, spiritus immunde" (found in the Bobbio Baptismal Order before the "Ephpheta" and in an Ambrosian Order quoted by Martène, but in both as an "exorcismus hominis"). These two are considered by Warren to belong to the Baptismal Order, but cf. the position of the "Benedictio super aquam" and "Benedictio hominis" in the Book of Mulling.
2.—*Præfatio*, in the Gallican sense, "Oremus fratres, Dominum Deum nostrum pro fratre nostro", followed by six collects, all but one of which, as well as the *Præfatio*, are in the Dimma.
3.—Two Gospels. Matt., xxii, 23, 29–33, and xxiv, 29–31. The first is in the Dimma, where there is also an Epistle, I Cor., xv, 19–22.
4.—The Unction. In the Dimma this is preceded by a declaration of faith in the Trinity, in eternal life, and in the Resurrection. In the Mulling the Credo follows the Unction. The form of the Unction here is "Ungo te de oleo sanctificato ut salveris in nomine . . . . . in sæcula", etc. The Dimma is "Ungo te de oleo sanctificato in nomine Trinitatis ut salveris in sæcula sæculorum", and the Mulling "Unguo te de oleo sanctificationis in nomine Dei Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti ut salveris in nomine Sancti Trinitatis". The forms in the old Ambrosian Rituals and in the pre-Tridentine Rite of the Venetian Patriarchate began with "Ungo te oleo sanctificato". A very similar form is given by Martène from a twelfth-century Monte Cassino Breviary (Vol. IV, 241), and another is in the tenth-century Asti Ritual described by Gastoué (Rassegna Gregoriana, 1903). The Roman and modern Ambrosian forms begin with "Per istam unctionem". Nothing is said in the Celtic books about the parts of the body to be anointed.
5.—The Pater Noster, with introduction, "Concede Domine nobis famulis tuis", and Embolism, "Libera nos Domine". The Dimma has the same introduction, but after the Pater Noster the *Infirmus* is directed to recite "Agnosce, Domine, verba quæ precipisti", as another (or it may be as an alternative) introduction to a Pater Noster. The Mulling and Deer have an introduction, "Creator naturarum omnium". In each case the Pater Noster and its accompaniments are preliminary to the Communion.
6.—Three prayers for the sick man, referring to his Communion. These are not in the Dimma, Mulling, or Deer. One, "Domine sancte Pater te fideliter", is in the present Roman Ritual.
7.—The Pax. "Pax et caritas D. N. J. C.", etc., as in the Mass.
8.—The Communion. The words of administration as given in the Stowe are "Corpus et sanguis D. N. J. C. filii Dei vivi altissimi, et reliqua". The Dimma omits *altissimi* and gives the ending in full,

"conservat animam tuam in vitam æternam". The Mulling has "Corpus cum sanguine D. N. J. C. sanitas sit tibi in vitam æternam". The Deer has the same, except that it ends "in vitam perpetuam et salutem". Then follow Communion anthems similar to those in the Mass. These differ in order and selection in the Stowe Mass, the Stowe, Dimma, Mulling, and Deer Communions of the Sick, and in the Bangor Antiphoner, though several are common to them all.

9.—The Thanksgiving, "Deus tibi gratias agimus". This is found in the Dimma, Mulling, and Deer forms, where it ends the service. In the Dimma it is preceded by the Blessing.

10.—The Blessing, "Benedicat tibi Dominus et custodiat te", followed by the signing of the Cross and "Pax tibi in vitam æternam".

VII. The Consecration of Churches.—In the *Leabhar Breac* there is a tract describing the consecration of a church. The ceremony is divided into five parts, the consecration of the floor, and of the altar with its furniture, the consecration out of doors, the aspersion inside, and the aspersion outside. The consecration of the floor includes the writing of two alphabets thereon. There are directed to be seven crosses cut on the altar, and nothing is said about relics. On the whole the service appears to be of the same type as the Roman, though differing in details, and if the order of the component parts as given in the tract may be taken as correct, in order also. The tract, edited with a translation by the Rev. T. Olden, D.D., has been printed by the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society (Vol. IV., 1900).

VIII. Hymns.—There are many native Irish hymns both in Latin and Irish. Of these, most, no doubt, were not intended for liturgical use, but rather for private reading, but a certain number were undoubtedly used in the services of the Celtic Church. In the "Liber Hymnorum" there are hymns by Patrick, Columba, Gildas, Sechnall, Ultan, Cummaim of Clonfert, Mugint, Colman mac UiCluasaigh, Colman Mac Murchan, Cuchuimne, Oengus, Fiach, Broccan, Sanctam, Scandlan Mor, Mael-Isu ua Brolchain, and Ninine, besides a few by non-Irish poets. The Bangor Antiphoner adds the names of Comgall and Camelac to the list. Of the twelve hymns given in the latter, eight are not found elsewhere, and ten are certainly intended for liturgical use.

Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus* (Bassano, 1788); Muratori, *Liturgia Romana vetus* (Venice, 1748); Mabillon, *Musæum Italicum* (Paris, 1637); Id., *De Liturgiâ Gallicanâ* (Paris, 1685); Gerbert, *Monumenta veteris Liturgiæ Allemannicæ* (St. Blaise, 1777); Neale and Forbes, *Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church* (Burntisland, 1855–67); Feltoe (ed.), *Sacramentarium Leonianum* (Cambridge, 1896); Wilson (ed.), *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford, 1894); Id., *Classified Index to the Leonine, Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries* (Cambridge, 1892); Delisle, *Mémoires sur d'anciens sacramentaires* (Paris, 1886); Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 1869–78); Probst, *Die abendländische Messe vom fünften bis zum achten Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1896); Duchesne, *Les origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1902; tr. London, 1904); Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace* (London, 1901); Frere, *New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1902); Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* (Oxford, 1881); Pryce, *The Ancient British Church* (London, 1878); G. Stokes, *Ireland and the Celtic Church* (London, 1907); Warren (ed.), *Bangor Antiphoner* (1893–95); Bernard and Atkinson (eds.) *Liber Hymnorum* (1898); Whitley Stokes (ed.), *Martyrology of Oengus the Culdee*; Warner (ed.), *Stowe Missal*, pt. I—the last four works issued by Henry Bradshaw Society;—MacCarthy, *On the Stowe Missal* in *Royal Irish Acad.* (Dublin, 1877–86); Kuypers, *The Prayer Book of Æthelwald the Bishop* [*Book of Cerne*] (Cambridge, 1902); Lawlor, *Chapters on the Book of Mulling* (Edinburgh, 1897); Meyer, *Das Turiner Bruchstück der ältesten irischen Liturgie*, in *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (Göttingen, 1904); Bannister, *Some recently discovered fragments of Irish Sacramentaries*, in *Jour. of Theol. Stud.* for Oct., 1903; Cagin, *Description of the Bobbio Missal*, in *Paléographie musicale* (Solesmes, 1896), V; Bäumer, *Das Stowe-Missale* in *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie* (Innsbruck, 1892); Lucas, *The Gallican Liturgy* in *Dub. Rev.* (July and Jan., 1893–94); *Leabhar Breac, The Speckled Book*—facsimile with introduction, etc., in *R. I. Acad.* (Dublin, 1876); Macgregor, *An Ancient Gaelic treatise on the Symbolism of the Eucharist*, in *Transactions of Aberdeen Ecclesiological Soc.*, No. XI, 1896 (Aberdeen, 1898); Warren, *The Irish Missal belonging to Corpus Christi College, Oxford* (London, 1879); Id., *The Leofric Missal* (Oxford, 1883); Forbes, *Missale Drummondense* (Burntisland, 1882); E. Bishop, *Liturgical note in Kuypers' Prayerbook of Æthelwald* [*Book of Cerne*] (Cambridge, 1902); Id., *The Earliest Roman Mass Book*, in *Dub. Rev.* for Oct., 1894; Id., *The Litany of Saints in the Stowe Missal*, in *Journal of Theol. Studies* for Oct., 1905; Id., *Spanish Symptoms (in Gallican, Irish and Roman Service Books)*, in same *Journal* for Jan., 1907; Mercati, *More Spanish Symptoms* in same *Journal* for April, 1907; Lejay, *Articles* in *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. rel.* (1897), II, 91, 189; (1903), VIII, 556; (1904), IX, 556; Ferotin, *Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'église wisigothique et mozarabe*, in Cabrol, *Mon. Eccl. Lit.* (Paris, 1904), V; Legg, *Ecclesiological Essays* (London, 1905); *Sti Columbani Regula*, in Flemingius, *Collectanea Sacra* (Louvain, 1667); Reeves, *On the Céli-Dé, commonly called Culdees*, in *R. I. Acad.* (Dublin, 1874), XXIV; Bury, *Life of St. Patrick* (London, 1905); Healy, *Life and Writings of St. Patrick* (Dublin, 1905); Dottin, *Notes bibliographiques sur l'ancienne littérature d'Irlande*, in *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. rel.* (Paris, 1900), V, 161.—It should be added that there is also a considerable mass of quasi-historical literature on both sides, Anglican and Roman, from which a certain amount of information may be gleaned, but it requires to be used with great discrimination, owing to its controversial character.

Henry Jenner.

Cemetery.—Name.—The word *cœmeterium* or *cimiterium* (in Gr. κοιμητήριον) may be said in early literature to be used exclusively of the burial places of Jews and Christians. A single doubtful example (Corp. Inscript. Lat., VIII, n. 7543), where it seems to be applied to a pagan sepulture, can safely be disregarded, and though the word, according to its etymology, means sleeping place (from κοιμᾶσθαι, to sleep), its occurrence in this literal sense is rare. Moreover, the phrase "their so-called cemeteries" (τὰ καλούμενα κοιμητήρια), used in an imperial edict of 259, shows that it was even then recognized as a distinctive name. The word occurs in Tertullian (De animâ, c. li) and is probably older. Let us add that though what we now understand by a cemetery is a separate, park-like enclosure not being the "yard" of any church, the word was originally of much more general application. It was applied either to any single tomb or to a whole graveyard, and was the usual term employed to designate those subterranean burial places now commonly known as the catacombs (q. v.).

Early History.—There can be little doubt that in the beginning of the preaching of Christianity the converts to the Gospel were content to be interred without distinction in the graves of their Jewish brethren (Acts, v, 6, viii, 2, and ix, 37). But it is also plain from the nature of things that this arrangement could not have been of long duration. To the Jew the dead body and all connected with it was an uncleanness. To the Christian it involved no contamination, but was full of the hope of immortality (I Cor., xv, 43). The practice of separate interment must, therefore, have begun early both in Rome and in other places where there were large Christian colonies. It would seem that the earliest Christian burial places were family vaults (to use a rather misleading word) erected upon private property. But the desire to rest near those of their own faith who had passed away before must have been especially strong in Rome, where even artisans practising the same trade sought to be buried side by side with their fellow-craftsmen and formed associations for the purpose. Wealthy Christians accordingly enlarged their family burial places and admitted their poorer brethren to share them. "For himself, for his freedmen, and for charity" (*sibi et libertis et misericordiæ*) is an inscription found in a construction of this class. Partly owing to the nature of the soil, partly, no doubt, to the desire of imitating the burial places in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and in particular the sepulchre of Christ, the practice was largely followed of excavating a subterranean chamber or series of chambers in the recesses of which bodies could be laid and walled in with bricks or marble slabs. The need of interring a disproportionately large number of persons

CAMPO SANTO, SANTIAGO DE CHILE

RUINS OF A CHRISTIAN BASILICA AND CEMETERY, SALONA, DALMATIA

THE CAMPO SANTO, PISA

upon one small property probably led to the early development of a system of narrow galleries tunnelled through the tufa, with horizontal niches (*loculi*) scooped out in the walls on both sides. At the same time it would be a mistake to suppose that Christians throughout the Roman Empire were compelled to resort to great secrecy regarding their interments. On the contrary, the well-understood principle of law that a burial place was a *locus religiosus* and consequently inviolable seems at normal times to have guaranteed to the Christians a large measure of immunity from interference. The jurisdiction which the pagan College of Pontiffs possessed over all places of sepulture no doubt caused difficulties, especially at those epochs when active persecution broke out, but the general tendency of the Roman magistrates was to be tolerant in religious matters. Moreover it is probable that for many years after the Gospel was first preached in Rome the Christians were looked upon merely as a particular sect of Jews, and the Jews, as we may learn from Horace and other pre-Christian writers, had long held a recognized and assured position which excited no alarm.

Hence from Apostolic times down to the persecution of Domitian, the faithful were interred upon private burial allotments, situated like the pagan tombs along the border of the great roads and of course outside the walls of the city. Moreover, as Lanciani says, "these early tombs whether above or below ground, display a sense of perfect security and an absence of all fear or solicitude" (Lanciani, Pagan and Christian Rome, 309). The vestibule and crypt of the Flavians, members of Domitian's own family, afford a conspicuous example of this. The ground, bordering on the Via Ardeatina, belonged to Flavia Domitilla, the niece of Domitian. Here a catacomb was excavated, a portion of which seems to have been set aside for the interment of the family. The entrance can plainly be seen from the road, and the vestibule and adjoining chambers still remain in which, according to Roman custom, anniversary feasts took place in honour of the dead. In this case the feasts would have been the *agapæ*, or love feasts of the Christians, probably preceded or followed by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; but the custom of honouring the third, ninth (afterwards seventh), thirtieth, and anniversary day of the decease seems to have been borrowed from the religious observances of Greece and Rome and to date from the earliest times. In contrast to these original private tombs the portion of the catacomb excavated for the use of the Christian community at large consisted of a vast network of galleries dug at more than one level. For a while, like many other underground Christian cemeteries, this catacomb seems to have been known by the name of the donor, Domitilla, but later it was called after the holy martyrs Nereus and Achilleus, who were subsequently buried there. Further, towards the close of the fourth century a basilica in honour of these two martyrs was erected upon the spot. Their tomb was near the entrance and consequently it was not disturbed, but the ground was dug away and the church built immediately over the tomb, much below the level of the surrounding soil. On the other hand, through devotion to these saints interments multiplied and numerous fresh galleries for the purpose were excavated in the immediate vicinity of the church. All this is typical of what took place in many other instances. The early burial places, which were certainly in private ownership and confined to isolated plots of ground (*areæ*), seem in the third century to have often become property held by the Christian community in common, other adjoining allotments being bought up and the whole area honeycombed with galleries at many different levels. We learn from the "Philosophumena" that Pope Zephyrinus appointed Callistus (c. 198) superintendent of the cemeteries. So again we have distinct record of the restoration of the cemeteries to the Christians in 259 after the Valerian persecution. (Euseb., Hist. Eccles., VII, xiii.) According to De Rossi the freedom which the Church at normal times enjoyed in their possession was due to the fact that the Christians banded themselves together to form a *collegium funeraticium*, or burial society, such associations, of which the members paid a certain annual contribution, being expressly recognized by law. (See Roma Sotterranea, I, 101 sq.) For this view there is very good evidence, and though objections have been raised by such authorities as Monseigneur Duchesne and Victor Schultze, the theory has by no means been abandoned by later scholars. (See Duchesne, Histoire ancienne de l'église, I, 384; Marucchi, Eléments d'archéologie, I, 117–124.)

When martyrs were thus buried, crowds of their fellow-Christians desired to be buried near them; moreover, some sort of open space forming a small chamber or chapel was generally opened out where Mass could be celebrated upon or beside the tomb. Still, this was only an occasional use. The catacombs, owing to difficulties of light and ventilation, were not ordinarily used as places of Christian worship except at times of fierce persecution. After Constantine's edict of toleration (312), when peace was restored to the Church, basilicas were sometimes built over portions of the catacombs, especially over the known burial place of some favourite martyrs. At the same time, during the fourth century the eagerness to be interred in these subterranean galleries gradually waned, though the zeal of Pope Damasus in honouring the tombs of the martyrs seems to have revived the fashion for a few years at a later date. After 410, when Rome was sacked by Alaric, no more burials took place in the Roman catacombs, but the earlier spread of Christianity is well illustrated by the excavations made. Any accurate estimate is of course impossible, but Michael de Rossi calculated that in the zone of territory lying within three miles of the walls, more than five hundred miles of subterranean galleries had been tunnelled and that the number of Christians buried therein must have exceeded 1,700,000. The use of open-air cemeteries in place of catacombs had probably begun in Rome before Constantine. Many have been identified in modern times (De Rossi, Roma Sotterranea, vol. III, bk. III), though it is not always easy to determine exactly the period at which they started. In other parts of the world it is quite certain that innumerable open-air Christian cemeteries were in existence long before the close of the period of persecutions. We may cite as characteristic the discoveries of Dr. W. M. Ramsay in Phrygia, where many Christian graves clearly belong to the second century, as also those of Northern Africa, of which we hear already in Tertullian, and in particular those of Salona in Dalmatia (second to sixth century; see Leclercq, Manuel d'archéologie, I, 327–329). This last is particularly interesting because the surviving remains illustrate so clearly the extreme antiquity of the practice of interring the dead in the near neighbourhood of the oratories in which the Christians assembled to offer the Holy Sacrifice. It is probably to this custom that we may trace the origin of the lateral chapels which have become so notable a feature of all our greater churches. No doubt the tendency to surround the church with graves was long kept in check by the Roman law forbidding the dead to be interred within the walls of cities; but this law at an early date began to be disregarded, and after the pontificate of John III (560–575) it would seem that burials at Rome generally took place within the walls.

As a rule the Christians, though their cemeteries were separate, accommodated themselves in things permissible to the burial usages of the peoples among

whom they lived. Thus in Egypt the early Coptic Christians converted their dead into mummies with the use of asphalt and natron. Again, though catacombs existed far away from Rome in many places where the soil favoured such excavations, e. g. in Naples and Sicily, still, in certain tracts of country otherwise suitable, e. g. in Umbria, the early Christians abstained from this method of interment, apparently because it was not used by the pagan inhabitants (see N. Müller in Realencyklopädie f. prot. Theol., X, 817).

Burial in Churches.—The fact that the tombs of the martyrs were probably the earliest altars (cf. Apoc., vi, 9), together with the eager desire to be buried near God's holy ones, gradually led up to the custom of permitting certain favoured individuals to be interred not only near but within the church. It may be said that the Roman emperors led the way. Constantine and Theodosius were buried under the portico of the church of the Apostles in Constantinople. At Rome, when the restrictions against burial within the city began to be set aside, the entrance of St. Peter's became the usual place of interment for the popes and other distinguished persons. It was no doubt in imitation of this practice that King Ethelbert of Canterbury was persuaded by St. Augustine to dedicate a church to Sts. Peter and Paul outside the town, with the intent "that both his own body and the bodies of his episcopal successors and at the same time of the kings of Kent might be laid to rest there". They were in point of fact buried in the vestibule. Probably a varying phase of the same tendency may be recognized in the practice of erecting little shelters or oratories, *basilicæ*, over certain favoured graves in the open. The Salic law prohibited outrages upon such basilics under heavy penalties: "Si quis basilicam super hominem mortuum exspoliaverit 1200 denarios culpabilis iudicetur", i. e. "If any one shall plunder a basilica erected over the dead he shall be fined 1200 denarii" (cf. Lindenschmidt, Handbuch d. deutsch. Alterthumskunde, I, 96). But interment within the church itself had been known from an early date in isolated cases. St. Ambrose allowed his brother Satyrus, although he was a layman, to be buried within the church beside the tomb of a martyr. As for himself, he wished to be buried under the altar of his own basilica. "Hunc ego locum (sc. sub altari) prædestinaveram mihi. Dignum est enim ut ibi requiescat sacerdos ubi offerre consuevit", i. e. "This place (beneath the altar) I had chosen for myself. For it is fitting that where the priest has been wont to sacrifice, there should he rest (Migne, P. L., XVI, 1023). In the earlier periods, however, when we hear of burial in churches we may as a rule presume that the cemetery basilicas are meant (cf. De Rossi, Roma Sotterranea, III, 548 sq.), and for a long time the resistance made to the growing practice of burial in churches was very determined. Of the numerous conciliar decrees upon the subject that of Vaison in 442 may be taken as a specimen. "According to the tradition of our ancestors", it says, "measures must be taken that on no account should anyone be buried within the churches, but only in the yard or in the vestibule or in the annexes [*exedris*]. But within the church itself and near the altar the dead must on no account be buried." This decree with others of similar purport was afterwards incorporated in the canon law. As may be learned from St. Gregory of Tours it was frequently disregarded in the case of bishops and royal personages, but on the other hand we have record of many other bishops, abbots, and other distinguished men both in the sixth century and later who were buried *juxta urbem*, or *in campis*, or *in communi cæmeterio*. St. Acca (q. v.) might be mentioned as an English example in point. None the less in the first half of the ninth century the serious abuses attendant upon the neglect of this prohibition were constantly complained of. The passage in the capitularies of Theodulfus (c. 790) is particularly interesting because it was afterwards translated into Anglo-Saxon (c. 1110) in the following form:—

"It was an old custom in these lands often to bury departed men within the church and to convert into cemeteries [*lictunum*] the places that were hallowed to God's worship and blessed for offering to Him. Now it is our will that henceforth no man be buried within a church unless it be some man of the priesthood [*sacerdhades*] or at least a layman of such piety that it is known that he by his meritorious deeds earned when living such a place for his dead body to rest in. It is not our intention however that the bodies which have been previously buried in the church should be cast out but that the graves which are seen therein be either dug deeper into the earth or else be levelled up and the church floor be evenly and decently laid so that no grave [*nan byrgen*] be any longer apparent. But if in any place there be so many graves that it is impossible to effect this, then let the place be left as a cemetery [*Thonne læte man tha stowe to lictune*] and the altar be taken from thence and set in a clean [i. e. new] place and a church be there raised where people may offer to God reverently and decently" (Thorpe, Eccles. Institutes and Laws, 472).

This decree plainly shows both that the law against burying within the churches had often been disregarded in the past and also that any attempt to enforce it rigidly was looked upon as impracticable. No one could determine the precise degree of piety which merited a relaxation, and in most countries those whose dignity, wealth, or benefactions enabled them to press their claims with vigour had little difficulty in securing this coveted privilege for themselves or for their friends. The English liturgist, John Beleth, seems to admit that any *patronus ecclesiæ*, i. e. the patron of a living, could claim to be buried in the church as a right, and his words are adopted by Durandus, though possibly without a full appreciation of their meaning. Still, such lay interments within the sacred building and especially in the chancel always stood in contradiction to the canon law, and some show of resistance was generally made. In particular, it was insisted on that tombs should not project above the pavement or should at least be confined to the side chapels. The ecclesiastical legislation of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries continued to recognize the right of the clergy to be buried within the sacred building, but it need hardly be remarked that the intervention of state legislation in almost all modern countries has deprived these decrees of much of their practical importance.

Medieval Cemeteries.—When the tribes of the North were first converted to Christianity an effort was generally made to restrain the converts from being buried in the barrows used by the pagans. This does not seem to have been the case to the same extent when the Gospel was preached to the Romanized Gauls. There, says Boulanger (Le mobilier funéraire gallo-romain et franc, 27), the pagan and the Christian Roman will often be seen resting side by side. "Glass with biblical subjects or pottery bearing Christian inscriptions may be found next door to a grave which contains the obol intended for Charon." In the Frank and Saxon interments there is not usually this confusion of pagan and Christian. At the same time, the national burial custom, which required the warrior to be buried with his arms and the girl with her ornaments and the implements of her daily occupation, was long observed even by Christians. The temptation which this custom offered for the rifling of graves was viewed with much disfavour by the Church, and under Charlemagne an ecclesiastical council passed a decree which seems to have been effective in putting an end to this burial

with accoutrements (Boulanger, op. cit., 41). Still Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, in 857, found it necessary to issue a whole series of instructions *De sepulcris non violandis*. In all these early Christian cemeteries the orientation of the tombs was carefully attended to. Each corpse was laid with its feet to the east, though it has been remarked as a curious fact that pagan Frankish sepultures also commonly exhibit the same peculiarity (Boulanger, op. cit., 32). With regard to England it may probably be assumed, though clear evidence is lacking, that separate Christian graveyards were formed almost from the beginning in all those places where the faithful were numerous. It would seem that even before a church was built it was the practice of our Saxon forefathers to set up a cross, which served as a rendezvous for the Christians of the district. An instance may be quoted from the almost contemporary life of St. Willibald, born in 699, who when he was three years old was consecrated to God at the foot of such a cross in a remote part of Hampshire. The suggestion has been recently made with much plausibility that round such a cross the Christian converts loved to be laid to rest, and that these primitive crosses marked a site upon which church and churchyard were established at a later time (see Baldwin Brown, Arts in Early England, I, 254–266). Certain it is that the churchyard cross was always a conspicuous feature of the consecrated enclosure and that the churchyard usually afforded sanctuary as secure as that of the church itself for those who were fleeing from justice or private vengeance. Numerous ecclesiastical ordinances enjoin that the churchyard was to be surrounded by a wall or other boundary sufficient to keep out straying cattle and to secure the area from profanation. As a specimen we may take the following ordinance of the Bishop of Lincoln in 1229:—"Regarding the arrangements of a church-yard [*cœmeterium*] let the ground be properly enclosed with a wall or a ditch, and let no part of it be taken up with buildings of any kind, unless during time of war. There should be a good and well-built cross erected in the church-yard to which the procession is made on Palm Sunday, unless custom prescribes that the procession should be made elsewhere" (Wilkins, Concilia, I, 623). This churchyard procession on Palm Sunday, in which, as early as the time of Lanfranc, the Blessed Sacrament was often carried in a portable shrine, as well as all the relics of the church, was a very imposing ceremony. Many descriptions of it have been left us, and traces still survive even in Protestant countries, where, as for example, in Wales, the country people to this day often visit the churchyard on Palm Sunday and scatter flowers on the graves (see Thurston, Lent and Holy Week, 213–230; The Month, April, 1896, 378). Less admirable was the use of the churchyard in medieval times as a sort of recreation ground or market-place. Numerous decrees were directed against abuses, but it was difficult to draw a clear line between what was legitimate and permissible and what was distinctly a profanation of the sacred precincts. The very fact that people congregated in the churchyard on the way to and from service on Sundays and holidays made it a convenient place of assembly. Down to modern times the day of the village feast or fair is often found to coincide with the sometimes forgotten original dedication of the church or with the festival of its patron saint. Moreover, there was a tendency to regard the church and its precincts as a sort of neutral ground or place of security for valuables. Hence ancient contracts often include a clause that such and such a sum of money is to be paid on a certain date in a particular church or churchyard. In any case it cannot be denied that the erection of stalls and booths for fairs in the churchyard persisted in spite of all prohibitions (Baldwin Brown, op. cit., 274, 364).

A curious feature found in many churchyards from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, especially in France, is the so-called *lanterne des morts*, a stone erection sometimes twenty or thirty feet high, surmounted by a lantern and presenting a general resemblance to a small lighthouse. The lantern seems to have been lighted only on certain feasts or vigils and in particular on All Souls' Day. An altar is commonly found at the foot of the column. Various theories have been suggested to explain these remarkable objects, but no one of them can be considered satisfactory. Besides the churchyard cross and the *lanterne des morts*, cemeteries, especially when not attached to the parish church, frequently contained a mortuary chapel similar to those with which modern usage is still familiar. Here, no doubt, Mass was offered for the souls of the departed, and the dead were on occasion deposited, when for some reason the service at the graveside was delayed. These mortuary chapels seem usually to have been dedicated to St. Michael, probably from the function attributed to him of escorting the dead to and from the judgment seat (cf. the Offertory in the requiem Mass: "Signifer sanctus Michael repræsentet eas in lucem sanctam". In other graveyards a "lych-gate", i. e. a roofed gate-



Cemetery of the Capuchins, Rome

way to the cemetery, served to afford shelter to the coffin and mourners when waiting to proceed to the graveside. Provision was also generally made, and some such arrangement is recommended by the decrees of more modern times, for the bestowal of bones which might be dug up in making new graves. Most churchyards possessed something in the nature of a charnel house or ossuary, and in many parts of the world, where for various reasons space had to be economized, a principle was recognized that after a certain term of years graves might be emptied to make room for new occupants, the remains thus removed being consigned to the charnel house. This was and is particularly the case in regions where, owing to the unsuitable nature of the soil, e. g. in the City of Mexico, the dead are built into oven-like chambers of solid masonry. When these chambers are cleared at intervals to receive another occupant, it is not unusual to find here and there a body which instead of falling to dust has become naturally desiccated or mummified. Such gruesome specimens have not unfrequently been sold and without a particle of foundation exhibited as "walled up nuns" or "victims of the Inquisition". (See The Month, Jan., 1894, pp. 14, 323, 574, and April, 1904, p. 334.) Among the Capuchins and some other orders in Southern Europe charnel houses are often constructed with the most fantastic elaboration, the bodies, dried to the consistency of parchment, being arranged around the

chamber in niches and robed in their religious habits. Moreover, even here, secular persons, following medieval precedents, have been admitted in some cases to share the sepulture of the religious. The curious practices observed in many ancient cemeteries, for instance in the arcade known as the *Charnier* of the Cemetery of the Innocents at Paris, would afford much matter for discussion, but lie outside the limits of the present article. A very favourite decoration for such erections or for cemetery walls was the Dance of Death (q. v.), otherwise known as the *Danse Macabre*. The frescoes of this character, however, seem none of them to be older than the fourteenth century.

MONASTIC CEMETERIES.—From an early date every religious house possessed a cemetery of its own. An interesting discovery of such a graveyard belonging to Anglo-Saxon nuns of the eighth century was made a few years ago near Hull. It is possible that these monastic cemeteries in early missionary days often formed the nucleus of a churchyard intended for all the faithful. In any case it became the ardent desire of many pious persons to be laid to rest among the religious of monastic institutions, and they often sought to purchase the privilege by benefactions of various kinds. Formal compacts dealing with this matter are to be met with among early charters, e. g. those of Anglo-Saxon England; and the question, as will easily be understood, led to much friction at a somewhat later date, between the religious orders and secular clergy, resulting in a great deal of ecclesiastical legislation upon the right of choosing a sepulture and the claims of the parish priest.

CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES.—The practice of blessing the grave or the vault in which any Christian was laid to rest is extremely ancient, and it may be traced back to the time of St. Gregory of Tours (De Gloria Conf., c. civ). In many early pontificals, e. g. those of Egbert of York and Robert of Jumièges, a special service is provided with the title *Consecratio Cymiterii*, and this, with certain developments and additions, is still prescribed for the blessing of cemeteries at the present day. According to this rite five wooden crosses are planted in the cemetery, one in the centre and the others at the four points of the compass. After the chanting of the Litany of the Saints with special invocations, holy water is blessed and the bishop makes the circuit of the enclosure sprinkling it everywhere with this water. Then he comes to each of the crosses in turn and recites before it a prayer of some length, these five prayers being identical with those appointed for the same purpose in the Anglo-Saxon pontificals of the eighth century. Candles are also lighted before the crosses and placed upon them, and this feature, though not so ancient as the prayers, is also of venerable antiquity. On each of these occasions incense is used, and finally a consecratory preface is sung at the central cross, after which the procession returns to the church, where solemn Mass is celebrated. A cemetery which has thus been consecrated may be profaned, and it is in a measure regarded as losing its sacred character when any deed of blood or certain other outrages are committed within its enclosure. For example, as the ground has been blessed for those who are in communion with the Church, the forcible intrusion of someone who has died under the Church's ban is looked upon as a violation which unfits it for the purpose for which it was designed. Innocent III decided that in such a case, if for any reason it was impossible to exhume the remains and cast them out of the enclosure, the cemetery must be reconciled by a form of service specially provided for the purpose. In a celebrated instance, known as the Guibord Case, which occurred in Montreal, Canada, in 1875, the bishop, seeing the civil law uphold the intrusion, laid the portion of the cemetery so profaned under an interdict. Finally we may note the quasi-consecration imparted to the famous Campo Santo of Pisa, as well as to one or two other Italian cemeteries, by the alleged transference thither of soil from Mount Calvary.

CEMETERIES AND THE CIVIL LAW.—It would be impossible here to deal in detail with the various legislative enactments which now almost everywhere prevent the Church's requirements from being carried into effect. (See BURIAL.) "From the principles which now obtain in German law", writes Dr. Peter Lex in his recent work, "Das kirchliche Begräbnissrecht", "the idea of a Catholic churchyard from the point of view of Catholic teaching and practice, has been completely suppressed and the cemetery has been degraded into a mere burial-ground belonging to the civil corporation." In such matters as the burial of Protestants or non-Christians in ground formerly blessed for the faithful only, the Church when opposed by the civil power allows her ministers to give way rather than provoke a conflict. In England, according to the Burials Act of 1852, the "Burial Boards" in different parts of the country are empowered to provide adequate graveyards out of the rates. In these a certain portion is consecrated according to the rites of the Church of England and the remainder is left unconsecrated. Of this last such a proportion as may be necessary is assigned for the use of Catholics, who are free to consecrate it for themselves. Moreover, when a chapel is erected upon the Church of England portion of the cemetery, a similar building must as a rule be provided in the other sections. The act assigns to the "Burial Board", at least indirectly, the control of the inscriptions to be set up upon the tombstones in the cemetery, but these powers are generally administered without hardship to Catholics. When Catholics are buried in ground which is not specially consecrated for their use the priest conducting the funeral is directed by the "Rituale Romanum" to bless the grave, and if the priest himself cannot conduct the funeral further, to put blessed earth into the coffin. Children who have died before baptism, we may notice, should be interred apart in ground which has not been consecrated; and it is usual even in the consecrated portion to assign a separate place for infants that have been baptized.

For other points not touched upon here, see the article BURIAL.

For general works see PERMANEDER, in *Kirchenlex.*, VII, 718; RULAND, *Gesch. der kirchlichen Leichenfeier* (Ratisbon, 1901); LEK, *Das kirchliche Begräbnissrecht* (Ratisbon, 1904); BERTRAND, *De la législation de la Sépulture* (Paris, 1901); *Archiv fur k. Kirchenrecht*, I, 25 sq., LXXVIII, 171 sq.; MOULART, *De Sepulturâ et Cœmeteriis* (Louvain, 1862), and in *L'Eglise et L'Etat* (Louvain, 1896), 512–29.

For the Catacombs and early Middle Ages see LECLERCQ, *Manuel d'archéol. chrét.* (Paris, 1907), I, 217–234, a very satisfactory discussion of the subject; MÜLLER in *Realencyklopädie f. prot. Theol.*, X, 814 sqq., also an extraordinarily full and elaborate article; LANCIANI, *Christian and Pagan Rome* (London, 1892), 305–361; BROWN, *From Schola to Cathedral* (London, 1893); MARUCCHI, *Eléments d'archéol.* (Rome, 1901), especially I; LINDENSCHMIDT, *Handbuch der deutschen Alterthumskunde*, I, 64–146; COCHET, *La Normandie Souterraine* (Paris, 1860); BROWN, *The Arts in Early England* (London, 1902), I, 253–270; KRAUS, *Real-Encyklopädie*, I, 307 sq.; BOULANGER, *Le mobilier funéraire gallo-romain et franc* (Paris, 1905); MURCIER, *La Sépulture Chrét.* (Paris, 1855).

On the Canon Law see WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1902), III, 464–71; ZEMA, *Quæstiones Canonico-Liturgicæ* (Rome, 1903); CAVAGNIS, *Institut. Jur. Pub. Eccles.* (Rome, 1889), II, 289 sq.; FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Sepultura*.

For the Liturgy see MARTÈNE, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus* (Bassano, 1788); CABROL, *Le livre de la prière antique* (Paris, 1900), 326–32.

For the ecclesiastical discipline of the Province of Quebec see GIGNAC, *Compend. Jur. eccl.*, etc. (Quebec, 1903), *De rebus*, etc., Nos. 773, 774, 778, 783; also *Discipline Eccl. du Diocèse de Québec*, s. v. *Sépulture;* and for the Civil Law, WEIR, *The Civil Code of Lower Canada* (Montreal, 1888).

HERBERT THURSTON.

CEMETERY LAWS IN THE UNITED STATES.—The several States of the Union have upon their statute books legislation, in its broader outlines identical, providing for the incorporation of cemetery associa-

tions, the safe and sanitary location and regulation thereof, and the protection of sepulture therein. In some States this statutory protection is more or less restricted to incorporated cemetery associations and is not directly applicable to church cemeteries. As a rule cemeteries throughout the United States are exempt from taxation and monuments therein from execution. The law is adverse to the disturbance of the dead in their last resting-place. In Alabama cemetery authorities removed the body of a child from a cemetery, which had been discontinued, to another cemetery that had been founded in place thereof, without giving the child's parents notice. The parents recovered damages to the amount of $1700 from the cemetery authorities. (18 So. R., 565.) In many of the States there are statutes making it a criminal offence to remove or deface tombstones, fences, or trees in a cemetery.

The bodies of the dead belong to their surviving relatives to be disposed of as they see fit, subject, of course, to public sanitary regulations. (Bogert vs. Indianapolis, 13 Ind. R., 434.) The title of the lot-holder in a cemetery is rarely a title in fee simple. The right of burial conveyed by written instrument in a churchyard cemetery is either an easement or a licence, and never a title to the fee-holder. (McGuire vs. St. Patrick's Cathedral, 54 Hun. N. Y., 207.) Where, for instance, the certificate of purchase reads, "to have and to hold the lots for the use and purpose and subject to the conditions and regulations mentioned in the deed of trust to the trustees of the church", this was construed as a mere licence; and, as such, revocable. The regulations of the Church may, and usually do, limit the right of interment in the cemetery to those who die in communion with the Church; and the courts have held that the Church is the judge in this matter. (Dwenger vs. Geary, 113 Ind. 114, 54 Hun. N. Y., 210.) One C—, a Catholic, received from the proper officer of a Catholic cemetery a receipt for seventy-five dollars, being the purchase money for a plot of ground in the cemetery. C— died a Freemason, and the cemetery authorities would not allow his body to be buried in the lot which he had bought. The case went to the highest courts in New York, and the cemetery authorities were upheld, it satisfactorily appearing that the rules of the Catholic Church forbid the burial, in consecrated ground, of one who is not a Catholic or who is a member of the Masonic fraternity. (People vs. St. Patrick's Cathedral, 21 Hun. N. Y., 184.) The Guibord Case at Montreal (1875) may be recalled in this connexion. Guibord, an excommunicated man, was interred in the Catholic cemetery by a decree of a civil court. Bishop Bourget laid the portion of the cemetery thus desecrated under interdict. Bishop Dwenger, of the Fort Wayne Diocese, secured an injunction against one Geary, who desired to bury the body of his suicide son in a lot owned by him (Geary) in the Catholic cemetery. The Supreme Court of Indiana upheld the bishop. (113 Ind., 106.)

While the right of eminent domain may be invoked to condemn lands for cemetery purposes, the same right may be employed to take the cemetery lands for such public purposes as extending a highway. However, in some States there are statutes prohibiting the opening of streets through cemeteries. The State exercising its police power, or a municipality, when authority is delegated to it by the legislature, may forbid the further use of a cemetery for interments, or declare it a nuisance and a danger to public health, and authorize the removal of the dead therefrom; and this may be done by such authorities without recourse to eminent domain proceedings. Various questions have arisen as to the right of a cemetery lot-owner to erect a monument thereon and as to his right to compel the cemetery authorities to keep the cemetery walks and grounds in good order and repair. In the absence of special regulations reserving such matters to the discretion of the cemetery authorities, the right of the lot-owner has been affirmed in these particulars. (61 N. W. Rep., 842; 36 S. W. R., 802.) Trusts for the purpose of keeping the graves in repair are held to be charitable to the extent of excepting them from the statute against perpetuities. (Am. and English Encycl. of Law, V, 790.) The heir-at-law has a right of property to the monuments of his ancestors in the graveyard, and may sue any person defacing them. (3 Edw. Ch., Rh., 155.)

For the cemetery legislation of the Province of Quebec, see MIGNAULT, *Le Droit Paroissial, etc.* (Montreal, 1893), in Index s. v. *Cimetières;* DORAIS, *Code Civil de la Province de Québec* (2nd ed., Montreal, 1905), nos. 53 b. and 66 sqq.; TYLER, *American Eccl. Law*, Ch. 71–85; *American and English Encycl. of Law*, V, 781–98; DESMOND, *The Church and the Law* (Chicago, 1898), c. xvi.

HUMPHREY J. DESMOND.

CANADIAN LEGISLATION CONCERNING CEMETERIES. —In the Dominion of Canada, cemeteries are under the authority of the legislatures of the different provinces. Outside of the Province of Quebec, in the English-speaking provinces, the laws regarding them are, with slight variations, the same. In all the provinces, cemeteries are exempt from taxation. Cemetery companies are authorized by general statutes. In the Province of Ontario provision is made for the amount of capital to be subscribed, and a certain percentage to be paid thereon, before an act of incorporation shall be granted, and "no such cemeteries shall be established within the limits of any city". In the case of incorporated villages or towns, a cemetery may be established when the lieutenant-governor, in council, considers that there is no danger for the public safety, and that in the opinion of the Provincial Board of Health the proposed cemetery may, under all the circumstances, be safely permitted. It is enjoined that "no body shall be buried in a vault or otherwise, in any chapel or other building in the cemetery, nor within fifteen feet of the outer wall of such chapel or building. No grave may be re-opened for the removal of a body, without permission of the corporation authorities, or the order of a judge of the County Court, excepting cases where the Crown may order the removal of a body for the purpose of legal inquiry". The company must furnish a grave for strangers and for the poor of all denominations free of charge, on a certificate, in the latter case, of a minister or a clergyman of the denomination to which the deceased belonged, that the representatives of the deceased are poor and cannot afford to buy a lot in the cemetery. The shareholders in such cemetery, cannot receive more than eight per cent on their investments. All excess must be applied to the preservation, improvement, and embellishment of the land of burial-grounds, and to no other purpose. Penalties are imposed upon any one destroying or defacing any tomb, injuring trees or plants, or committing any nuisance in the cemetery (see ch. cccvii, of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1897, an "Act respecting the Property of Religious Institutions").

The Criminal Code of Canada enacts penalties for not burying the dead, for indignity to dead bodies, for forging, mutilating, destroying, or concealing registers of burials. The body of every offender executed, shall be buried within the walls of the prison, within which judgment of death is executed on him, unless the lieutenant-governor in council orders otherwise.

Any religious society or congregation of Christians may, among other things, acquire land for a cemetery. These are subject to the general rules, as the precautions for health, etc. The provisions of this law have been extended to the Church of England, and "all rights and privileges conferred upon any society or congregation of Christians, in virtue of this statute, shall extend in every respect to the Roman Catholic

Church, to be exercised according to the government of said Church". Since 7 April, 1891, the same privileges have been extended to those professing the Jewish religion. In the Province of Quebec, provisions are also made for the incorporation of cemetery companies. The lieutenant-governor may at any time, by order in council, confirm any deed of sale or grant, executed with prescribed formalities, of any one piece of land not exceeding twenty-five arpents in extent, to any persons not less than five in number named in such deed, such persons not being trustees for a religious congregation or society, or Roman Catholics. These associations are subject to the general laws as regards health regulations, and are further obliged to keep registers of all interments or disinterments, as well as a record of all proceedings and transactions of the corporations. Any parish mission, congregation or society of Christians not being a parish recognized by law, may, in the mode indicated by the statute, acquire lands for cemeteries, and, subject to the approval of the lieutenant-governor, may exchange such lands for others for a like purpose. Each parish must have its cemetery, the exception being in favour of large cities, where many parishes use the same place for interments. This cemetery belongs to the parish represented by the parish priest, or Protestant rector or pastor, and churchwardens. No cemetery can be acquired, exchanged, or enlarged without the authorization of the bishop. Lands may be expropriated for cemetery purposes. No body may be buried until at least twenty-four hours after death. Special laws exist in all the provinces with reference to burials in time of epidemic. In the Province of Quebec, interments in churches are permitted, but the coffin must be covered by at least four feet of earth, or encased in masonry, of at least eighteen inches in thickness if in stone, or of at least twenty inches if in brick, both brick and stone having been well covered with cement. The same regulations apply to burials in private vaults. Interments in churches or cemeteries may be prohibited in the interest of public health by the superior or diocesan ecclesiastical authority. In the Province of Quebec the civil and religious authorities are interwoven, thus the pastor of every parish is bound to keep in duplicate registers of births, marriages, and deaths. At the end of each year he deposits one of the copies at the court-house of the district, and the other is retained in the parish record.

As regards burials in consecrated ground, no question can now be raised affecting the powers of the Catholic Church authorities. By Art. 3460, Revised Statutes, P. Q., 1888, it is enacted: "it belongs to the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authority to designate the place in the cemetery, in which each individual of such faith shall be buried, and if the deceased, according to the canon rules and laws, in the judgment of the ordinary, cannot be interred in ground consecrated by the liturgical prayers of such religion, he shall receive civil burial in ground reserved for that purpose and adjacent to the cemetery." Virtually the same law is in force in the Province of Ontario as that shown above. This legislation in the Province of Quebec arose from a celebrated action at law, commonly known as the "Guibord Case".[1] Joseph Guibord was a member of the "Institut Canadien", an organization which had been condemned by the bishop, and whose members were excommunicated as a body. Guibord died, 18 November, 1869. His widow applied to the religious authorities for the burial of his body in the cemetery. The parish priest of the church of Notre-Dame, under instructions from diocesan authorities, refused to accede to this demand, offering however to bury the deceased in an adjoining lot, where children who die without having been baptized, public sinners, etc., are interred. This the widow refused, and she applied for a writ to force the church authorities to grant a Christian burial. This petition was granted by the Superior Court. The Court of Review, reversing the judgment, held that the civil courts had no jurisdiction to inquire into the reasons for the refusal of the parish priest to grant Christian burial, and that he and his wardens had the right to subdivide the burial grounds into such lots as they might think fit, and to regulate as to where and how the mode of burial should be carried out. Many other questions were raised, but these were the principal grounds. The Court of Appeal for the Province of Quebec unanimously confirmed the Court of Review. The case was carried before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England, where the judgment of the Quebec Court of Appeal was reversed. It was held that a Catholic parishioner, who had not been excommunicated *nominatim* (i. e. by name), and who had not been proved to have been a public sinner, was not, according to the diocesan regulations, which had been invoked by both parties, under any valid ecclesiastical censure which would deprive his remains of Christian burial. The report of the case may be found in "Lower Canada Jurist", Vol. XX, and covers all the relations of Church and State since the cession of Canada by France to England.

Strict regulations exist as to the disinterment of bodies, which cannot be effected without authority from the Superior Court, as well as from the diocesan authorities. These apply equally to cemeteries, and to churches and chapels where burials have been made. Registers of all such disinterments have to be kept. In 1907 a petition was presented by the Franciscan Order to the Superior Court at Three Rivers, against the rector of the Anglican parish church. It set forth that, prior to the cession of Canada to England, the Franciscans were known as the "Recollets", and had established a missionary post at Three Rivers, in the earliest days of the colony, where they built a church, wherein they buried the members of their order, and some Catholic laymen as well. When the cession took place, their properties were confiscated. They urged that for many years they had no representatives in the country, and that their church had passed into, and then was in the possession of the minister of the Church of England. The latter body, they said, had never used their church for burial purposes, as was established by the register of burials. They further set forth that recently the Franciscan Order had built a new church, where they desired to have the remains of their brethren who had been buried during the French regime interred according to the discipline of the Catholic Church, and they prayed for an order from the court, to be permitted to make such disinterments, undertaking to pay all damages. On 3 December, 1907, a judgment was rendered dismissing the petition because, prior to making their application, the Franciscans had not obtained permission from the authorities of the Church of England, in whose possession and under whose control the church was when the order for the disinterment was sought to be obtained.

STEWART, *Index to Dominion and Provincial Statutes* (Montreal, 1902); MIGNAULT, *Droit Paroissial* (Montreal, 1893); PAGNUELO, *Liberté religieuse en Canada* (Montreal, 1872); BEAUCHAMP, *Privy Council Reports in Lower Canada Jurist*, XX, 228; *Municipal Code, Province of Quebec; Law Reports: Cases in Privy Council* (English), ed. ROBERT COWELL; BROWN, *Les Curés et Marguilliers de l'Œuvre et Fabrique de Notre-Dame de Montréal*, VII, 157.

J. J. CURRAN.

EARLY ROMAN CHRISTIAN CEMETERIES.—This article treats briefly of the individual catacomb cemeteries in the vicinity of Rome. For general information on the Roman catacombs, see CATACOMBS, ROMAN. This summary account of the in-

dividual catacombs will follow the order of the great Roman roads along which were usually located the Christian cemeteries:

Sources of the History of the Catacombs.—There is but the faintest hope that any new documents will ever turn up to illustrate the pre-Constantinian period of the ancient cemeteries of Rome. Their place is taken necessarily by late martyrologies, calendars, Acts of the martyrs, writings of popes, historico-liturgical books of the Roman Church, and by old topographies and itineraries come down to us from the Carlovingian epoch. Among the old martyrologies the most famous is that known as the Martyrology of St. Jerome (*Martyrologium Hieronymianum*). Its present (ninth-century) form is that essentially of Auxerre in France, where it underwent considerable remodelling in the sixth century. But it is older than the sixth century, and is surely an Italian compilation of the fifth century, out of rare and reliable documents furnished by the churches of Rome, Africa, Palestine, Egypt, and the Orient. No martyrology contains so many names and indications of saints and martyrs of a very early period, and it is of especial value for the study of the catacombs, because it very frequently gives the roads and the cemeteries where they were buried and venerated in the fifth century, while the cemeteries were yet intact. By dint of transcription, however, and through the neglect or ignorance of copyists, the text has become in many places hopelessly corrupt, and the restitution of its dates and local and personal indications has been one of the hardest crosses of ancient and modern ecclesiastical archæologists. Besides its very ancient notices of the cemeteries, this martyrology is of great value as embodying a catalogue of martyrs and basilicas of Rome that surely goes back to the early part of the fifth century, and perhaps a third-century catalogue of the Roman pontiffs. Several other martyrologies of the eighth and ninth centuries contain valuable references to the martyrs and the cemeteries, especially that known as the Little Roman (*Parvum Romanum*) Martyrology, and which served as a basis for the well-known compilation of Ado. Next in importance comes an ancient Roman Calendar, published between the years 334 and 356, written out and illustrated by a certain Furius Dionysius Philocalus. This calendar contains a list of the popes, known formerly as the "Bucherian Catalogue", from the name of its first editor, and the Liberian, from the pope (Liberius, 352–56) with whom it ends. The whole book is now usually known as the "Chronographer of A. D. 354". Besides this ancient papal catalogue, the book contains an official calendar, civil and astronomical, lunar cycles, and a Paschal table calculated to 412, a list of the prefects of Rome from 253 to 354 (the only continuous one known), a chronicle of Roman history, the "Natalitia Cæsarum", and other useful contents, which have caused it to be styled "the oldest Christian Almanac". It contains numerous traces of having been drawn up for the use of the Roman Church, and hence the value of two of its documents for the cemeteries. They are, respectively, a list of the entombments of Roman bishops from Lucius to Sylvester (253–335), with the place of their burial, and a *Depositio Martyrum*, or list of the more solemn fixed feasts of the Roman Church, with indications of several famous martyrs and their cemeteries. The importance of all this for the original topography of the catacombs is too clear to need comment. We will only add that closer examination of the ecclesiastical documents of the "Chronographer of 354" leaves us persuaded that they date from the third century and represent the location of the cemeteries at that time and the martyrs whose cult was then most popular.

In the latter half of the fourth century Pope St. Damasus (366–84) did much to beautify the ancient Roman cemeteries and to decorate the tombs of the most illustrious martyrs. As he possessed a fine poetic talent, he composed many elegant inscriptions, which were engraved on large marble slabs by his "friend and admirer", Furius Dionysius Philocalus, already known to us as the calligrapher of the preceding document. The lettering used by this remarkable man was very ornamental, and as its exact like is not found before or after, it has been styled the hieratic writing of the catacombs. In time these inscriptions were copied by strangers and inserted in various anthologies and in travellers' scrapbooks or portfolios. Many of the original stones perished from various causes, but were piously renewed *in situ* during the sixth century. To these Damasan inscriptions De Rossi owed much, since any fragment of them in a cemetery indicates an "historic crypt", and their copies in the manuscripts are links for the construction of the chain of history that connects each great cemetery with the modern investigator.

To the above *fontes*, or sources of information and control, must be added the historic-liturgical literature of the Roman Church from the fourth to the eighth centuries—the period in which the bodies of the most celebrated martyrs began to be removed *en masse* from the catacombs, through fear of the marauding Lombards. Such are the Liber Pontificalis in its several recensions, the Acts of the martyrs, chiefly the Roman ones, the calendars of the Roman Church constructed out of the missals or sacramentaries, the antiphonaries, capitularies of the Gospels, and the like, in which not infrequently there are hints and directions concerning the cemeteries and the martyrs of renown who were yet buried there. Finally, there has been extracted almost endless information from the old Roman topographies of travellers and the itineraries of pilgrims. Of the former we possess yet two curious remnants, entitled "Notitiæ regionum Urbis Romæ" and "Curiosum Urbis Romæ", also a list of oils collected at the shrines of the Roman martyrs by Abbot Johannes for Queen Theodolinda, and known as the Papyrus of Monza. An Old Syriac text of the sixth century and a note of the *innumeræ cellulæ martyrum consecratæ* in the almanac of Polemius Silvius (499) complete the list of strictly topographical authorities. Certain itineraries of pilgrims from the seventh to the ninth century are not less useful as indicating the names and sites of the cemeteries, whether above or below ground, and what bodies were yet entombed therein, as well as the distance between the cemeteries and their position relative to the great monuments of the city.

After the middle of the ninth century the historic crypts had been emptied, and the bodies brought to Roman churches. Naturally, the written references to the catacombs ceased with the visitors, and a stray chapter in the "Mirabilia Urbis Romæ" or an odd indication in the "Libri Indulgentiarum" kept alive the memory of those holy places which once attracted a world of pilgrims. It is not easy to explain how one of the best of the old itineraries, referable to the seventh century, should have fallen into the hands of William of Malmesbury, and been by him copied into his account of the visit of the crusaders to Rome under Urban II (1099). Neither is it easy to explain why the old itineraries of Einsiedeln, Würzburg, and Salzburg make no mention of the tombs of such celebrated Roman martyrs as St. Clement the consul, St. Justin the philosopher, Apollonius the Roman senator, Moses a famous priest of the time of St. Cornelius, and many other celebrities of the early Roman Church, who were, in all likelihood, buried in some of the many Roman cemeteries. What the old pilgrims saw they related honestly and faithfully; more they compiled from guides now lost. They

were not learned men, but pious travellers, anxious to benefit their successors and unconsciously enabling us to form some exact idea of the solemn scenes that they once assisted at. (Shahan, The Beginnings of Christianity, New York, 1905, 410–16.)

THE VATICAN CEMETERY.—The first popes were buried near the body of St. Peter, "in Vaticano" "juxta corpus beati Petri". St. Anacletus, the second successor of St. Peter raised over the body of the Apostle a *memoria*, or small chapel (Lib. Pontif., ed. Duchesne, I, 125). This narrow site was the burial-place of the popes to Zephyrinus (d. 217), with whom began the series of papal burials in the cemetery of St. Callistus (Barnes, The Tomb of St. Peter, London, 1900). Among the epitaphs discovered near the

SEPULCHRE OF ST. CORNELIUS, CEMETERY OF ST. CALLISTUS

tomb of St. Peter are two celebrated ones, dogmatic in content, that of Livia Primitiva, now in the Louvre, and that known as the *Ichthys Zōntōn* (Fish of the Living), symbolic of the Eucharist. In the sixteenth century a marble fragment showing the word LINUS was found on this site, not improbably from the epitaph of the first successor of St. Peter. The building of two basilicas, the Old St. Peter's in the fourth and the New St. Peter's in the sixteenth century, easily explains the disappearance of the early papal monuments "in Vaticano". The cemetery was probably above ground. From 258 to 260 (de Waal, Marucchi) the bodies of the Apostles reposed in the catacomb of St. Sebastian on the Via Appia, in a cubiculum or chapel (the Platonia), yet extant, whither they were taken from their original resting-places for some not sufficiently clear reason. In the fifth century members of the imperial family found a resting-place in the vicinity of the Apostle's tomb. It was long a favourite burial-place; in 689 the Saxon king, Cedwalla, was laid to rest there, "ad cujus [sc. apostolorum principis] sacratissimum corpus a finibus tenæ pio ductus amore venerat", says Bede (H. E., v, 7), who has preserved the valuable metrical epitaph put up by order of Pope Sergius ending with: "Hic depositus est Caedual, qui et Petrus, rex Saxonum," etc. The "Grotte Vecchie" and the "Grotte Nuove", or subterraneous chapels and galleries in the vicinity of the tomb of St. Peter, cover the site of this ancient Christian cemetery; in them lie buried also a number of popes; St. Gregory I, Boniface VIII, Nicholas V, Alexander VI. The rich sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, important for early Christian symbolism, is in the "Grotte Nuove" [de Waal, Der Sarkophag des Junius Bassus in den Grotten von St. Petrus, Rome, 1900; Dufresne, Les Cryptes vaticanes, Rome, 1900; Dionisi (edd. Sarti and Settele), Sacrar. Vaticanæ basilicæ cryptarum monumenta, Rome, 1828–40].

I. VIA AURELIA, beyond the Porta Cavallegieri.—1. *Cemetery of St. Pancratius*, a very youthful martyr, probably of the persecution of Diocletian. His body was never removed to a city church as were so many others, hence the cemetery remained open in the Middle Ages. Its galleries have suffered a complete devastation, last of all during the French Revolution, when the relics of the martyrs were dispersed. 2. *Cemetery of Sts. Processus and Martinianus*, the jailors of St. Peter in the Mamertine Prison, converted by him, and soon after his death beheaded on the Aurelian Way. The pious matron Lucina buried their bodies on her own property. The cemetery, it is believed, extends beneath the Villa Pamfili, and perhaps beyond under the Vigna Pellegrini. The accessible galleries exhibit a complete devastation, also very large *loculi*, an indication of remote Christian antiquity. In the fourth-century overground basilica St. Gregory preached his sermon "Ad. SS. martyrum corpora consistimus, fratres" etc. (P. L. LXXVI, 1237). Paschal I transported the bodies of the two saints to a chapel in the Vatican. After the twelfth century the cemetery was totally forgotten. 3. *Cemetery of the "Duo Felices"*. The origin of the name is obscure, though connected somehow with Felix II (355–58) and Felix I (269–74); the latter, however, was certainly buried in the papal crypt in St. Callistus. 4. *Cemetery of Calepodius*, a very ruinous catacomb under the Vigna Lamperini, opposite the "Casale di S. Pio V", or about the third milestone. Calepodius was a priest martyred in a popular outbreak, and buried here by Pope St. Callistus. Later the pope's own body was interred in the same cemetery, not in the one that bears his name. St. Julius I (337–52) was buried there, and a little oratory long preserved the memory of St. Callistus. His body was eventually transferred to Santa Maria in Trastevere, where it now lies.

II. VIA PORTUENSIS, the road leading to "Portus" or Porto, the new "Havre" of Rome.—5. *Cemetery of St. Pontianus*, to the right beneath Monte Verde. It is so called, not from Pope Pontianus (230–35) but from a wealthy Christian of the same name mentioned in the Acts of Callistus, and whose house seems to have been the original nucleus of the present Sta Maria in Trastevere, the site once claimed by the *cauponarii* under Alexander Severus, but adjudged by that emperor to the Christians. It was discovered by Bosio in 1618. Many famous martyrs were buried there, among them Sts. Abdon and Sennen, noble Persians who suffered martyrdom at Rome, it is thought in 257. In an overground fourth-century basilica were deposited the bodies of two popes, Anastasius I (d. 405) and Innocent I (d. 417). Byzantine frescoes of the sixth century attract attention, also the "historic chapel" of Sts. Abdon and Sennen, whose bodies were removed to the *basilica magna* above ground about 640, finally in 820 to the city basilica of St. Mark, when the cemetery was abandoned. 6. *Cemetery of St. Felix*, indicated in several "Itineraria" as located on the Via Portuensis, not far from the cemetery of Pontianus, but not yet found; also known as "ad insalsatos" probably a corruption (Marucchi) of "ad infulatos",

in reference to the Persian tiara of Sts. Abdon and Sennan. 7. *Cemetery of Generosa.* Generosa was a Roman lady who buried on her property the bodies of the martyrs Simplicius, Faustinus, and Beatrix, transferred later (683) to St. Bibiana, in the city. The cemetery, a poor rural one, is now famous for important inscriptions of the "Fratres Arvales" found there between 1858 and 1874. (Henzen, Acta fratrum Arvalium quæ supersunt, Berlin, 1874.) The cemetery probably grew up (Marucchi) from a neighbouring quarry whence later it took in the sacred wood of the ancient pagan brotherhood of the "Arvales", who seem to have died off or removed elsewhere about the middle of the third century. An ancient basilica, built by St. Damasus, was also unearthed when the aforesaid inscriptions were discovered. As in most catacombs an overground cemetery grew up, which was used until the eighth century.

III. Via Ostiensis.—8. *Tomb of St. Paul.* The body of St. Paul was buried on the Ostian Way, near the place of his martyrdom (*ad Aquas Salvias*) on the property (*in prædio*) of Lucina, a Christian matron. St. Anacletus, second successor of St. Peter, built a small *memoria* or chapel on the site, and about 200 the Roman priest Caius refers to it (Euseb., H. E., ii, 25) as still standing. From 258 to 260 the body of St. Paul with that of St. Peter lay in the "Platonia" of St. Sebastian; in the latter year, probably, it was returned to its original resting-place. In the meantime a cemetery had been growing in the aforesaid *prædium* of Lucina. Constantine replaced the little oratory of Anacletus with a great basilica. Under Gregory XVI, the sarcophagus of St. Paul was discovered, but not opened. Its fourth-century inscription bears the words **PAULO APOST MART** (Paul, Apostle and Martyr). The museum of the modern basilica contains some very ancient epitaphs from the aforesaid cemetery of Lucina, antedating the basilica; two of them bear dates of 107 and 111. After these we must come down to 217, before finding any consular date on a Christian epitaph. Dom Cornelio Villani proposed (1905) to publish all the ancient Christian epitaphs found here. 9. *Cemetery of Commodilla*, at a little distance from that of Lucina. Commodilla is an unknown Christian matron, on whose property were buried Felix and Adauctus, martyrs of the persecution of Diocletian. This cemetery, once extensive, is now difficult of access, and its frescoes and inscriptions have disappeared almost entirely. The open *loculi* are an evidence of the pillage to which such cemeteries were once subject. 10. *Tomb of St. Timothy.* Timothy was possibly a priest of Antioch, martyred at Rome under Diocletian, and buried by the pious matron Theona in her garden, not far from the body of St. Paul, "ut Paulo apostolo ut quondam Timotheus adhæreret", says the Martyrology (22 May). De Rossi identifies with this tomb a small cemetery discovered by him (1872) in the Vigna Salviucci to the left of the Ostian Way, and opposite the apse of St. Paul. 11. *Cemetery of St. Thecla*, discovered by Armellini in 1870, named from some unknown Roman Thecla, and certainly anterior to Constantine; an epitaph of Aurelia Agape has an early Christian savour and is cut on the back of a pagan epitaph of the time of Claudius Gothicus (268–70). 12. *Cemetery of Aquæ Salviæ.* There was certainly a cemetery in early Christian times on or near the site of the decapitation of St. Paul (now Tre Fontane); it probably bore the name of St. Zeno. Farther on was the cemetery of St. Cyriacus, mentioned in the "Mirabilia Urbis Romæ" and seen by Bosio at the end of the sixteenth century. Its exact site is no longer known. Ostia itself, at the end of the road, had a remarkable Christian cemetery.

IV. Via Ardeatina, to the right of the Appian Way; the ancient Porta Ardeatina between the churches of St. Sabas and St. Balbina was destroyed in the sixteenth century to make way for the fortifications of Sangallo.—13. *Cemetery of St. Domitilla* (Tor Marancia), the largest of all the Roman catacombs known to Bosio, who thought it a part of Saint Callistus, and nearly perished (1593) in its depths. It is the ancestral burial-place of Flavia Domitilla, wife of the consul Flavius Clemens (95). She was exiled by Domitian for her Christian Faith to the island of Pontia; her faithful servants Nereus and Achilleus, said to have been baptized by St. Peter, followed her into exile, were beheaded at Terracina, and their bodies brought back to the family sepulchre of their mistress. In 1873 De Rossi discovered the important ruins of the large three-nave basilica erected here between 390 and 395 in honour of these saints and of St. Petronilla, whose body was transferred thence to St. Peter's in the eighth century. At an earlier date (1865) he had the good fortune to discover, close to the highway, the primitive entrance to the cemetery, one of the most ancient Christian monuments. It is a spacious room or gallery, with four or five separate niches for as many sarcophagi, the walls finished in fine stucco, with classical decorations. On either side are similar edifices, a little later in date, but evidently used by the guardian of the monument and for the celebration of the Christian agapæ or love-feasts. The sarcophagi, whole or

Original Entrance to the Cemetery of Domitilla

fragmentary, the brick tiles, and the names on the epitaphs (Claudii, Flavii, Ulpii, Aurelii) show that this *hypogæum* or "vestibule of the Flavians", as it is called, belongs to the early part of the second century. De Rossi believed it the tomb of the martyred consul, Flavius Clemens (95). The site has suffered from the vandalism and greed of earlier visitors, but the frescoes yet extant exhibit great beauty of execution and a rich variety of Christian symbolism. "We are quite sure", say Northcote and Brownlow (I, 126–27), "that we have been here brought face to face with one of the earliest specimens of Christian subterranean burial in Rome; and it shows us the sense of liberty and security under which it was executed." Not far away was discovered in 1875 the famous epitaph of "Flavius Sabinus and his sister Titiana", possibly the children of Flavius Sabinus, brother of the Emperor Vespasian, mentioned by Tacitus (Hist., III, 65) as a mild, but indolent and austere man, terms that to some seem to make him out a Christian and therefore the origin of the new religion among the Flavii. Quite near also are the touching third-century inscriptions of M. Antonius Restutus "sibi et suis fidentibus in Domino", i. e. for himself and his own who trust in God; likewise the very ancient and fine crypt of Ampliatus, whom De Rossi identifies with the Ampliatus of Romans, xvi, 8. Not to speak of numerous dogmatic epitaphs, the cemetery of Domitilla is famous for a beautiful third-century Adoration of the Magi, here four in number, and for the venerable second-century medallion of Sts. Peter and Paul, the oldest known monument of Christian portraiture, and a signal proof of their simultaneous

presence at Rome and their religious authority. It was also, according to De Rossi, the burial-place of Sts. Marcus and Marcellianus, and the family sepulchre of St. Damasus, whose mother (Laurentia) and sister (Irene) were buried there, likewise himself, though the site is yet unknown.

V. Via Appia.—14. *Cemetery of St. Callistus*, one of the oldest underground burial-places of the Roman Christians. As a public Christian cemetery it dates from the beginning of the third century. The original nucleus from which it developed was the famous crypt of Lucina, a private Christian burial-place from the end of the first century, very probably the family sepulchre of the Cæcilii and other closely related Roman families. From there grew, during the third century, the vast system of galleries and *cubicula* that then took and has since kept the name of Cœmeterium Callisti; early in the third century it was known as The Cemetery (*τὸ κοιμητήριον*) *par excellence*, and owed its new name, not to the burial there of Pope Callistus (for he was buried in the cemetery of Calepodius), but to his zeal in developing and perfecting the original *areæ*, or private Roman sepulchral plots, that in his time had come to be the first landed property ever possessed by the Catholic Church. The chief interest of this cemetery lies in the so-called Papal Crypt, in whose large *loculi* were buried the popes from St. Zephyrinus (d. 218) to St. Eutychianus (d. 283). Of the fourteen epitaphs it once contained there remain but five, more or less fragmentary: Anterus, Fabian, Lucius, Eutychianus, Urban? (Marucchi, II, 138–144). In the fourth century Pope St. Damasus ornamented richly this venerable chapel, and put up there two epitaphs in honour of the numerous martyrs buried in St. Callistus, among them several of his predecessors. One of these epitaphs was found *in situ*, but broken in minute fragments. Its restoration by De Rossi is a masterly specimen of his ingenious epigraphic erudition; the closing lines are now celebrated:

Hic fateor Damasus volui mea condere membra
Sed cineres timui sanctos vexare piorum

(I, Damasus, wished to be buried here, but I feared to offend the sacred remains of these pious ones). For a view of the (near-by) countless *graffiti* or pious scratchings of medieval pilgrims (names, ejaculations) see Marucchi, "Eléments d'archéol. chrét.", II, 140–41. Popes St. Marcellinus and St. Marcellus (d. 304; d. 309) were buried in the cemetery of Priscilla (see below); on the other hand Popes St. Eusebius (d. 309) and St. Melchiades (d. 314) were buried in the cemetery of Callistus, but elsewhere (see below). The neighbouring very ancient crypt of St. Cecilia offers an interesting Byzantine (sixth-century) fresco of the saint, and in the niche whence her body was transferred (817) to the church of St. Cecilia in Trastevere, a recent copy of Stefano Maderna's famous statue of the saint as she was found when her tomb was opened in 1599. In the same cemetery, and close by, separated only by a short gallery, is a series of six chambers known as the "Sacramental Chapels" because of the valuable frescoes that exhibit the belief of the early Roman Christians in the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, and are at the same time precious jewels of early Christian art. Pope St. Eusebius, as said, was buried in this cemetery, in the gallery called after him the crypt of St. Eusebius, and in which once reposed quite close to him another martyr pope, St. Caius (d. 296). In the sepulchral chapel of the former may still be seen the epitaph put up by Damasus, and from which monument alone we learn of an unhappy schism that then devastated the Roman Church. On either side are sculptured perpendicularly the words: "Furius Dionysius Philocalus, Damasis pappæ cultor atque amator", i. e. the name of the pope's famous calligrapher, also his friend and admirer. At some distance lies the crypt of Lucina, in which was once buried Pope St. Cornelius. Lucina is identified by De Rossi with the famous Pomponia Græcina of Tacitus (Annales, XIII, 32); the crypt, therefore, is of Apostolic origin, an opinion confirmed by the classical character of its symbolic frescoes and the simplicity of its epitaphs; its Eucharistic frescoes are very ancient and quite important from a doctrinal standpoint. The body of St. Cornelius, martyred at Centumcellæ (Civitavecchia) was brought hither and long remained an object of pious veneration, until in the ninth century it was transferred to Santa Maria in Trastevere. His epitaph (the only Latin papal epitaph of the third century) is still in place: "Cornelius Martyr Ep [iscopus]", i. e. Cornelius, martyr and bishop. 15. *Cemetery of St. Sebastian*. This cemetery, from two to three miles out of Rome, was known through the Middle Ages as Cœmeterium ad Catacumbas, whence the term *catacomb*, a word seemingly of uncertain origin (Northcote and Brownlow, I, 262–63). The chief importance of this cemetery now lies in the fact that here were deposited (258) for a time the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul, taken respectively from their Vatican and Ostian repositories under somewhat obscure circumstances; they were restored in 260. The chapel in which they were thus temporarily placed (see Liber Pontif., ed. Duchesne, Introd., I, civ–cvii, and i, 212) beneath the church of St. Sebastian, is still accessible. Close by arose in time the cemetery known as "ad Catacumbas" or "in Catacumbas", a local indication that was eventually extended to all similar Christian cemeteries. St. Philip Neri loved to visit the crypts of St. Sebastian; an inscription in one of them recalls his veneration of these holy places. From the fourth century on, an overground cemetery was formed around the Basilica Apostolorum that was then built and which included the Platonia or aforesaid mortuary chapel of the Apostles. The rich mausolea of this cemetery added to the dignity of the underground burial-place that was, like the others of its kind, no longer used for burials after 410. The body of St. Sebastian, buried there "apud vestigia apostolorum", is still in the church, but in a modern chapel. It was only after the eighth century that the original fourth-century name of Basilica Apostolorum gave way to that of St. Sebastian. 16. *Cemetery of Prætextatus*, dates from the second century, when the body of St. Januarius, eldest son of St. Felicitas, was buried there (c. 162). The chapel of that saint exhibits a fine Damasan epitaph and elegant symbolical frescoes representing the seasons, with birds, genii, etc. Among the famous martyrs buried in this cemetery were Felicissimus and Agapitus, deacons of Pope Sixtus II and colleagues of St. Laurence, put to death under Valerian in 258, also St. Urbanus, a bishop and confessor mentioned in the Acts of St. Cecilia. Certain portions of this cemetery, hitherto inaccessible by reason of the proprietor's unwillingness, are said to offer traces of great antiquity, and perhaps contain historic chapels or tombs of much importance.

VI. Via Latina.—The cemeteries on this road, like those on the Aurelian Way, have never been regularly explored, and their galleries are at present quite choked or dilapidated. Marucchi (II, 229) distinguishes three groups of ancient Christian monuments that appear in the afore-mentioned "Itineraria"; the church of Sts. Gordian and Epimachus; the basilica of Tertullinus, and the church of St. Eugenia with the cemetery of Apronianus, also a large basilica dedicated by St. Leo I to St. Stephen Protomartyr, discovered in 1857, in the heart of an ancient Roman villa, near the remarkable pagan tombs of the Valerii and Pancratii.

VII. Via Labicana, outside the Porta Maggiore.—17. *Cemetery of St. Castulus*, a martyr under Diocletian, and according to the Acts of St. Sebastian the husband of Irene, the pious matron to whose house

was brought the body of the soldier-martyr. The cemetery was discovered by Fabretti in 1672 and reopened in 1864, when the railway to Civitavecchia was building, but was again closed because of the ruinous state of the corridors and crypts. 18. *Cemetery of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus*, known also as *ad duas lauros, ad Helenam* from the neighbouring (ruined) mausoleum of St. Helena (Tor Pignattara), and *sub Augusta, in comitatu*, from a neighbouring villa of Emperor Constantine. St. Peter and St. Marcellinus suffered under Diocletian. They were honoured with a fine Damasan epitaph known to us from the early medieval epigraphic collections. Here also were buried St. Tiburtius, son of the city prefect, Chromatius, and the obscurely known group called the "Quattuor Coronati", four marble-cutters from the Danubian region. The splendid porphyry sarcophagus at the Vatican came from the mausoleum of St. Helena. In 826 the bodies of Peter and Marcellinus were stolen from the crypt and taken to Germany, where they now rest at Seligenstadt; the story is graphically told by Einhard (Mon. Germ. Hist., Script., XV, 39). Since 1896 excavations have been resumed here, and have yielded important results, among them the historic crypt of Sts. Peter and Marcellinus and a small chapel of St. Tiburtius. Wilpert discovered here and illustrated a number of important frescoes: Our Lord amid four saints, the Annunciation, the Adoration of the Magi, the Good Shepherd, Oranti, and some miracles of Christ (Wilpert, Di un ciclo di rappresentanze cristologiche nel cimitero dei SS. Pietro e Marcellino, Rome, 1892). Elsewhere are scenes that represent the agape, or love-feast, of the primitive Christians, symbolic of paradise or of the Eucharist. There is also a noteworthy fresco of the Blessed Virgin with the Infant Jesus between two adoring Magi. This cemetery is said to have been more richly decorated with frescoes than any other except that of Domitilla.

VIII. Via Tiburtina.—19. *Cemetery of St. Cyriaca.* According to ancient tradition, represented by the pilgrim-guides (*itineraria*), she was the widow who buried St. Laurence (martyred 6 Aug., 258) on her property "in agro Verano". In 1616 Bosio saw in this cemetery an altar, a chair, and an inscription, with a dedication to St. Laurence. The enlargement of the modern cemetery of San Lorenzo damaged considerably this venerable catacomb. Many important or interesting epitaphs have been found in this cemetery, among them those of a group of Christian virgins of the fourth and fifth centuries (De Rossi, Bullettino, 1863). In the fourth century Constantine built here a basilica over the tomb (*ad corpus*) of St. Laurence; here were buried Pope Zosimus (418), Sixtus III (440), and Hilary (468); in one of these three niches, later vacant, lie buried the remains of Pius IX. In 432 Sixtus III added another church (*basilica major*) facing the Via Tiburtina; it was not until 1218 that Honorius III united these churches and made the basilica of Constantine the *Confessio* of the earlier Sixtine basilica, on which occasion the *presbyterium*, or sanctuary, had to be elevated. 20. *Cemetery of St. Hippolytus.* On the left of the Via Tiburtina under the Vigna Gori (now Caetani). Considerable uncertainty reigns as to the identity of this Hippolytus, both in his Acts and in the relative verses of Prudentius; possibly, as Marucchi remarks, this confusion is as old as the time of St. Damasus and is reflected in his metrical epitaph, discovered by De Rossi in a St. Petersburg manuscript. According to this document Hippolytus was at first a follower of Novatian, about the middle of the third century, but returned to the Catholic Faith and died a martyr. The famous statue of Hippolytus, the Christian writer of the third century, made in 222, and now in the Lateran Museum, was found in the Vigna Gori in the sixteenth century; our martyr and the Christian scholar are doubtless identical. In 1882–83 a small subterranean basilica was discovered here with three naves and lighted by an air-shaft. According to the "Itinerary of Salzburg" this cemetery contained the body of the actor-martyr Genesius and the bodies of the martyrs Triphonia and Cyrilla, the (alleged) Christian wife and daughter of Emperor Decius, of whom nothing more is known.

IX. Via Nomentana.—21. *Cemetery of St. Nicomedes*, near the Porta Pia, in the Villa Patrizi, known to Bosio but rediscovered only in 1864. Nicomedes is said to have suffered martyrdom under Domitian and to have been buried by one of his disciples "in horto juxta muros". Very ancient masonry, Greek epitaphs, and other signs, indicate the great age of this small cemetery, that may reach back to Apostolic times. 22. *Cemetery of St. Agnes.* The body of St. Agnes, who suffered martyrdom probably under Valerian (253–60), was buried by her parents "in prædiolo suo", i. e. on a small property they owned along the Nomentan Way. There was already in this place a private cemetery, which grew rapidly in size after the interment of the youthful martyr. The excavations carried on since 1901, at the expense of Cardinal Kopp, have revealed a great many fourth- to sixth-century graves (*formæ*) beneath the sanctuary of the basilica. The cemetery (three stories deep) is divided by archæologists into three regions, the aforesaid primitive nucleus (third century), a neighbouring third-century *area*, and two fourth-century groups of corridors that connect the basilica of St. Agnes with the ancient round basilica of St. Constantia. It is not certain that the actual basilica of St. Agnes, built on a level with the second story of the catacomb, is identical with that built by Constantine; there is reason to suspect a reconstruction of the edifice towards the end of the fifth century. St. Damasus composed for the tomb of Agnes one of his finest epitaphs. Symmachus (498–514), and Honorius I (625–38), restored the basilica, if the former did not reconstruct it; to the latter we owe the fresco of St. Agnes between these two popes. In the sixteenth century, and also in the nineteenth (Pius IX, 1855), it was again restored; in 1901 (25 Nov.) new excavations laid bare the heavy silver sarcophagus in which St. Pius V had deposited the bodies of St. Agnes and St. Emerentiana. In the neighbouring *Cœmeterium majus* (accessible from the cemetery of St. Agnes through an *arenaria*, or sand-pit) is the famous crypt or chapel of St. Emerentiana, opened up in 1875, at the expense of Monsignore Crostarosa, and identified by De Rossi with the Cœmeterium Ostrianum, the site of very archaic Roman memories of St. Peter, a position now strongly disputed by his disciple Marucchi (see below, *Cemetery of Priscilla*). In the vicinity of the crypt of St. Emerentiana is an important arcosolium-fresco representing the Blessed Virgin as an Orante, with the Infant Jesus before her. It belongs to the first half of the fourth century, and is said by Marucchi (II, 343) to be almost the latest catacomb fresco of Our Lady, a kind of hyphen between the primitive frescoes and the early Byzantine Madonnas; it seems at the same time a very early evidence of the adorational use of paintings in public worship (Le Bourgeois, Sainte Emérentienne, vierge et martyre, Paris, 1895). 23. *Cemetery of St. Alexander*, between four and five miles from Rome, and within the limits of an early Diocese of Ficulea. It is the burial-place of two martyrs, known as Alexander and Eventius. Whether this Alexander is the second-century pope and martyr (c. 105–15), as his legendary Acts indicate, is quite doubtful; possibly he is a local martyr of Ficulea. The matron Severina buried here the bodies of the two saints in one tomb, and near to them the body of Saint Theodulus; early in the ninth century they were all transferred to the city, after which the

cemetery fell into ruins. As in the cemetery of St. Laurence and in that of St. Symphorosa, there arose here two basilicas, one built by Constantine (*ad corpus*), rediscovered in 1855, another in the fifth century; there remain yet some important relics of the former, an altar with its marble *cancellus*, or front, in which was opened a *fenestella confessionis* through which could be seen the bodies of the martyrs, the site of the *schola cantorum* in front of the altar, and in the apse the episcopal chair.

X. Via Salaria Nova.—24. *Cemetery of St. Felicitas.* This famous Roman matron and her seven sons were put to death for the Christian Faith, under Marcus Aurelius. The very ancient Acts of their martyrdom are extant in a Latin translation from the Greek, and are probably based on the original court records. The place of burial of the mother and Silanus, her youngest son, not given in the Acts, is learned from the fourth-century Liberian Catalogue and from sixth- and seventh-century itineraries, as the cemetery of Maximus (otherwise unknown) on the Via Salaria. A basilica, built there in the fourth century, was ornamented with a fine epitaph by St. Damasus (Verdun MS.). Early in the fifth century it served Boniface I (418) as a place of refuge from the adherents of the Antipope Eulalius; Boniface was also buried there, according to the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum". Gregory the Great preached there one of his homilies "Ad martyres". The two bodies were transferred to the city in the ninth century, and the cemetery was lost sight of until De Rossi discovered it in 1858, almost simultaneously with his discovery of the crypt of St. Januarius in the cemetery of Prætextatus. In 1884 the "historic crypt" was discovered, beneath a basilica of the fourth century; it is surmised that this must have been the site of the house of Felicitas, or at least of the trial 25. *Cemetery of Thraso, Cœmeterium Jordanorum.* The cemetery of Thraso, a rich and aged martyr in the persecution of Diocletian, was discovered in 1578 by Bosio. It once contained a fine Damasan epitaph; its chief oratory or crypt was restored in 326 and was open until the end of the thirteenth century. The body of St. Thraso was at some unknown time taken to Sts. John and Paul in the city. In this cemetery excellent third- or fourth-century frescoes are still visible, among them an interesting one symbolic of the Eucharist. A little farther on, to the right of the road, is the *Cœmeterium Jordanorum*, possibly, says Marucchi (II, 369), the deepest of the Roman catacombs; it has four stories, but the groups of galleries are separated by sand-pits (*arenariæ*). The name, says the aforesaid writer, may be a corruption of *Germanorum*, i. e. the other sons of St. Felicitas. Here, too, it seems, ought some day to be found the *arenaria*, or sand-pit, in which Sts. Chrysanthus and Daria were buried during the persecution of Valerian (257), and in which (their Acts tell us) some Christians who came there to pray were stoned to death and walled up by the heathen (Via Salaria in arenariâ illic viventes terrâ et lapidibus obrui). In the sixth century this venerable sanctuary was still visited, and through its *fenestella* the bones of the martyrs scattered on the ground within could still be seen (Marucchi, op. cit., II, 371). Many important and interesting epitaphs have been found here. 26. *Cemetery of Priscilla.* This is the oldest general cemetery of Early Christian Rome (Kaufmann) and in several respects the most important. It takes its name from Priscilla, the mother of the Senator Pudens in whose house St. Peter, according to ancient tradition, found refuge. The sepulchral plot (*area*) of Pudens on the New Salarian Way became the burial-place of Aquila and Prisca (Rom., xvi, 3), and of Sts. Pudentiana and Praxedes, daughters of Pudens. In this manner the history of the very ancient Roman churches of Santa Pudentiana and Santa Prassede, also that of Santa Prisca on the Aventine, being originally the meeting-places (*domesticæ ecclesiæ*, Rom., xvi, 5), of the little Christian community, became intimately connected with the burial-site of the family to which they originally belonged. In this catacomb were buried Sts. Felix and Philip (two of the seven martyr sons of St. Felicitas), also Popes St. Marcellinus (d. 304) and St. Marcellus (d. 309), both victims of the persecution of Diocletian. In the basilica (see below) that was soon raised on this site were buried several popes, St. Sylvester (d. 335), St. Liberius (d. 366), St. Siricius (d. 399), St. Celestine (d. 432), and Vigilius (d. 555). Their "fine group of sarcophagi remained intact", says Marucchi (II, 385) until the ninth century, when the transfer of their bodies to various city churches brought about the usual neglect and final decay of the cemetery, above and below ground. Marucchi maintains that here and not at St. Agnes' is the true *Cœmeterium Ostrianum* mentioned in ancient Roman Acts of martyrs as containing a reservoir where St. Peter was wont to baptize, also the chair in which he first sat (ad nymphas ubi Petrus baptizaverat, sedes ubi prius sedit Sanctus Petrus, etc.) when he began his Roman ministry. With much erudition and acumen he develops this thesis in his oft quoted work (Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne, II, 432 sqq.), his principal arguments being based on a detailed study of two ancient reservoirs in this cemetery, according to him the original Petrine baptisteries, through deep veneration for which holy places came about the later development of the cemetery of Priscilla, the burial there of several fourth- and fifth-century popes, the overground basilica of St. Sylvester, etc. It was only in 1863 that earnest and continuous efforts were made to explore in a scientific way this vast necropolis; in 1887 the finding of the burial-crypts of the Acilii Glabriones amply repaid the efforts of the Sacred Commission of Archæology. The corridors and *cubicula* of this portion of the cemetery of Priscilla offer numerous evidences of Apostolic antiquity, and there is sufficient reason to believe (a) that the aforesaid Acilii Glabriones were closely related to the family of Senator Pudens, and (b) that their Christian family epitaphs of the second century began with the (not yet found) epitaph of Manius Acilius Glabrio, consul in 91, and put to death by Domitian for charges (Suetonius, Domit., 15; Dio Cassius, LXVII, 13) now recognized as equivalent to the profession of the Christian religion. Not far from the modern entrance to the cemetery is the elegant subterranean chapel or crypt known as the Capella Greca, from two Greek epitaphs found there; this crypt is ornamented with very ancient symbolic frescoes, the most important of which is the celebrated Eucharistic painting in the apse, known as the *Fractio Panis*, because in it a figure (the priest) is breaking bread and giving it to persons seated at the same table (Wilpert, Fractio Panis, la plus ancienne représentation du sacrifice eucharistique, Paris, 1896). In the vicinity was found in 1820 the epitaph of St. Philomena (facsimile in Christian Museum of the Lateran); according to Marucchi the current legend of St. Philomena is a nineteenth-century invention. The three tiles of this epitaph were removed at some early date from their original place and used to close another grave, so that the body found in 1820 was not that of Philomena, nor are the tracings on the epitaph those of instruments of martyrdom but anchors, palms, etc. (op. cit., II, 409–10; cf. de Waal, "Die Grabschrift der heiligen Philumena", in "Röm. Quartalschrift", 1898). There is also here a very ancient fresco of the Blessed Virgin holding to her breast the Infant Jesus, while a prophet (Isaias?; cf. Is., ix, 2; xlii, 6) points to a star above her head. It is a clear evidence of the sentiments of Christian veneration for the Mother of God in the second century, to which period the best archæologists refer this fresco (see Mary). Else-

where in Saint Priscillâ is the oldest known liturgical fresco of the early Christian Church, the *virgo sacra* or *Deo dicata*, i. e. a Christian virgin whose solemn consecration to the service of God is quite dramatically set forth by the artist (cf. Marucchi, II, 417–18, and Wilpert, "Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen", in bibliography). From a theological point of view not the least important discovery in Saint Priscilla was the fresco in which Our Lord is represented as giving the Christian law to St. Peter with the inscription "Dominus legem dat" (the Lord gives the law); De Rossi considered it as confirmatory of the primacy of Peter; Monsignor Duchesne saw in it a reference to the *traditio symboli* or Apostles' Creed communicated to the neophytes at the moment of baptism. It belonged to the fourth century and was discovered in 1887, but has since almost entirely perished (reproduced in De Rossi's "Bullettino", 1887, 23 sqq.). The once rich and imposing basilica built by St. Sylvester over the scene of so many early and valuable Christian memories has long since perished. De Rossi published ("Bullettino", 1890, plates VI–VII) a plan of its probable outlines; Marucchi suggests (ingeniously and with verisimilitude) that in the apse of this basilica stood the ancient Chair of Peter, the "sedes ubi prius sedit" when he baptized in the suburban villa of Senator Pudens, the true Cœmeterium Ostrianum in whose venerable precincts Pope Liberius took refuge about the middle of the fourth century, and confirmed the faith of the Romans by baptizing regularly amid the Apostolic memories yet fresh and influential at that place. Some of the papal epitaphs in this basilica have reached us by way of the various medieval epigraphic collections, among them ["Sylloge Corbeiensis", in De Rossi, "Inscript. Christ.", II (1) 83, 85] an epitaph that the latter, with Marucchi (II, 469–70) and others, believes to be the epitaph of Pope St. Liberius; if so it offers indisputable evidence of the constant orthodoxy of that much maligned pope.

XI. Via Salaria Vetus, beyond the present Porta Pinciana (see Marucchi, II, 437–74).—27. *Cemetery of St. Pamphilus*, an unknown martyr. It was discovered by De Rossi in 1865. Among some rude charcoal sketches in one of its *cubicula* is one representing the demolition of a pagan idol, an index of the end of the fourth century.—28. *Cemetery of St. Hermes* (or *Basilla*), a little farther on, in a vineyard of the German College. Hermes seems to have been a martyr of the early part of the second century (c. 119). The fourth-century Liberian Catalogue mentions him as buried in the cemetery of St. Basilla; Padre Marchi and De Rossi had the good fortune to discover the ancient fourth-century basilica raised above the martyr's tomb; it proves to be the largest of the subterranean churches of Rome, and was probably built on the site of an older edifice. It was constructed in the tufa rock, lined with masonry, and had quite a high vault. This basilica was a favourite burial-place, for its floor was found covered with sepulchres. The body of St. Hermes was removed to the city by Adrian I (772–95). This cemetery also held the bodies of Sts. Protus and Hyacinthus, martyrs in the persecution of Valerian (257), and mentioned in the Liberian Catalogue. Their mistress, Saint Basilla, suffered at the same time; the Martyrologium Hieronymianum calls them "doctores sanctæ legis". The body of St. Basilla has not been found, but that of St. Hyacinthus now reposes in the church of the Propaganda at Rome whither it was transferred in 1845 after its discovery by Padre Marchi; that of St. Protus, though once buried in the neighbouring *loculus*, seems to have been removed in the ninth century by Leo IV. Since 1894 excavations have been renewed in this cemetery, in consequence of which the crypt and stairs built by St. Damasus, or about his time, have been found. The cemetery of Hermes has already yielded a number of valuable dogmatic epitaphs now kept in the Kircherian Museum at Rome.—29. *Cemetery ad clivum cucumeris*. It was located in the vicinity of Aqua Acetosa, and was the burial-place of several martyrs, among them the Consul Liberalis, whose fine metrical epitaph has come down to us through the "Itineraries".

Martyris hic sancti Liberalis membra quiescunt
Qui quondam in terris consul honore fuit

(Here reposes the body of Saint Liberalis, who in life was honoured as a Consul). The exact site of this cemetery is unknown, though De Rossi believed for a while (1892) that he had discovered it.

XII. Via Flaminia, outside of Porta del Popolo, the great northern highway, as the Via Appia was the great southern highway, of Rome.—30. *Cemetery of St. Valentinus*. This martyr, according to his (late) Acts a priest and a physician, seems to have suffered under Claudius Gothicus (268–70). He was buried on the site of his martyrdom by the pious matron Sabinilla at the first milestone on the Flaminian Way. In time a small cemetery grew up about the tomb of the martyr which in the Middle Ages was in charge of the Augustinians; one of them, the historian Onofrio Panvinio, wrote a description of it. Eventually, however, the cemetery became a wine-cellar. In 1877 Marucchi discovered the "historical crypt" of St. Valentinus, with its interesting Byzantine frescoes of the seventh century, among them a Crucifixion, the only one found in the catacombs, and one of the oldest artistic representations of this scene. As in the ancient Crucifixion in Santa Maria Antiqua (Roman Forum), the figure of Christ is clothed in a *colobium*, or long mantle. An overground cemetery on the site is said to have been the most extensive of its kind. The epitaphs collected there yield only to the epigraphic collection in the Lateran Museum for number and importance; many are dated, from 318 to 523, i. e. to the final period of the consular dignity. A fourth-century basilica built on this site has recently been discovered (1888), showing, like so many others, the *fenestella confessionis* through which the tomb of the martyr could be seen. The cemetery was open and respected as late as the middle of the eleventh century. With the transfer of the martyr's body (fourteenth century) to Santa Prassede in the city began the decay of the catacomb; the basilica had fallen by the time of Bosio (1594), whose "Villa Bosia" was over the cemetery, and yet exists as Villa Trezza.

The best English introduction to the study of the catacombs is the work of Northcote and Brownlow (see below). The latest and best literature is found in the works, quoted below, of Kaufmann, Marucchi, and Leclercq, particularly in the exhaustive study of Nicholas Müller, art. *Koimeterien*, in *Realencyclopädie f. prot. Theol. und Kirche*, X, 794–877.—The chief collections of materials are those of Giovanni Battista De Rossi, and in them are also seen on the largest scale the methods of investigation that have rendered such excellent results for theology and church history, also the history of the arts, social life, etc. of Christian antiquity. For the life of De Rossi, see that article. The titles of his writings number over 200, but the epoch-making works are the following: 1. *Roma sotterranea cristiana* (3 vols., Rome, 1864–77), large quarto with maps and illustrations, dealing, however, only with the cemetery of Saint Callistus. The introduction is a monumental piece of work. As these works are rare, even in public libraries, Dr. Kaufmann gives (pp. 24–27) full tables of their contents. De Rossi planned a complete collection of the inscriptions (epitaphs) of the catacombs but only partially finished it.—2. *Inscriptiones christianæ urbis Romæ septimo sæculo antiquiores* (folio I, Rome, 1861; II, ibid., 1888).—3. In a special periodical (now very rare) conducted by him he consigned many results of his studies and investigations, *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana* (Rome, 1863–1894), in five series, continued as its official record by the Commission of Sacred Archæology under the title of *Nuovo Bullettino*, etc. (Rome, 1895 sqq.). Among his numerous special studies we may mention his account of the earliest pictures of the Blessed Virgin in the catacombs, *Imagines selectæ Deiparæ virginis in cœmeteriis subterraneis udo depictæ* (Rome, 1863; to be read now in connexion with the magisterial *Malereien* of Wilpert), and his account of the inscriptions of the Christian Museum of the Lateran, *Il museo epigrafico Pio Lateranense* (Rome, 1877); cf. Marucchi, *Guida del museo cristiano-Lateranense* (Rome, 1898). Two fundamental studies of De Rossi, made at the

beginning of his career and yet of value for catacomb researches, are his *De Christianis monumentis ἰχθὺν exhibentibus*, in *Spicileg. Solesm.* (Paris, 1855), III, 544–77; *De Christianis titulis Carthaginen.* (ibid.), 505–538.

The Jesuit writer, RAFFAELE GARRUCCI, deserves an honourable mention for his voluminous (6 large folios) and learned work that deals largely with the catacombs, *Storia dell'arte cristiana nei primi otto secoli della Chiesa* (Prato, 1873–80), with numerous illustrations.—The writings of De Rossi, especially his *Roma sotterranea*, soon gave rise to a number of adaptations in various European languages; one of the most useful and reliable is that of NORTHCOTE AND BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotterranea, or an Account of the Roman Catacombs, especially of the Cemetery of St. Callistus* (London, 1869; 2d ed. 1878–79), published also in briefer form. Quite similar are the German work (same title) of KRAUS (Freiburg, 1873; 2nd ed. 1879), and the French manual of REUSENS, *Éléments d'archéologie chrétienne* (Louvain, 1871–75; 2nd ed., 1885).

The constant activity of excavation, literary research, and criticism, creates as constant a demand for newer manuals of the science which has thus grown up; among the later works of this kind we may mention with praise: ARMELLINI, *Lezioni di archeologia sacra* (Rome, 1898); IDEM, *Gli antichi cimiteri cristiani di Roma e d'Italia* (Rome, 1893); MARUCCHI, *Les éléments d'archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1902–1905, 3 vols.); KAUFMANN, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie* (Paderborn, 1905; an Italian tr., *Manuale di archeologia cristiana* (Rome, 1907); LECLERCQ, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'au VIII^e siècle* (3 vols., Paris, 1907), the latter being a résumé of the rich materials of the new Benedictine dictionary of Christian archæology quoted below. Among later English works similar in intention, if not equal in execution, are: CHEETHAM, *History of Early Christian Art* (New York, 1895), and the praiseworthy summary of LOWRIE, *Christian Art and Archæology* (London, 1901).

The natural desire to obtain some easy control over the enormous mass of facts and opinions that all these labours developed led soon to the creation of illustrated encyclopedias of Christian antiquities, all of which are useful beyond expression for the study of the catacombs. The first of these, based on De Rossi's work, was MARTIGNY, *Dict. des antiquités chrétiennes* (Paris, 1865; 3d ed., 1889). It was followed by a good English (non-Catholic) compilation of the same nature, SMITH AND CHEETHAM, *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (London, 1876–80), and shortly by the German (Catholic) work edited by KRAUS, *Realenzyklopädie d. christl. Alterthümer* (Freiburg, 1882–86), now out of print and rare. In the mean time the French Benedictines of Farnborough, England (CABROL chief editor) have begun a very exhaustive encyclopedia of both Christian archæology and liturgy under the title of *Dict. d'archéol. chrét. et de liturgie* (Paris, 1903 sqq.).—Among the French disciples of De Rossi who contributed most to spread the principles and methods of the new catacomb excavations may be mentioned LE BLANT, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule* (Paris, 1856–65), and *Nouveau recueil des inscriptions*, etc. (ibid., 1892); IDEM, *Études sur les sarcophages chrétiens antiques de la ville d'Arles* (Paris, 1878), *Les sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule* (ibid., 1886), and other important works.—Easily foremost, however, among the scientific students of the Roman catacombs is MONSIGNORE JOSEPH WILPERT, whose accurate reproduction of the originals of the catacomb frescoes has placed before all scholars reliable copies of these famous relics of ancient Christian life, and enables everyone to study them scientifically and at his ease: WILPERT, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms* (Freiburg, 1903, 2 folio volumes, 596 pages of text, 267 plates and 54 figures, published also in Italian as *Pitture delle Catacombe romane*, same place and date). He had previously published a number of valuable researches, both patristic and archæological in content; among them: *Prinzipienfragen der christlichen Archäologie* (Freiburg, 1889, with supplement, ibid., 1890); *Die gottgeweihten Jungfrauen in den ersten Jahrhunderten der Kirche* (ibid., 1892); *Ein Cyklus christologischer Gemälde*, etc. (ibid., 1891); *Fractio Panis, die älteste Darstellung des eucharistischen Opfers* (ibid., 1895); *Die Malereien in der Sakramentskapelle i. d. Katak. des hl. Callistus* (ibid., 1897).—Among the scholarly Protestant writers on the catacombs the following deserve credit: PIPER, *Einleitung in die monumentale Theologie* (Gotha, 1867); MÜLLER, *Archäologische Studien*, etc. (Leipzig, 1895–1901), and since 1902, as *Studien über christliche Denkmäler*, particularly his articles in the *Realenzyklopädie f. prot. Theologie u. Kirche*, on *Koimeterien, Christusbilder*, and *Inschriften;* SCHULTZE, *Die Katakomben* (Leipzig, 1882), *Der theologische Ertrag der Katakombenforschung* (ibid., 1882), *Die altchristlichen Bildwerke*, etc. (ibid., 1889); and *Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst* (Munich, 1895).

Important for the study of the catacombs, their excavations, history, problems, sources, literature, etc., are the above-mentioned official *Nuovo Bullettino*, the Christian archæological bulletin of the *Civiltà Cattolica* by GRISAR, the *Comptes rendus* of KIRSCH in the *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Alterthumskunde* (Freiburg and Rome), conducted, for the archæological content, by MGR. DE WAAL to which may be added the *Oriens Christianus*, conducted by A. BAUMSTARK (Campo Santo Tedesco, or German College, Rome), a useful repository of archæological information from the Christian Orient. Here it may not be out of place to mention the merits of the Roman association known as the "Collegium Cultorum martyrum", especially devoted to the veneration of the holy martyrs and the sites of their sepulchres, and the Christian Archæological Congresses of 1894 and 1900. The *American Journal of Archæology* (Baltimore, 1885 sqq.) also devotes attention to the results of catacomb studies and researches.—It is easily understood that the researches in every field of early Christian antiquities throw light on the catacombs and in turn are helped by the special researches in these cemeteries; hence the importance of the remarkable discoveries of PÈRE DELATTRE of the Pères Blancs on the site of ancient Carthage (for a bibliography of his writings see *Le Musée Lavigerie de Saint-Louis de Carthage* (Tunis, 1900); cf. DALTON, *Catalogue of Early Christian Antiquities*, etc., in the British Museum (London, 1901).

Similarly it is of interest to know the sources of the early art-impulses among the Roman Christians, attributed mostly to the Orient (Egypt, Syria, Palestine), by STRZYGOWSKI, *Orient oder Rom* (Leipzig, 1901), *Kleinasien* (ibid., 1903). Finally it may be useful to add that any serious study of the catacombs demands some acquaintance with the excellent introductory pages of the above-mentioned manuals of KAUFMANN, MARUCCHI, or LECLERCQ, also with the earlier volumes of the histories of the City of Rome by the Catholic writers VON REUMONT (Berlin, 1867), and GRISAR (Rome, 1900, I, unfinished); and the non-Catholic GREGOROVIUS (Eng. tr.), to which must be added the excellent introduction and notes of the critical edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* (2 vols., 4°, Paris, 1886, 1892), by MGR. LOUIS DUCHESNE.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Cenacle. See LAST SUPPER.

Cenacle, RELIGIOUS OF THE.—The Society of Our Lady of the Cenacle was founded in 1826, at La Louvesc in France, near the tomb of St. John Francis Regis, the Jesuit apostle of the poor, by Jean-Pierre-Etienne Terme, a holy and zealous missionary priest of the Diocese of Viviers, and Marie-Victoire-Thérèse Couderc, a woman twenty years of age, but already mature in courage, energy, and the living resources of faith. Desirous to attract pilgrims to the tomb of St. John Francis Regis, and induce them to there recollect themselves in solitude, prayer, and meditation, they resolved to open houses where women might follow the exercises of a retreat; the first of those houses was opened at La Louvesc. Father Terme was not to see the full development of his work; he died in 1834, leaving his religious family to the direction of the Jesuit Fathers. Encouraged by episcopal authority, and then by Popes Gregory XVI, Pius IX, and Leo XIII, the last of whom definitely approved its constitutions, the new institute grew rapidly and soon counted houses in France, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, and Holland. In England, the first house was opened at Manchester, in 1888. The year 1892 saw the first foundation in America, at New York.

The Society of Our Lady of the Cenacle honours particularly, and proposes to itself for its model, the retirement of the Blessed Virgin in the Cenacle, after the Ascension of our Lord, while the whole Church, expecting the Holy Ghost, "were persevering with one mind in prayer with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus" (Acts, i, 14). The religious of this society aim, first, at their own personal sanctification; secondly, at procuring the salvation and perfection of their neighbour. It is this twofold end that they endeavour to attain by the invisible apostolate of perpetual prayer, the recitation of the Divine Office, and the daily Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, as well as by the exercise of exterior forms of apostolate, principally in providing for spiritual retreats and the teaching of Christian doctrine.

The houses of the society are open at any time to women of all classes wishing to make the Spiritual Exercises, that is, to apply themselves for a few days to the consideration of the truths of faith, to recollection and prayer, either in order to make a choice for the disposition of their future life, or because they feel it necessary to regulate their lives in a more Christian manner. From its origin, the society has taken up the teaching of Christian doctrine as a powerful means of apostolate, and receives all persons who are desirous to learn the truths of faith, so as to dispose themselves for the reception of the sacraments, also all who are preparing to enter the Catholic Church, or who, after their return to God, seek to strengthen themselves in faith and piety. Other means used are the day's retreat, associations, etc.; in fact, all offices of spiritual charity proper to extend

the kingdom of God in souls, according to the spirit of the Cenacle, are employed by the Society of Our Lady of the Cenacle, for the love of Christ and the Blessed Virgin.

Cenalis, ROBERT (sometimes written CÉNEAU and CŒNALIS, whence the nickname, *le Soupier*), bishop, historian, and controversialist, b. in Paris, 1483; d. there, 1560. In 1513 he became doctor of the Faculty of Theology in the Sorbonne, and in 1515 was made Bishop of Vence. From here he was transferred in 1530 to the See of Riez, and in 1532 to that of Avranches. He took an active part in the religious and polemical discussions that attended the Reformation, and wrote several controversial works, the most important of which are: "Pro tuendo sacro cœlibatu" (Paris, 1545); "Tractatus de utriusque gladii facultate, usuque legitimo" (Paris, 1546, and Leyden, 1558); "Axioma de divortio matrimonii mosaici per legem evangelicam refutato" (Paris, 1549); "Traductio larvæ sychophanticæ petulantissimæque impietatis Calviniacæ" (Paris, 1556); "Methodus de compescendâ hæreticorum ferociâ" (Paris, 1557). In the same year and place in which the last-named work was published, there appeared his "Historia Galliæ", dedicated to King Henry II. This was a folio volume, treating of the name, origin, and achievements of the Gauls, Franks, and Burgundians. It has but little critical value. Not long afterward he produced "L'histoire ecclésiastique de Normandie". While Bishop of Riez he issued synodal statutes of that diocese, and wrote an erudite treatise on weights and measures under the title: "De liquidorum leguminumque mensuris, seu verâ mensurarum ponderumque ratione" (Paris, 1532, 1535, 1547).

GENEBRARD, *Chronographia* (Cologne, 1581); JÖCHER, *Gelehrtenlexikon*, s. v.; HURTER, *Nomenclator*.

JOHN A. RYAN.

Ceneda, DIOCESE OF (CENETENSIS). The city of Ceneda is situated in the province of Treviso, in former Venetian territory, on a declivity of the Rhætian Alps, in a picturesque region. In ancient times it was known as *Ceneta* or *Acedum*. It was pillaged by Attila in 452, and a century later by Totila. During the domination of the Lombards it was governed by a duke, and afterwards became part of the marquisate of Treviso. Later (994) the bishop of that city was also its temporal lord, even after it was incorporated with Venice, since in 1447 and in 1514 Bishops Francesco and Oliviero gave the republic civil investiture of the territory of Ceneda, reserving for themselves and their successors (until about1768) authority over the city and a few villas. The Gospel, it is said, was preached in this region in the first century by St. Fortunatus, deacon of St. Hermagoras of Aquileia. The earliest known bishop is Vindemius, present in 579 at the Synod of Grado, held to continue the Schism of the Three Chapters. In 680 Ursinus, Bishop of Ceneda, was present at the Council of Rome convened against the Monothelites. Other bishops were: Azzo (1140), Sigifredo (1170), during whose time there were many conflicts between Ceneda and the neighbouring towns; Antonio Correr (1409); Lorenzo da Ponte (1739), the last bishop to exercise temporal power. Since 1818 Ceneda has been a suffragan of Venice; previously it was under the jurisdiction of Udine. The diocese has a population of 183,000, with 118 parishes, 500 churches and chapels, 216 secular and 25 regular priests, 5 religious houses of men and 3 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), 221–320; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 386–87.

U. BENIGNI.

Censer, a vessel suspended by chains, and used for burning incense at solemn Mass, Vespers, Benediction, processions, and other important offices of the Church. It is now commonly called a thurible. In its present prevailing shape the censer consists of a cup, or bowl, which rests on a firm base and is provided with a hollow movable pan for holding ignited charcoal, a lid or covering, and four chains about three feet in length, three of which unite the bowl to a circular disc, while the fourth is used for raising the lid, to which one end is attached, the other passing through a hole in the disc and terminating in a small ring. To carry the censer the chains are grasped in the hand just under the disc, care being taken to keep the base elevated to a height of six or eight inches from the ground and to swing it gently to and fro in order that the current of air thus created may cause the fire to burn the fragrant gums or incense which is placed on it whenever the censer is being used. The censer played an important part in the ancient religious worship both of the Jews and Pagans. It is no wonder, then, that its employment in Christian ceremonies goes back to the very earliest times. Its primitive form, however, was quite different from what it is now, being something like a vase with a perforated cover to emit the perfumed odours. Later on chains were added for greater convenience in manipulation. These vessels in the Middle Ages were often made of gold and silver and enriched with numerous details of most elaborate ornamentation. In the archives or inventories of many Continental and English cathedrals (such as St. John Lateran, Trier, Louvain, Lincoln, and York Minster) minute descriptions are given of some ancient specimens in the possession of these churches.

BONA, *De Rebus Liturgicis* (Turin, 1747), I, XXV; DUGDALE, *Monasticum Anglicanum* (London, 1682), passim; PUGIN, *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament* (London, 1868), s. v. *Censer;* O'LOAN, *Ceremonies of Ecclesiastical Functions* (Dublin, 1893), 27; LEVASSEUR, *Manuel Liturgique* (Paris, 1890), I, 275; VAN DER STAPPEN, *De Celebratione Missæ* (Mechlin, 1892), X, 92.

PATRICK MORRISROE.

Censorship of Books (CENSURA LIBRORUM).—DEFINITION AND DIVISION.—In general, censorship of books is a supervision of the press in order to prevent any abuse of it. In this sense, every lawful authority, whose duty it is to protect its subjects from the ravages of a pernicious press, has the right of exercising censorship of books. This censorship is either *ecclesiastical* or *civil*, according as it is practised by the spiritual or secular authority, and it may be exercised in two ways, viz.: before the printing or publishing of a work, by examining it (*censura prævia*); and after the printing or publishing, by repressing or prohibiting it (*censura repressiva*). This is the double meaning of the classical word *censura*, especially as used in the legislation of the Roman Church. Later on, however, particularly in civil law, *censura* denoted almost exclusively *censura prævia*. Wherever the abolition of censorship in past centuries is referred to, only the latter is meant.

The reverse of censorship is freedom of the press. In all civilized countries, however, that have abrogated the *censura prævia*, freedom of the press is by no means unlimited. Its abuse may, in the worst cases, be condemned and punished according to common law, and the old censorship has nearly everywhere been replaced by more or less severe press-laws. Although the censorship of books (in a wider sense) did not begin precisely with the invention and spread of the art of printing, yet in our definition of it, only productions of the press are spoken of. In the first place, censorship now, as well as in centuries past, is concerned exclusively with printed works; secondly, in the narrower sense (*censura prævia*), it has taken that definite form, which is expressed by "censorship of books", only after the invention of the printing press. When explaining, however, the historical development of censorship, we must begin with an earlier period, because we are here dealing with it as exercised by the Universal Church of Rome. From the beginning and at all times in principle, the Church adhered to the censorship, although in the

course of time the application was modified according to conditions and circumstances. The censorship of books, as well as the press-laws of states or of church-communities other than Catholic, can here be mentioned for the sake of comparison only.

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.—As soon as there were books or writings of any kind the spreading or reading of which was highly detrimental to the public, competent authorities were obliged to take measures against them. Long before the Christian Era, therefore, we find that heathens as well as Jews had fixed regulations for the suppression of dangerous books and the prevention of corruptive reading. From numerous illustrations quoted by Zaccaria (pp. 248–256) it is evident that most of the writings condemned or destroyed offended against religion and morals. Everywhere the books declared dangerous were cast into the fire—the simplest and most natural execution of censorship. When at Ephesus, in consequence of St. Paul's preaching, the heathens were converted, they raised before the eyes of the Apostle of the Gentiles a pile in order to burn their numerous superstitious books (Acts, xix, 19). No doubt, the new Christians moved by grace and the Apostolic word did so of their own accord; but all the more was their action approved of by St. Paul himself, and it is recorded as an example worthy of imitation by the author of the Acts of the Apostles. From this burning of books at Ephesus, as well as from the Second Epistle of St. Peter and the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, it clearly appears how the Apostles judged of pernicious books and how they wished them to be treated. In concert with the Apostle of the Gentiles (Tit., iii, 10), St. John most emphatically exhorted the first Christians to shun heretical teachers. To the disciples of the Apostles it was a matter of course to connect this warning not only with the persons of such teachers, but first and foremost with their doctrine and their writings. Thus, in the first Christian centuries, the so-called apocrypha (q. v.), above all other books, appeared to the faithful as *libri non recipiendi*, i. e. books which were on no account to be used. The establishment of the Canon of Holy Writ was, therefore, at once an elimination and a censuring of the apocrypha. The two documents referring to this, both from the latter half of the second century, are the Muratorian Canon (q. v.) and the Apostolic Constitutions (see Hauler, Didascaliæ Apostolorum fragmenta, Leipzig, 1900, p. 4).

When the Church, after the era of persecution, was given greater liberty, a censorship of books appears more plainly. The First Œcumenical Council of Nicæa (325) condemned not only Arius personally, but also his book entitled "Thalia"; Constantine commanded that the writings of Arius and of his friends should everywhere be delivered up to be burned; concealment of them was forbidden under pain of death. In the following centuries, when and wherever heresies sprang up, the popes of Rome and the œcumenical councils, as well as the particular synods of Africa, Asia, and Europe, condemned, conjointly with the false doctrines, the books and writings containing them. (Cf. Hilgers, Die Bücherverbote in Papstbriefen.) The latter were ordered to be destroyed by fire, and illegal preservation of them was treated as a heinous criminal offence. The authorities intended to make the reading of such writings simply impossible. Pope St. Innocent I, enumerating in a letter of 405 a number of apocryphal writings, rejects them as *non solum repudianda sed etiam damnanda*. It is the first attempt at a catalogue of forbidden books. The so-called "Decretum Gelasianum" contains many more, not only apocryphal, but also heretical, or otherwise objectionable, writings. It is not without reason that this catalogue has been called the first "Roman Index" of forbidden books. The books in question were not unfrequently examined in the public sessions of councils. There are also cases in which the popes themselves (e. g. Innocent I and Gregory the Great) read and examined a book sent to them and finally condemned it. As regards the kinds and contents of writings forbidden in ancient times, we find among them, besides apocryphal and heretical books, forged acts of martyrs, spurious penitentials, and superstitious writings. In ancient times information about objectionable books was sent both from East and West to Rome, that they might be examined and, if necessary, forbidden by the Apostolic See. Thus at the beginning of the Middle Ages there existed, in all its essentials, though without specified clauses, a prohibition and censorship of books throughout the Catholic Church. Popes as well as councils, bishops no less than synods, considered it then, as always, their most sacred duty to safeguard the purity of faith and to protect the souls of the faithful by condemning and forbidding any dangerous book.

During the Middle Ages prohibitions of books were far more numerous than in ancient times. Their history is chiefly connected with the names of medieval heretics like Berengarius of Tours, Abelard, John Wyclif, and John Hus. However, especially in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, there were also issued prohibitions of various kinds of superstitious writings, among them the Talmud and other Jewish books. In this period, also, the first decrees about the reading of translations of the Bible were called forth by the abuses of the Waldenses and Albigenses. What these decrees (e. g. of the synods of Toulouse in 1229, Tarragona in 1234, Oxford in 1408) aimed at was the restriction of Bible-reading in the vernacular. A general prohibition was never in existence. During the earlier Christian centuries, and till late in the Middle Ages, there existed, as compared with our times, but few books. As they were multiplied by handwriting only, the number of copies to be met with was very small; moreover none but the learned could make use of them. For these reasons preventive censorship was not necessary until, after the invention of the printing press and the subsequent large circulation of printed works, the harm done by pernicious books increased in a manner hitherto unknown. Nevertheless, a previous examination of books was not altogether unknown in more remote times, and in the Middle Ages it was even prescribed in some places. St. Ambrose sent several of his writings to Sabinus, Bishop of Piacenza, that he might pass his opinion on them and correct them before they were published (P. L., XVI, 1151). In the fifth century Gennadius sent his work "De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis" to Pope Gelasius for the same purpose. The chronicler, Godfrey of Viterbo, applied expressly to Urban III (1186) for examination and approbation of his "Pantheon" which he dedicated to the pope. These are, of course, examples of a merely private preventive censorship. Yet in the most flourishing period of the Middle Ages we find censorship of that kind established by law in the very centres of scientific life. According to the papal statutes of the University of Paris (1342), the professors were not allowed to hand any lecture over to the booksellers before it had been examined by the chancellor and the professors of theology. (In the preceding century the booksellers were bound by oath to offer for sale only genuine and "corrected" copies.) A similar censorship occurs in the fourteenth century at all universities.

Down to more recent times forbidden books were got out of the way in the simplest manner, by destroying or confiscating them. It is worthy of note that when the Roman synod of 745 ordered the burning of the superstitious writings sent by St. Boniface to the Apostolic See, Pope Zachary ordered them to be preserved in the pontifical archives (Mansi, XII, 380). Again, while the provincial synod of Paris (1210) strictly forbade certain works of Aristotle as

found in the erroneous Arabic edition, Pope Gregory IX (1231) merely suspended the use of these writings until they had been minutely examined and cleared of all suspicion (Du Plessis d'Argentré, Collectio judiciorum, I, 1, 133; Denifle, Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis I, 70, 138). The Roman expurgation of suspected books, so often unjustly held in ill repute, had, therefore, no inglorious beginning under this last-named great ecclesiastical legislator. In general, it may be said that in the examination and prohibition of books Rome displayed wise moderation and true justice, since it intended only to keep faith and morals unpolluted. With the invention and spread of typography began a new period in the censorship of books. It was in the nature of things that the discoveries and tendencies of the end of the fifteenth, and commencement of the sixteenth, century should very soon abuse the "divine art" of printing for the purpose of multiplying and disseminating all kinds of pernicious books. The religious disruption of Germany had not yet begun when Rome took precautionary measures by insisting on a preventive censorship of all printed works. The beginnings of the censorship just mentioned are not to be traced to the Curia of Rome, but to Cologne, where we find it established in the university in the reign of Sixtus IV. In a Brief of 18 March, 1479, this pope granted the fullest powers of censorship to the university, and praised it for having hitherto checked with such zeal the printing and selling of irreligious books. In 1482 the Bishop of Würzburg enacted a law of censorship for his diocese; in 1485 and 1486 the Archbishop of Mainz did the same for his ecclesiastical province. Thus the way was paved for the Bull of Innocent VIII (17 Nov., 1487), which universally prescribed the censorship of books and entrusted the bishops with its execution. Nevertheless, this first universally binding papal edict of censorship remained unheeded. We only hear of its being promulgated by Herman IV, Archbishop of Cologne. Consequently, in Venice, the papal legate, Nicolò Franco, issued in 1491 an order of censorship for this republic. As early, however, as 1480 we find books published with the approbation of the Patriarch of Venice. The decree of 1491 ordered the censorship of theological and religious books only.

On 1 June, 1501, followed the Bull of Alexander VI, an exact copy of Innocent VIII's, but issued only for the ecclesiastical provinces of Cologne, Mainz, Trier, and Magdeburg. Finally, during the Lateran Council, Leo X promulgated, 3 May, 1515, the Bull "Inter sollicitudines". This is the first papal censorial decree given for the entire Church which was universally accepted. All writings without exception were subjected to censorship. The examination was entrusted to the bishops or to the censors appointed by them and to the inquisitor; in Rome it appertained to the cardinal-vicar (q. v.) and the *Magister Sacri Palatii*. Printers offending against the law incurred the punishment of excommunication; moreover they were liable to a fine and had their books destroyed by fire. After examination, approbation was to be given free of charge and without delay, and this under pain of excommunication. Meanwhile the prohibition of books had been maintained by the pope and the bishops as usual. In 1482 the Bishops of Würzburg and Basle forbade certain printed works in their dioceses, and by a Bull of 4 August, 1487, Innocent VIII prohibited Giovanni Pico della Mirandola's nine hundred theses, printed at Rome in December, 1486. This prohibition was ratified by Alexander VI in 1493. In Germany great excitement prevailed, it being the eve of the Reformation. A book containing the tenets of Humanism, the "Epistolæ obscurorum virorum", was suppressed by a Brief of Leo X, 15 March, 1517. The case of Reuchlin's "Augenspiegel" was a long time pending in Rome; the book was ultimately prohibited 23 June, 1520. Some days previous (15 June, 1520) Leo X issued the Bull "Exsurge Domine", by which all writings of Luther, even future ones, were forbidden under pain of excommunication. Adrian VI again set forth this prohibition in divers Letters of the year 1522, and in 1524 Clement VII inserted in the Bull "Consueverunt" (*in cœna domini*) a clause proscribing under pain of excommunication all heretical writings, notably those of Luther.

After being reorganized by Paul III (Bull of 21 July, 1542) the General Inquisition took charge of the supervision of books, chiefly in Rome and Italy. Subsequent to a proclamation of 12 July, 1543, enjoining with special emphasis the suppression and censorship of books, this tribunal composed a catalogue of forbidden books, which, together with a rather too rigorous decree (30 Dec., 1558) and another that mitigated it, was promulgated in the reign of Paul IV, some days after the date just mentioned. Similar catalogues had been published since the twenties of the sixteenth century, by political as well as ecclesiastical authorities, particularly in England, the Low Countries, France, Germany, and Italy (Venice, Milan, Lucca). But the catalogue of the Inquisition of 1559 was the first Roman list meant for the whole world; it was also the very first that bore the title "Index". This Roman catalogue, like all others published up to that time, contained almost exclusively works distinctly heretical or suspected of heresy; and since these were considered as already condemned and forbidden, especially by the Bull "In Cœna Domini", the catalogue seemed to be merely the detailed list or register, in short the "Index", of the prohibited books. This Index of Paul IV, however, contained one particularly rigorous enactment, viz.: that all books—published as well as to be published—of the writers mentioned in the catalogue (of the so-called first class); all books of the second and third class; and even books thereafter published by printers of heretical works, were declared forbidden under the same most severe pains and penalties. No other entirely new enactments or regulations of censorship were contained in this edition. Later editions of the Index imitated this first one only in name. The typical Index for Roman decrees of this kind appeared soon after and abolished the too rigorous one of Paul IV.

During the fourth session (1546) of the Council of Trent the assembled Fathers, discussing the Canon of Holy Scripture, insisted expressly on the censorship of books, such as had been universally prescribed by the Lateran Council, and on the sanctions therein decreed, especially with regard to books and writings treating of religious things, or, in their own words, *de rebus sacris*. For members of religious orders wishing to publish works of this sort, examination and approbation of their writings on the part of their superiors was prescribed, in addition to the approbation of the ordinary. Towards the end of the council the reorganization of the censorship and prohibition of books was more particularly debated. The result was the so-called "Index Tridentinus", which, however, was not published until 1564, by order of the council, along with a Brief of Pius IV; wherefore it is also called "Index of Pius IV". Besides a revised catalogue of forbidden books this index contained, as a most important modification, ten general rules composed by the council, since known as the "Tridentine Rules". *First*, these ten rules contain prohibitions (a) of all heretical and superstitious writings; (b) of all immoral (obscene) books, the old classics alone excepted, which, however, are not to be used in teaching the young; (c) of all Latin translations of the New Testament coming from heretics. A peculiar statement is made with regard to heresiarchs, or heads of sects sprung up since 1515, whose names

are mentioned in the so-called first class of the Index. All their books, even those free from objection, i. e. not treating of religious questions, as well as future publications, are to be considered as forbidden. *Second*, the rules contain conditional prohibitions, i. e. books published by heretics, or even by Catholics, that are in the main good and useful but not altogether free from dangerous passages, are forbidden until corrected by the lawful authorities. To these writings belong chiefly those mentioned in the Index itself as needing correction. *Third*, on certain conditions, and after asking special permission, leave is granted for the reading of Latin translations of the Old Testament edited by heretics, and for the use of Bible-versions in the vernacular written by Catholics. *Fourth*, preventive censorship and approbation, as prescribed by the Bull of Leo X (1515), are insisted on. The punishment of excommunication is extended also to the author who has his book printed without the necessary approbation. A copy of the examined and approved manuscript is to remain with the censor. Moreover, printers and booksellers are forbidden both to offer for sale prohibited books and to sell conditionally interdicted works to anyone not producing a permit; they are ordered to keep ready an exact list of all writings they have in stock. At the same time bishops and inquisitors are urged to supervise printing and book-shops and to have them inspected. *Finally*, the rules inflict the punishment of excommunication on such as read and possess forbidden heretical works, or those suspected of heresy. Any person reading or keeping a book prohibited for other reasons commits a grievous sin and is to be punished according to the bishop's discretion. The ten rules remained in force until Leo XIII abrogated them by the Constitution "Officiorum ac Munerum" (25 Jan., 1897) and replaced them by new general decrees. In the course of time, however, the rules not only received some few additions, especially when a new index was published, but in consequence of contrary custom also gradually lost their binding force with regard to certain regulations.

The most important event regarding the administration of the censorship after the Council of Trent was the institution of a special congregation, the S. Congregatio Indicis Librorum Prohibitorum. (See CONGREGATIONS, ROMAN.) The first task of this body of cardinals was to be the promulgation of new indexes as well as the expurgation of books needing correction. It also soon took in hand the examination and prohibition of dangerous new writings, together with the supervision and management of all that pertained to the production and distribution of books. The Congregation of the Index was called into existence by Pius V in March, 1571, formally and solemnly confirmed by the Bull of Gregory XIII, "Ut pestiferarum" (13 September, 1572), and its rights eventually defined by Sixtus V in the Bull "Immensa Æterni Patris" (22 Jan., 1588), with those of the other congregations of cardinals. Sixtus V intended to replace, in his new index (printed 1590), the ten Tridentine rules by twenty-two new ones. This index, however, never passed into law; Sixtus died, and its publication was stopped by the succeeding popes. In the next Roman index the ten rules were reinstated instead of the twenty-two of Sixtus V. The new index, published at length by Clement VIII (1596), contained, besides additions to the catalogue of forbidden books, not only the ten rules but, directly after them, an instruction on the prohibition, expurgation, and printing of books, some remarks on the fourth and ninth rules, and on several of the forbidden books. The instruction reminds bishops and inquisitors both of their duties and rights regarding the prohibition of books. Outside Italy they, as well as the universities, are ordered to draw up and promulgate indexes of forbidden books for their respective districts, copies of which are to be sent to Rome. As regards expurgation of books, the instruction sets forth in detail who is authorized for this purpose, how it is to be practised in different cases, and what is to be cancelled. After completing the corrections, bishop and inquisitor are to publish a "Codex expurgatorius", according to which the books in question are to be expurgated. Practically, neither of these first two parts of the instruction was of much consequence. Outside Italy, apart from Spain and Portugal, Poland and Bohemia, particular indexes were almost unknown. A short time after it was even forbidden to do this without special leave of the Congregation of the Index. As regards expurgation, it was only in Rome itself, apart from Spain, Portugal, and Belgium, that an "Index expurgatorius" (one volume) was published in 1607, the author of which was the then *Magister Sacri Palatii*. But this never became legally binding. The third part of the instruction exactly states the rules to be observed, (1) when examining a book previous to the printing, (2) when approving, and (3) when actually printing it. The whole is a more detailed specification of the decree of the Lateran Council as well as of the regulations laid down in the tenth Tridentine rule. The observations appended to the instruction refer chiefly, on the one hand, to the permission of reading translations of the Bible; on the other, to the prohibition of astrological works, of the Talmud, and of other Jewish books.

In the early part of the seventeenth century both the Congregation of the Index and the *Magister Sacri Palatii* published in Rome, from time to time, decrees containing new prohibitions of books. These decrees were collected in smaller indexes considered as additions to the index of Clement VIII, and in 1632 the then secretary of the Congregation of the Index edited (in his private capacity only) a complete alphabetical list of all books forbidden up to that time. But it was not until 1664, under Alexander VII, that by order of the congregation a new official index was published which differed from all prior ones in form and arrangement of the subject-matter; as to the contents, the only difference was that all prohibitions from 1596 to 1664 were inserted. The same is to be said of the abridged edition of the index of Alexander VII, which was published the following year (1665). In the introductory Brief, "Speculatores", this pope decreed that in the prohibition of books none but the penalties fixed, both in the tenth rule and the Bull "In Cœna Domini", should be in force. In the second half of the seventeenth century and the first of the eighteenth, many (chiefly Jansenistic) books were condemned by the Congregation of the Index, the Roman Inquisition, and papal Bulls or Briefs. The works interdicted by letters Apostolic were, as a rule, forbidden under pain of excommunication. During this time it was not unusual that in addition to single books whole classes of writings of a similar kind were forbidden, just as had been done formerly, particularly in letters Apostolic. Originally these classes of books were inserted in the alphabetical list mostly under the word *libri*, until the Index was reformed under Benedict XIV. This new index (1758) far surpasses all former ones by reason of the correction of the many typographical errors and inaccuracies to be found in the earlier indexes, so that it is in every sense the best edition published prior to 1900. It was also notable for the novel arrangement by which the aforesaid classes of works were now expressly registered, at the commencement of the catalogue of forbidden books, in four paragraphs headed: "Decrees Concerning Forbidden Books not Mentioned Individually in the Index". Among the works enumerated, we find especially books and writings on certain disputed questions, such as the Immaculate Conception, the theory of grace, the Malabar and Chinese Rites.

The most important addition to this new index was the Bull "Sollicita ac Provida" (9 July, 1753), which, for the Congregations of both the Inquisition and the Index, uniformly regulated and definitively settled the whole method of conducting cases concerning literary productions. Even now this Bull furnishes the principal directions for all decisions concerning the prohibition of books. Benedict XIV states as his motive for publishing this constitution the many unjust complaints against the prohibition of books as well as against the Index. All such complaints, even in our own times, are best refuted by this Bull. In the following century neither index nor censorship underwent substantial changes. Quite spontaneously, however, the prescriptive law was formed to no longer submit for ecclesiastical censorship all books and writings, but only theological and religious ones. This right was assented to first tacitly, then also indirectly by other ecclesiastical enactments. When later on, by the Bull "Apostolicæ Sedis" (12 Oct., 1869) Pius IX reorganized the ecclesiastical censures (penal laws of the Church), he abolished the penalty of excommunication which, both in the Tridentine (1564) and Clementine (1596) indexes, was inflicted upon printers as well as authors not submitting their works for ecclesiastical censorship. Since the publication of that Bull only three definite classes of books are still forbidden under pain of excommunication (see below). During the Vatican Council great exertions were made, especially on the part of Germany and France, to induce the assembled Fathers to mitigate the ecclesiastical laws relating to censorship (cf. Coll. Lacens. Concil., VII, 1075), but before this question could be discussed, the council was dissolved. Leo XIII, therefore, took it upon himself to reorganize the ecclesiastical legislation in this respect, which he accomplished by the Constitution "Officiorum ac Munerum" (25 Jan., 1897) and the reform of the Index, published in 1900. Since that time, for all literary matters, for censorship and prohibition of books no other laws and rules are in force than those contained in the new index of Leo XIII. Of former enactments, the Bull "Sollicita ac Provida" alone has been retained; together with the new Bull "Officiorum ac Munerum" it forms the first and general part of the Leonine Code, whereas the second and larger, but not therefore more important, part comprises the special, alphabetically arranged catalogue of books forbidden by particular decrees since 1600. Pius X issued in 1905 orders regarding the printing and publication of liturgical chants and melodies, and in the Encyclical Letter "Pascendi dominici gregis" (8 Sept., 1907) most urgently enjoined on all the prohibition and censorship of books.

ECCLESIASTICAL LAWS IN OPERATION SINCE 1900.—The end of the Church founded by Christ is the propagation and preservation of the genuine teachings of Christ and a life after these teachings. One of the most formidable dangers threatening purity of faith and morals among the members of the Church arises from pernicious books and writings. For this very reason the Church has from the beginning and at all times taken such precautions against bad literature as were appropriate for the different times and the peculiar character of the dangers. If the Church had ever neglected doing this, she would have failed in one of her most important and solemn duties. In our own days the danger caused by bad books has risen to a degree never thought of before. Unrestraint of intellect and will is the real cause of this increase. The so-called freedom of the press or the abolition of public censorship is largely responsible for this unrestraint. All the more the Church is bound to put an end to the evil by wise and just laws. The highest ecclesiastical authority, Leo XIII himself, has done so in the most solemn way by the aforesaid Bull "Officiorum ac Munerum" (25 Jan., 1897) which obliges very strictly all the faithful. This papal constitution contains the general legal enactments (*decreta generalia*) arranged under two headings of ten and five chapters respectively, in forty-nine paragraphs or articles. The forty-nine paragraphs exhibit not only the prohibition of certain classes of books, together with the injunction of preventive censorship for other classes, but also detailed regulations concerning the application and sanction of the whole law.

The first paragraph decrees that the books mentioned in former indexes and forbidden previous to 1600, remain forbidden even though not individually enumerated in the new index of Leo XIII—unless they be allowed by the new general paragraphs. To this class, however, belong almost exclusively heretical books and a few others forbidden also by the following general decrees. Here it is to be remarked that heretical works of ancient times, or even of the Middle Ages, are no longer held to be forbidden, so that the words of the first paragraph seem to refer exclusively to the sixteenth century. In accordance with the main end of the law, paragraph 2 forbids books of apostates, heretics, schismatics, and in general of all writers defending heresy or schism or undermining the very foundations of religion; paragraph 11 prohibits books falsifying the notion of "Inspiration of Holy Scripture"; paragraph 14 condemns all writings defending duelling, suicide, divorce, or representing as useful and innocuous for Church and State Freemasonry and other secret societies, or maintaining errors specified by the Apostolic See [those mentioned, e. g., in the Syllabus of Pius IX (1864) or of Pius X (1907)]; paragraph 12 interdicts superstitious writings in the following words: "It is forbidden to publish, read or keep books teaching or recommending sorcery, soothsaying, magic, spiritism or similar superstitious things"; paragraph 9 reads as follows: "Books systematically (*ex professo*) discussing, relating or teaching obscene and immoral things are strictly prohibited"; paragraph 21 says: "Dailies, newspapers and journals which aim at (*data opera*) destroying religion and morality are interdicted not only by natural law but also by ecclesiastical prohibition". All works forbidden in the above-mentioned paragraphs may be put together in one group, viz.: irreligious, heretical, superstitious, and immoral writings. It will readily be understood that these classes of books constitute a serious danger to faith and morals, and consequently must needs be forbidden by the Church. Works, however, composed by heterodox authors are, agreeable to paragraphs 3 and 4, not forbidden even if treating of religion, provided that they contain nothing serious against the Catholic Faith. Paragraph 10 grants leave for the use of the classics, ancient as well as modern, though not free from immorality, in consideration of the elegance and purity of their style. This exception is made for the benefit of those whose official or educational duties demand it; for teaching purposes, however, only carefully expurgated editions are to be given to students. Concerning newspapers and journals forbidden in paragraph 21, the bishops are specially reminded to deter the faithful from such reading; and in paragraph 22 it is warmly recommended to all Catholics, and particularly the clergy, to publish nothing in dailies, journals, and writings of that sort, except for just and sensible reasons.

A second group of prohibited books comprises all insulting writings directed against God and the Church. Regarding them paragraph 11 says: "All books are forbidden that insult God or the Blessed Virgin Mary or the saints or the Catholic Church and her rites, the sacraments or the Apostolic See. In like manner all books are forbidden that aim at the defamation of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the clergy

or the religious". It is hardly necessary to say that a fair historical work, for example, on an individual member of the hierarchy, of a religious order, or even on any particular order who have but disgraced their calling or the Church, is not included in paragraph 11. With this second group may also be reckoned, among the works forbidden by paragraphs 15 and 16, all novel religious pictures that deviate from the spirit and the decrees of the Church, also all works on indulgences containing spurious or falsified statements.

The third and last group also comprehends several classes of forbidden books. To these belong, in the first place, all editions and versions of Holy Writ not approved by competent ecclesiastical authorities. For by paragraphs 5, 6, and 8, leave to use editions and versions published by non-Catholics, provided they do not attack Catholic dogmas either in the preface or the annotations, is given only to such as are occupied with theological or Biblical studies. And by paragraph 7 all vernacular versions, even those prepared by Catholic authors, are prohibited if they are not, on the one hand, approved by the Apostolic See or, on the other, are not supplied with annotations taken from the works of the Holy Fathers and learned Catholic writers and accompanied by an episcopal approbation. Second, according to paragraph 18, there belong to the third group of prohibited works all liturgical books such as missals, breviaries and the like, in case any change is made in them without special sanction of the Apostolic See. By a new decree of Pius X (1905), all editions of ecclesiastical liturgical chant differing from the pontifical edition are now forbidden. Third, by paragraph 20 are forbidden prayer and devotional books or booklets, catechisms and books of religious instruction, books and booklets of ethics, asceticism, and mysticism, or any others of like kind, if they are published without permission of the competent ecclesiastical authorities. Fourth, the works condemned by paragraph 13 must here be mentioned, viz., books and writings containing novel apparitions, revelations, visions, prophecies, miracles, or those endeavouring to introduce novel devotions, private or public, in case these works appear without legitimate ecclesiastical approbation. These four classes of prohibited works are here put together in the third group because all of them are but conditionally forbidden, i. e. only in case the previous ecclesiastical approbation be wanting. It is just these classes of books that may be very dangerous, particularly to pious people, unless previous examination and approbation sufficiently guarantee the absence of anything contrary to Christian Faith or the Church. It was proper, therefore, to forbid them. Besides the three groups just quoted the Constitution "Officiorum ac Munerum" prohibits no other class of books. For all works individually mentioned in the Index and held to be still forbidden, belong one way or the other to one of those groups, and for this very reason they have been put on the Index.

The Index of forbidden books is a general law strictly binding on all, inclusive of the learned, and this even if in a particular case no great risk would be incurred by the reader or owner of a forbidden book. The obligation refers to the reading as well as to the possession of the book in question. It is in itself a grave obligation by reason of the importance of the matter, since the safeguarding and protection of faith and morals are involved. This is also apparent both from the existence of the constitution and from its wording. Nevertheless it is self-evident that not only for subjective, but also for objective, reasons lighter transgressions and venial sins may be committed when offending against the prohibition of books. Only in the event of more serious offences, in two particular cases, the heaviest ecclesiastical punishment is inflicted by the law. According to paragraph 47, the penalty of excommunication specially (*speciali modo*) reserved to the pope is forthwith incurred by all who, though conscious of law and penalty yet read or keep or print or defend books of heretical teachers or apostates maintaining heresies. Under the same penalty, and in like manner, books individually condemned by letters Apostolic are interdicted by paragraph 47, in case the letters referred to are still in full force, and punish the reading of the condemned book with excommunication reserved to the pope. The penalty of the said paragraph applies solely to *books*, not to smaller pamphlets or manuscripts of any kind. The paragraphs 23 to 26 deal with the permission to read and keep forbidden books. Whosoever desires such permission may obtain it from the competent ecclesiastical authorities. To these it appertains to judge of the need for the permission requested. It is evident that the permission granted by the Church can exempt only from the ecclesiastical law. In spite, therefore, of a special dispensation the licensee would not be at liberty to read such books as would for some reason or other cause him grievous harm in faith and morals. For him also, the obligation of the natural law remains intact, just as before the license was granted.

Since the prohibition of books concerns all, anyone wishing to use forbidden books is bound to get a dispensation either from the Apostolic See or from some person specially authorized by the pope (paragraph 23). By paragraph 24 full powers to that effect are given to the Roman Congregation of the Index as well as to that of the Holy Office; also to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith with regard to the countries under it, and to the *Magister Sacri Palatii Apostolici* with reference to Rome. Bishops as well as prelates with episcopal jurisdiction have the aforesaid power, according to paragraph 25, by virtue of their office, only in urgent cases for individual books; they are, however, invested with full power, either directly by the Apostolic See or through the Congregation of the Index or the Propaganda. Dispensations are to be granted with prudence and on just and reasonable grounds. The general authority given to the bishops directly by the pope, in the so-called quinquennial faculties, may be delegated by them to others since the decree of 14 December, 1898 (Acta S. Sedis, XXXI, 384). The bishops of England have this power from the Congregation of the Propaganda, and they make use of it by delegating it to their priests; thus the latter may, without further formalities, give permission (e. g. to their penitents) to read forbidden books. Still, a confessor or even a bishop, who foresees that the reading of prohibited writings would expose the petitioner to great risk regarding faith or morals, would not be free to grant the desired dispensation; and if the petitioner nevertheless obtains it, he is not allowed to make use of it, since he is at all times bound by the natural law. Whoever has permission to use forbidden books may not read works distinctly forbidden by the bishop for his own diocese unless the dispensation refers expressly to "all books prohibited by whomsoever"; otherwise he must ask special leave of his bishop. In addition to this, paragraph 26 states that anyone having obtained a dispensation is strictly bound to keep forbidden books in such a way as to prevent them from falling into the hands of others.

It is, of course, absolutely impossible for both the pope and the Congregation of the Index to watch over the press of all countries in order to suppress at once each and every pernicious writing. Nor is this necessary after the aforenamed definite classes have been marked out as pernicious and consequently forbidden. For with regard to the worst and most dangerous works, even they who are unskilled in such things will soon perceive that these are strictly prohibited by the Church through the general decrees of the Index, though they have never been individually

condemned nor put on the Index. There happen, however, at all times and in all nations cases in which the writings of celebrated scholars, even of distinguished Catholic theologians, contain erroneous doctrines. The better the author is known as an orthodox Catholic, the greater his reputation as a writer, the more easily will his work influence and mislead the unsuspecting. In these and similar cases, though the savant may have acted in good faith and written his book in the best of intentions, the Church as a Divinely appointed guardian must protect the imperilled faithful. If such a book is circulated and read only in small districts, it may be sufficient that the competent bishop, after careful examination, forbid it for his diocese. If, however, the work in question constitutes a danger to the faithful of a whole country, it must as soon as possible be denounced to the Apostolic See, above all by the bishops concerned, in order that the book may be examined in Rome and forbidden, if necessary, to all Catholics. This is a sacred obvious duty of all bishops; nevertheless, the ecclesiastical law specially reminds them of it by paragraph 29. In the different countries and dioceses the bishops are the appointed guardians of faith and morals. Hence, the highest ecclesiastical authorities in Rome do not, as a rule, take any steps until a book has been denounced to them. It is for this reason that the law contains three paragraphs, 27 to 29, on the obligation of giving information about bad books. The tenor of paragraph 29 has been stated above; the two others read as follows:—

> Although it is the concern of all Catholics and particularly of the educated to give notice of pernicious books to the bishops or the Apostolic See, still it is above all the official duty of the nuncios, the Apostolic delegates, the ordinaries (bishops) and the rectors of universities of high scientific repute.
>
> It is desirable that anyone giving information against bad books should mention not only the title of the book, but also, as far as possible, the reason why he thinks the book deserving of condemnation. Those, however, to whom information is given, have the sacred duty to keep private the names of informers.

From these plain regulations it will be readily seen that the much abused so-called "denunciation" has nothing odious about it at all; that, on the contrary, just as in the case of a public prosecutor, it is part and parcel of the most indispensable official duties, e. g. of a bishop.

So far the Constitution of Leo XIII with regard to the prohibition of books. In addition, however, it contains exact regulations concerning preliminary examination, the so-called "preventive censorship". Of this, the censorship of books in the proper sense, the second title of the Bull "Officiorum ac Munerum" treats in five chapters. From the notion and scope of censorship it is evident that it appertains exclusively to the pope and the bishops, not, however, to any committee of scholars nor to any university. The pope, of course, has the right of censorship for the entire Church. In the general decrees here spoken of, he has (by paragraphs 7 and 30) reserved to himself the examination and approbation of all vernacular editions of Holy Scripture, if they are to appear without annotations. From paragraph 18 it is apparent that in like manner authentic editions of the Missal, Breviary, Ritual, Cæremoniale Episcoporum, Pontificale Romanum, and other liturgical books (to which also belong works on liturgical chant) require the approbation of the Apostolic See (see above). A book forbidden for the entire Church may not, as a rule, be reprinted. If, however, in a particular case this be necessary or desirable, it is to be done only with permission of, and on the conditions laid down by, the Congregation of the Index (paragraph 31). The same holds good also for any work forbidden not absolutely but with the clause *donec corrigatur* (i. e. until it be corrected). Paragraph 32 prescribes that writings on matters appertaining to a still pending process of beatification or canonization require the approbation of the Congregation of Rites. Generally speaking, collections of decrees of the Roman Congregations may be published only with the express permission of the congregation concerned (paragraph 33). For censorship and approbation of grants of indulgences see INDULGENCES. Since Apostolic vicars and missionaries are immediately under the Congregation of Propaganda, they must, according to paragraph 34, observe the regulations of the said congregation regarding censorship of books. Apart from the particular cases mentioned above, in which censorship is reserved to the pope or to one of the Roman Congregations, it appertains in general to the bishop of the place in which a book appears (paragraph 35). This does not imply, however, that the said bishop may not simply agree to the censorship of another ordinary, v. g. the bishop of the author. Paragraph 36 warns the *regulares*, i. e. members of religious orders with solemn vows, that beyond an episcopal imprimatur they shall also require, according to the regulation of the Council of Trent—at least for books *de rebus sacris*—the approbation of their own superior. Finally, paragraph 37 states that a writer living in Rome, even if he wish to bring out his work elsewhere, need not have any other approbation than that of the cardinal-vicar and the *Magister Sacri Palatii Apostolici*.

After this first chapter (paragraphs 30 to 37) the second instructs bishops (paragraph 38) to appoint as censors none but conscientious and capable men. The next paragraph (39) recommends to the censors themselves, warmly and above all, the exercise of impartial justice. When examining books, they must have before their eyes solely the dogmas of Holy Church and the universal Catholic doctrine as contained in the decrees of œcumenical councils, the constitutions of the Roman pontiffs, and the unanimous teaching of theologians. The last paragraph (40) prescribes that the bishop, if after finishing the examination nothing is to be said against the publication of the book, should grant the author the required permission in writing and free of charge. The imprimatur is to be printed at the beginning or end of the book. Pius X in the Encyclical "Pascendi Dominici Gregis" of 8 September, 1907 (Acta S. Sedis, XL, 645), expressly orders all bishops to appoint as censors qualified theologians, to whom the censorship of books appertains ex officio. Like appointments are to be made also at Rome. The official censor is to present to the bishop a written verdict on every book he has examined. In case the decision is favourable to the book, the bishop will give the approbation using the formula *Imprimatur*, which is to be preceded by *Nihil obstat*, together with the name of the censor. If after the examination the bishop refuses approbation, but thinks the book capable of improvement, he must make known to the author the points to be corrected.

In the third chapter paragraph 41 mentions more exactly which books are to be submitted for previous censorship. "All the faithful must submit for previous censorship at least those books that deal with Holy Scripture, theology, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics or other branches of religion or morals, and in general, all writings having special reference to religion and morality." To this class belong also the more important journals treating of religious or theological matters, as far as they are equivalent to books, not, however, writings of lesser extent, booklets or papers discussing similar topics. Publications of this sort need only be submitted for

censorship when for special reasons, in consideration of circumstances of matter or time, examination and approbation seem to be necessary. Hence, for example, pastoral gazettes seem to require ecclesiastical approbation. In the first title (paragraph 19), episcopal approbation is expressly prescribed for all novel litanies. The litanies of the Saints, of the Blessed Virgin, the Holy Name, and the Sacred Heart of Jesus have been explicitly approved by the Apostolic See or the Congregation of Rites. Paragraph 42 demands of secular priests that in token of their submissiveness they should confer with their bishops, even for such books as are exempted from censorship. They must also obtain permission from their bishop if they wish to be editors of a paper or journal. Supposing that the paper or journal in question is subject to censorship, the bishop may, of course, appoint as its censor the editor approved by him. In that case the censorship of a paper published even frequently would have no special difficulties.

The fourth chapter, which consists of four paragraphs, is chiefly meant for Catholic printers and publishers. Paragraph 43 provides that: "No book subject to ecclesiastical censorship may be published without stating at the beginning the name and surname of both author and publisher; moreover, place and year of printing and publication ought to be mentioned. If for good reasons it be advisable in special cases to suppress the name of the author, the ordinary can give leave to do so." Paragraph 44 reminds printers and publishers that for each new edition, as well as for translations of a work already approved, fresh approbation is required. Books condemned by the Apostolic See are, according to paragraph 45, to be considered as forbidden everywhere and in any translation whatsoever. The last paragraph (46) prohibits booksellers from selling, lending out, or keeping in stock, such books as explicitly treat of obscene matters. To put up for sale other forbidden books, they require permission of their bishop. But even then they must not sell them to any person unless they can reasonably suppose him to be qualified for using such literature.

As regards the last (fifth) chapter, which deals with the penalties incurred by trespassers against the general rules, the first paragraph (47) has been mentioned previously, as it fixes the punishment for reading, etc., special classes of forbidden books. The next paragraph (48) inflicts excommunication (q. v.) "reserved to no one" on any person printing or causing to be printed, without approbation of the ordinary, books of Holy Scripture or annotations or commentaries on them. The closing paragraph (49) of the whole constitution declares it to be the duty of the bishops to watch over the observance of the law and to employ, at discretion, monition or even punishment in case of contraventions not provided for by paragraphs 47 and 48. The above-mentioned forty-nine paragraphs—*Decreta generalia*, as they are called in the Bull—exhibit the proper ecclesiastical law regulating prohibition and censorship of books. There remain now to be ascertained the full import and binding force of these general decrees. This is best done by quoting the pertinent words of the Constitution "Offieiorum ac Munerum":

> On mature consideration of the matter, and after consulting with the cardinals of the Congregation of the Index, we have decided to issue the general decrees embodied in this constitution. The tribunal of the aforenamed Congregation shall henceforth be guided solely by these decrees, to which, for the sake of God, Catholics of the entire world must submit. It is our will that the said decrees alone shall have legal power, and we abrogate the rules published by order of the Council of Trent together with the commentaries annexed to them, as well as our predecessors' instructions, decrees, *monita*, and every other order or enactment referring to this matter, with the sole exception of the Constitution of Benedict XIV, "Sollicita ac provida", which, as it has hitherto been in full force, shall remain so in future.

The Encyclical of Pius X, "Pascendi Dominici Gregis" (Acta S. Sedis, XL, 593 sqq.), not only confirms the general decrees of Leo XIII, but also lays special stress upon the paragraphs concerning previous censorship. The pope demands of all bishops strictest vigilance over all works about to appear in print; he recommends warmly to them to take, if necessary, measures against dangerous writings; he expressly commands them to institute in all dioceses a council the members of which are, in a special manner, to watch carefully the teachings of innovators (Modernists), in order to assist the bishop in combating their books and writings.

MOTIVES OF ECCLESIASTICAL LAWS REGULATING CENSORSHIP.—Every law is in one way or another a restriction of human liberty. In the domain of thought especially, mankind resents such an interference on the part of any human authority. The precept of fasting is more easily submitted to than an order relating to prohibition of books. Thus, apart from all slander against, and misconception of, the ecclesiastical laws regulating censorship, apart also from all deficiencies to be met with in these as in all other laws, it is easily understood that proud human nature is from the first opposed to everything these laws prescribe. This is all the truer the more distinctly and unequivocally the commands and prohibitions are worded, and the more strictly and universally they are applied, even to the educated and the learned. There are, of course, books forbidden to man by mere natural law. Still, in such cases, man fancies himself to be guided by his own judgment, by the dictates of his own conscience; whereas with regard to the ecclesiastical laws he sees himself dependent upon, and restrained by, human authority. Moreover, ecclesiastical legislation, since it is meant for all, contains not only prohibitions but also positive orders, and even in its prohibitions it goes, in places, beyond the limits of natural law. For human law is universal in its provisions, and obliges even when, for subjective reasons, natural law does not bind the individual. It must be added that in past centuries particularly the censorship of the State often made itself decidedly unpopular with the people, and that their hatred was but too easily, though without reason, transferred to the censorship of the Church. What has been said explains to some extent why the ecclesiastical laws relating to books and the Index are so much disliked. Nevertheless, these laws constitute a perfectly reasonable guidance for the human will. They are, therefore, good laws, nay, for the faithful taken as a whole they are morally necessary and extremely useful even at the present time.

It is universally granted that especially in our days there exists hardly a greater danger to faith and morals than that which we may call the literary danger. From the greatness or rather indispensableness of the good at stake, the opportuneness and even necessity of preventive and strictly binding measures undoubtedly follow. In other words, the object in view of the law, that of safeguarding and keeping pure religion and morality, is absolutely necessary; now this object is at the present time more than ever endangered by a bad press; consequently those authorities whose principal office it is to protect the faith and morals of their subjects, must needs make suitable provisions against that press. Hence the moral necessity of such laws. Natural law empowers the father to keep away from his child bad and corrupt companions; the highest public authorities are bound to protect by stern measures, if necessary, their communities

from epidemics and infectious maladies; State and police rightly allow the selling of poison and the like only under strict supervision. In the same way the competent ecclesiastical authorities in their sphere justly claim the right to protect the faithful by appropriate precautions from the poison, the danger of infection, the corruption springing from bad books and writings. Faith and morals in a very special sense are the domain of the Church; within their limits she must have independent, sovereign power and be able to discharge autonomously her most sacred duties. It ought to be clear, also, without special proof, at least to orthodox Catholics, that such morally necessary laws issued by the Church of Christ cannot be other than substantially good and reasonable. Considering, moreover, that the matter in question is a legislation which is really as old as the Church herself, which was applied according to circumstances by Leo the Great and Gregory the Great just as by Benedict XIV and Leo XIII, and which in its present form comes from such legislators as the last-named popes—everyone must admit that the wisdom and suitableness of the regulations are fully guaranteed. While with regard to these laws, as far as they are of a disciplinary nature, there can be no question of real infallibility, still they remain strictly binding precepts of Christ's Church guided by the Holy Ghost. As the origin and aim of the law, so likewise do its provisions make known its reasonableness and suitableness. Allusion to this has been made in the general history of censorship, and more detailed references have been given in the summary of the recent Leonine laws.

From the previously mentioned arrangement of all forbidden books in three groups it clearly follows that the Church not only keeps within the limits of her right, but also forbids only as much as she is bound to forbid by reason of her office as teacher and guide of all the faithful. She suppresses solely those books that are in fact dangerous to all, those writings that every man of common sense must call destructive to faith and morality. Thus only the real dangers and the unrestraint of free research are checked. Neither do the paragraphs stating penalties contain intolerable rigorousness, since ecclesiastical punishment is inflicted solely for the most grievous offences. Besides, as to the sale of immoral, obscene books, the Church is not more exacting towards booksellers than the natural law; and with regard to the sale of other prohibited books she is more indulgent than any well-ordered government towards sellers of poison or dangerous explosives. There are cases, just as in all general laws, in which an individual is in need of a dispensation. But for these very cases the law makes provision by exactly stating how and where the needed permission is to be obtained. During late years especially, the Church has most liberally granted such dispensations. Likewise in the matter of previous censorship the Church confines herself to what is absolutely required, by subjecting to examination only theological and religious writings, i. e. such as are most likely to imperil true Christianity and religion. If it be admitted that the Church of Christ is the mistress of all the faithful, even of the profoundest scholars, and Divinely endowed with power to teach all, then in truth free research and scientific study are not hampered by previous censorship—any more, at least, than profane learning is hindered by its most qualified and renowned representatives at the universities. In the laws of censorship itself, impartiality and true justice are most strongly impressed upon censors and judges, who are aware from its terms that it is their most solemn duty to exercise their functions solely in conformity with the dogmas and the universal teaching of the Catholic Church, but in no case whatever according to private prejudice or the doctrine of any particular school.

This is why the censorship of the Catholic Church differs from every other ecclesiastical or political censorship, and why it has been guarded no less from biased injustice than from arbitrary rigour and conflicting inconstancy. Just these defects, on the other hand, characterized non-Catholic censorship, particularly that of all the Protestant sects with their continual variations of doctrine in Great Britain and Holland, the Northern Kingdoms, and Germany. The same shortcomings disgraced the political censorship of past centuries, and rightly led in the end to the failure of Gallican, Josephinistic, Napoleonic, and Prussian censorship. This, however, is no proof of the objectionableness of censorship in itself, merely evidences of its defective execution. It may be added that prohibition of books and preventive measures against a bad press are indispensable even where in appearance, and according to the letter of the law, absolute freedom of the press prevails. The truth of this is established by the political history of the last century no less than by the civil legislation of more recent years. During the past decades the freedom of the press, sanctioned by the laws, has degenerated in so many places into absolute lawlessness, that on all sides and from all parties has arisen a demand for legal protection. The Catholic Church was therefore bound to adhere all the more firmly to her system, though in its practical application she was able to introduce many opportune mitigations. As to the censorship here dealt with, all factors of importance concur to demonstrate its usefulness and even necessity as practised in the Church of Christ, viz. the eminent importance for time and eternity of the doctrines that are to be safeguarded; the trustworthy foundation of revealed truth and universal Catholic teaching on which the previous examination is based; the guarantee of judicious and impartial censors. At the same time the historical development of Catholic censorship on the one hand and of Protestant and political censorship on the other, furnishes the best illustration and the most lucid commentary on the subject. For the historical evidence, see Hilgers, "Der Index der verbotenen Bücher", quoted below. (See INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS; MODERNISM.)

ZACCARIA, *Storia polemica delle proibizioni de'libri* (Rome, 1777); FESSLER, *Sammlung vermischter Schriften* (Freiburg, 1869), s. v. *Censur und Index*, 125–214; REUSCH (Old Catholic), *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Bonn, 1883–1885); TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1906), s. v. *Censorship of Books;* VERMEERSCH, *De prohibitione et censurâ librorum* (Rome, 1906). For historical evidence see HILGERS, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher* (Freiburg, 1904); IDEM, *Die Bücherverbote in Papstbriefen* (Freiburg, 1907).

JOSEPH HILGERS.

Censures, ECCLESIASTICAL, medicinal and spiritual punishments imposed by the Church on a baptized, delinquent, and contumacious person, by which he is deprived, either wholly or in part, of the use of certain spiritual goods, until he recover from his contumacy.

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT.—The name and general nature of this punishment date from the Roman Republic. With the Romans, in the year of the Republic 311, we find established the office of public censor (*censores*), whose functions were the keeping of a register (*census*) of all Roman citizens and their proper classification, e. g. senators, knights, etc. Furthermore, their functions were the disciplinary control of manners and morals, in which their power was absolute, both in sumptuary matters and in the degradation of any citizen from his proper class, for reasons affecting the moral or material welfare of the State. This punishment was called censure (*censura*). As the Romans were jealous in preserving the dignity of their citizenship, so also was the Church solicitous for the purity and sanctity of her membership, i. e. the communion of the faithful. In the early Church the

faithful in communion with her were inscribed in a certain register; these names were read in public gatherings, and from this list were excluded those who were excommunicated, i. e. put out of the communion. These registers were called diptychs or canons, and contained the names of the faithful, both living and dead. The Canon of the Mass still preserves traces of this ancient discipline.

Excommunication was then the generic term for all coercive remedies used against delinquent members of the Church, and there were as many kinds of excommunication as there were grades of communion in the Christian society, either for the laity or for the clergy. Thus some of the grades of the laity in the Church were the *expiatores* and *pœnitentes*, again subdivided into *consistentes*, *substrati*, *audientes*, and *flentes* or *lugentes*. Then also, as now, some goods of the Church were common to all its members, e. g. prayer, the sacraments, presence at the Holy Sacrifice, and Christian burial. Other goods again were proper to the various grades of clerics. Whoever was deprived of one or all of these rights, came under the general designation of excommunicated, i. e., one placed outside of the communion to which his grade in the Church entitled him, either wholly or in part. (Berardi, Com. in Jus Eccl., II, pt. II, diss. 3, cap. 5.) In earlier ecclesiastical documents, therefore, excommunication and similar terms did not always mean censure or a certain species of censure, but sometimes meant censure, sometimes *pœna*, as explained below, and very often penance. In the later Roman legal terminology (Codex Theod., I, tit. I, 7 de off. rector. provinc.) we find the word censure used in the general sense of punishment. Accordingly, the Church, in the early ages, used this term to designate all her punishments, whether these were public penances, excommunications, or, in the case of clerics, suspension or degradation. In her ancient penal legislation the Church, like the Roman State, looked on punishment as consisting, not so much in the infliction of positive suffering, as in the mere deprivation of certain goods, rights, or privileges: these in the Church were spiritual goods and graces, such as participation with the faithful in prayer, in the Holy Sacrifice, in the sacraments, in the general communion of the Church, or, as in the case of clerics, in the rights and honours of their office.

Some centuries later, however, in the period of the Decretals, we note a great advance in legal science. In the schools and in the courts a distinction was made between internal and external forum, the former referring to matters of sin and conscience, the latter to the external government and discipline of the Church. The different kinds and the nature of punishments were also more clearly defined by commentators, judges, and doctors of law. In this way, from the beginning of the thirteenth century, though not expressly so stated in the Decretals, the term *censure* became the equivalent of a certain class of ecclesiastical penalties, i. e. interdict, suspension, and excommunication. Innocent III, who in 1200 (cap. 13, X De judiciis, II, 1) had used the term for punishment in general, at a later date (1214), answering a query as to the meaning of ecclesiastical censure in pontifical documents, expressly distinguished (cap. 20, X De verb. signif. V, 40) censure from any other ecclesiastical penalty (respondemus quod per eam non solum interdicti, sed suspensionis et excommunicationis sententia valet intelligi), thereby authentically declaring that by ecclesiastical censure were meant the penalties of interdict, suspension, and excommunication. Furthermore, in accordance with the internal nature of these three penalties, glossators and commentators, and, in their wake, later canonists introduced and maintained the distinction, still universally recognized, between medicinal or remedial punishments (censures) and vindictive punishments. The primary scope of the former is the correction or reformation of the delinquent; this being properly accomplished, they cease. Vindictive punishments (*pœnæ vindicativæ*), while not absolutely excluding the correction of the delinquent, are primarily intended to repair violated justice, or to restore the social order of justice by the infliction of positive suffering. Such are corporal and pecuniary punishments, imprisonment and seclusion for life in a monastery, deprivation of Christian burial, also the deposition and degradation of clerics, as well as their suspension for a definite period of time. (Suspension *latæ sententiæ*, e. g. for one or for three years, is a censure according to St. Alphonsus, Th. Mor. VII, n. 314.) Confession penances are vindictive punishments, their chief purpose being, not reformation, but reparation and satisfaction for sins. The irregularity arising from a crime is not a censure, nor is it a vindictive punishment; in fact it is not a punishment at all, properly speaking, but rather a canonical impediment, an inability to support the honour of the sacred ministry, which forbids the reception of orders and the exercise of those received.

The matter of censures was seriously affected by the Constitution "Ad vitanda" of Martin V in 1418. Prior to this constitution all censured persons, known to be such by the public, were to be avoided (*vitandi*), and could not be communicated with *in divinis* or *in humanis*, i. e. in religious or in civil intercourse. A censure, being a penal withdrawal of the right of participating in certain spiritual goods of the Christian society, was of course something relative, that is, it affected the person thus enjoined and also those who participated with him in the use of these goods. In this way the sacraments or other spiritual services could not be accepted from a suspended cleric. But, by virtue of the Constitution of Martin V, only those censured persons were in future to be considered and treated as *vitandi* who were expressly and specifically by name declared to be such by a judicial sentence. The S. Cong. Inquis. (9 Jan. 1884) declared this formality unnecessary in the case of notorious excommunicates *vitandi* for reason of sacrilegious violence to clerics. Nor is the validity of the denunciation restricted to the locality where it takes place (Lehmkuhl, II, n. 884). On the other hand, Martin V expressly declared that this relaxation was not in favour of the censured party, so that the *tolerati* really gained no direct privilege, but was only in favour of the rest of the faithful, who could henceforth communicate with tolerated excommunicates, and, as far as the censure was in question, could deal with them as not-censured persons—all this on account of the grave changes in social conditions. (See EXCOMMUNICATION.) In 1869 Pius IX modified seriously the ecclesiastical discipline in the matter of censures by his Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis Moderationi" (q. v.), which abrogated many *latæ sententiæ* censures of the common law, changed others (thus reducing their number), and made a new list of common law censures *latæ sentiæ*.

NATURE OF THE PENALTIES.—If every human society has the right to protect itself by laying down conditions according to which men can be and remain members and enjoy the benefits of such society, it is easily conceivable how necessary such a right is for the Church, being a society founded on moral principles, aiming at higher ends, and dispensing spiritual benefits, in view of the eternal welfare of her members. The power to enforce these conditions the Church receives from Christ. It is certain that the Church has the right to make disciplinary laws to govern her subjects. This right would be meaningless if she had no way of enforcing the observance of her laws. Christ Himself gave her this power when He gave to Peter the power to govern the whole Church (John, xxi, 15 sqq.). He meant as much when He said of the offending brother that "if he will not hear the

Church let him be to thee as the heathen and publican" (Matt., xviii, 17). Moreover, from her very origin the Church has used this right to enforce her laws, as may be seen from the action of St. Paul against the incestuous Corinthian (I Cor., v, 1 sqq.) and against Hymeneus and Alexander (I Tim., i, 20). The end for which the Church is striving is the eternal salvation of the faithful. In dealing with delinquent members, therefore, she seeks principally their correction; she wishes the reformation of the sinner, his return to God, and the salvation of his soul. This primary effect of her penalties is often followed by other results, such as the example given to the rest of the faithful, and, ultimately, the preservation of Christian society. On the Divine principle, therefore, that God does not desire the death of the sinner, but that he be converted from his ways and live (Ezechiel, xviii, 23), the Church has always inclined to the infliction of censures, as medicinal or remedial in their nature and effects, rather than to vindictive punishments, which she uses only when there is little or no hope for the sinner himself.

It follows, then, that the primary and proximate end of censures is to overcome contumacy or wilful stubbornness in order to bring back the guilty person to a better sense of his spiritual condition; the secondary and remote end is to furnish an example of punishment, in order that other evil-doers may be deterred. Contumacy is an act of stubborn or obstinate disobedience to the laws; but it must imply contempt of authority, i. e., it must not only be directed against the law, but must also, generally speaking, express contempt for the punishment or the censure attached to the law. (Lehmkuhl, Cas. Consc., Freiburg, 1903, no. 984.) Ignorance of the threatened punishment or grave fear, would, therefore, generally excuse a person from incurring a censure; under such circumstances there can be no question of real contumacy. Since contumacy implies obstinate persistence in crime, in order to become liable to these punishments a person must not only be guilty of crime, but must also persist in his criminal course after having been duly warned and admonished. This warning (*monitio canonica*), which must precede the punishment, can emanate either from the law itself or from the ecclesiastical superior or judge. Contumacy can therefore occur in one of two ways: first, when the delinquent does not heed the warning of his ecclesiastical superior or judge, addressed to him personally and individually; second, when he violates a law of the Church with full knowledge of the law and of the censure attached, in the latter case the law itself being a standing warning to all (*Lex interpellat pro homine*).

Censures, being a privation of grave spiritual benefit, are inflicted on Christians only for a sin internally and externally grave, and *in genere suo*, i. e. in its own kind, or that contemplated by the censure, perfect and complete. There must be a just proportion between the crime and its penalty. Being medicinal, the punishment of a censure consists, not in depriving the delinquent of the spiritual goods themselves, but only of the use of the spiritual goods; and this not perpetually, but for an indeterminate time, i. e., until he repents, in other words, until the patient is convalescent from his spiritual illness. Hence excommunication, being by far the gravest of censures, is never inflicted for a certain definite time; on the other hand, suspension and interdict, under certain conditions, may be inflicted for a definite time. The real punishment of ecclesiastical censures consists in the privation of the use of certain spiritual goods or benefits. These spiritual goods are those which are within the power of the Church or those which depend on the Church, e. g. the sacraments, public prayers, Indulgences, sacred functions, jurisdiction, ecclesiastical benefices and offices. Censures, however, do not deprive of grace nor of the private prayers and good works of the faithful; for, even if censured, the internal communion of the saints still remains by virtue of the indelible character imprinted on the soul by baptism. Thus, to distinguish the various effects of the three censures: Excommunication may be inflicted on clerics and laymen, and excludes from the communion of the faithful, prohibits also the use of all spiritual goods in which the faithful participate as members of the visible body whose visible head is the Roman Pontiff. Suspension is for clerics only, leaves them participating in the communion of the faithful, but directly prohibits them from the active use of sacred things, i. e. as ministers (*qua ministri*), and deprives them of some or all of the rights of the clerical state, e. g. jurisdiction, the hearing of confessions, the holding of office, etc. Interdict prohibits the faithful, either clerics or laymen, from the passive use of some ecclesiastical goods, as far as these are sacred things (*res sacræ*), or as far as the faithful are participants, e. g. certain sacraments, Christian burial, etc.

DIVISION.—Besides the particular division of censures into excommunication, suspension, and interdict, there are several general divisions of censures. First censures *a jure* and *ab homine*. Censures *a jure* (by the law) are those inflicted by a permanent edict of the lawgiver, i. e. which the law itself attaches to a crime. We must distinguish here between a law, i. e. an enactment having, of itself, permanent and perpetual binding force, and a mere command or precept, usually temporary in obligation and lapsing with the death of the superior by whom it was given. Censures *a jure*, therefore, are annexed either to the common law of the Church, such as decrees of popes and general councils, or are inflicted by particular law, e. g. by bishops for their particular diocese or territory, usually in provincial or diocesan synods. Censures *ab homine* (by man) are those which are passed by the sentence, command, or particular precept of the judge, e. g. by the bishop, as contradistinguished from the law described above. They are usually owing to peculiar and transient circumstances, and are intended to last only as long as such circumstances exist. The censure *ab homine* may be in the form of a general order, command, or precept, binding all subjects (*per sententiam generalem*), or it may be only by a particular command or precept for an individual case, e. g. in a trial where the delinquent is found guilty and censured, or as a particular precept to stop a particular delinquency.

Another general division of censures is important and peculiar to the penal legislation of the Church. A censure *a jure* or *ab homine* may be either (1) *latæ sententiæ* or (2) *ferendæ sententiæ*.—(1) Censures *latæ sententiæ* (of sentence pronounced) are incurred *ipso facto* by the commission of the crime; in other words the delinquent incurs the penalty in the very act of breaking the law, and the censure binds the conscience of the delinquent immediately, without the process of a trial or the formality of a judicial sentence. The law itself inflicts the penalty in the moment when the violation of the law is complete. This kind of penalty is especially effective in the Church, whose subjects are obliged in conscience to obey her laws. If the crime be secret the censure also is secret, but is binding before God and in conscience; if the crime be public the censure also is public; but if the secret censure thus incurred is to be made public, then a judicial examination of the crime is had, and the formal declaration (declaratory sentence) is made that the delinquent has incurred the censure.—(2) Censures *ferendæ sententiæ* (of sentence awaiting pronouncement) are so attached to the law or to the precept that the delinquent does not incur the penalty until, after a legal process, it is formally imposed by a judicial or condemnatory sentence. Whether a censure be *latæ* or *ferendæ sententiæ* is

ascertained from the terms in which it is couched. The expressions most commonly used in the censure *latæ sententiæ* are: *ipso facto, ipso jure, eo ipso sit excommunicatus, sciat se esse excommunicatum*, etc. If, however, the expressions are of the future and imply judicial intervention, the censure is *ferendæ sententiæ*, e. g. *excommunicetur, suspendatur, suspendetur*, etc. In doubtful cases the censure is presumed to be *ferendæ sententiæ*, because in penal matters the more benign interpretation is to be followed. Moreover, before the infliction of the latter kind of censures three warnings (*monitiones*) are necessary, or one peremptory warning, except when both the crime and the contumacy of the delinquent are notorious and therefore sufficiently proved.

Censures are again divided into reserved and non-reserved censures. As sins may be reserved, so also may censures, reservation, in this case, being equivalent to limitation or negation of an inferior's jurisdiction to absolve from the censure, and the retention of this power by his superior. (See RESERVATION.)

REQUIREMENTS FOR CENSURES.—For the infliction of censures, either *a jure* or *ab homine*, are required: (1) Jurisdiction in the legislator or in the judge; (2) sufficient cause; (3) correct method of procedure.—As to jurisdiction, since censures belong to the *forum externum*, or external government of the Church, it necessarily follows that for their infliction, either by law or by judge, jurisdiction or power to act in this forum is required. Sufficient cause, moreover, must be had for the infliction of a censure. A censure, as a sanction of the law, is an accessary to the law; therefore a substantial defect in the law, e. g. injustice or unreasonableness, nullifying the law, nullifies also the censure attached to the law. This sufficient cause for a censure may be lacking in the law, either because in its formation the legal order was not observed, or because the fault considered in the law was not sufficiently grave to justify the penalty of ecclesiastical censure. The penalty must be in proportion to the crime. If in the legislative act the legal order was observed, but the proportion of punishment to crime was lacking, i. e., if the offence did not justify the extreme penalty attached to the law, then, as the law has two parts, it is sustained in the first part, i. e. the precept, but not in the second, i. e. the penalty or censure (Suarez, Disp. IV, sect. VI, n. 10). In doubt, however, both law and penalty are presumably valid. As to the correct method of procedure, a sentence of censure may be void if any substantial rule of procedure be not observed, e. g. the warnings in a censure inflicted *ab homine*. The censure is valid, however, if there be any objective proportion between the gravity of the penalty and the gravity of the fault, even if the sentence have some accidental defect, e. g. a censure inflicted through hatred for a person, who, however, is a transgressor, or if some other accidental rule of procedure has not been observed. A question arises concerning censures invalid *in foro interno* or according to truth, but valid *in foro externo* or according to presumption of law. For instance, a person is convicted *in foro externo* of a crime to which a censure is attached, but in his conscience he knows himself to be innocent. What are the effects of a censure thus inflicted? Having been found guilty *in foro externo*, the censure has valid effects in that forum and must be observed externally, to avoid scandal and for good discipline. All acts of jurisdiction *in foro externo* of such a censured party might be declared invalid. But *in foro interno* he would possess jurisdiction, and, should there be no danger of scandal, he could act as though uncensured without incurring the penalty of violating a censure, e. g. irregularity. A censure may also be inflicted conditionally; if the condition is fulfilled the censure is valid.

Can censures be inflicted as vindictive penalties, i. e. not primarily as remedial measures, but rather to avenge a crime? This is a graver question and canonists have sought to solve it by an interpretation of certain texts of the law, chiefly from the "Decretum" of Gratian (*Eos qui rapiunt, Raptores.*—Caus. XXXVI, Q. 2, c. 1, 2, and *Si quis episcopus*, Caus. XXVII, Q. 1, c. 6, etc.). These laws, however, contemplate the earlier discipline of censures, when the name was applied to punishments in general, without any specific signification. It is evident, therefore, that the solution must now be sought in positive law. In the law of the Decretals no express decision of the question is to be found, although the species of penalties are there more accurately distinguished. In later law the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, c. iii, De ref.) most wisely warns bishops that the sword of censures is to be used only with sobriety and with great circumspection. Censures, being essentially a deprivation of the use of spiritual goods or benefits, are to be inflicted medicinally, and should therefore be lifted as soon as the delinquent recedes from his contumacy. We have seen above that St. Alphonsus and other authors after him, hold that secondarily, a censure may have a punitive and deterrent motive, and from that point of view, may be inflicted for a given time. Generally speaking, therefore, censures cannot be inflicted as vindictive punishments, for a certain time, but must be inflicted indefinitely, i. e. until the delinquent repents. This is generally speaking, for while it is certain that excommunication can never be thus inflicted as a vindictive punishment, suspension and interdict can be inflicted, rarely and for a short period, as vindictive penalties by positive law. The reason of this is that suspension and interdict do not, like excommunication, cast out the delinquent from the communion of the faithful, neither do they deprive him absolutely of all spiritual goods; they may, therefore, for grave reasons take on the nature of vindictive penalties. This is especially true when their effect is the privation of some temporal right, e. g., when a cleric is suspended from his office or benefice; for whenever censures deprive primarily of the use of temporal goods, they are rather punishments properly so called than censures, whose primary character is the deprivation of the use of spiritual goods (Suarez, op. cit., Disp. IV, sect. V, 29–30).

SUBJECT OF CENSURES, ACTIVE AND PASSIVE.—As regards the active subject of censures, i. e. who can inflict them, it must be stated that censures belong to the external government of the Church. They can therefore be inflicted only by those who have proper jurisdiction in the external government of the Church (*forum externum*). Censures *a jure*, i. e. incorporated in laws binding Christian society, in whole or in part, can be passed by him who has power to thus legislate. Thus the pope or a general council can inflict such censures upon the whole world, the Roman congregations in their own spheres, the bishop within his diocese, the chapter or vicar capitular during the vacancy of a see (*sede vacante*), regular prelates having external jurisdiction, legates of the Holy See, also chapters of regulars over their own subjects. Parish priests, abbesses, and secular judges, however, have no such power. Censures *ab homine* or inflicted by an ecclesiastical judge, whether his jurisdiction be ordinary or delegated, can be inflicted to enforce a certain law or to prevent certain evils. Vicars-general and delegated judges not having legislative power cannot inflict censures *a jure*, but only *ab homine*, in order to assert and protect their power, e. g. to enforce the execution of a judicial decree. In respect to the passive subject of censures, i. e. who can be censured, it must be noted that censures, being spiritual punishments, can only be inflicted on Christians,

i. e. baptized persons. Moreover, being punishments, they can only be inflicted on the subjects of the superior inflicting the censure; such subjection may arise from domicile, quasi-domicile, or by reason of the crime committed (*ratione delicti*). Pilgrims violating a particular law are not subject to censure, but if they transgress the common law with a censure *ferendæ sententiæ* attached, the latter can be inflicted on them by the local bishop. Cardinals and bishops are not subject to censures *a jure* (except excommunication) unless in the law express mention be made of them. Kings and sovereigns cannot be censured by bishops, nor can communities or chapters be excommunicated by them. However, a community can suffer interdict and suspension, only in that case it would not be a censure, properly speaking, but rather a penal privation; ceasing to be a member of the community one would cease to undergo the penalty.

ABSOLUTION FROM CENSURES.—All canonists agree in this, that a censure once incurred can only be taken away by absolution. Although censures are medicinal punishments and are destined to overcome contumacy, they do not cease at once upon repentance. As the sentence was a judicial act, so there is required a judicial absolution, lawfully given when there is amendment. Not even the death of the censured party, if excommunicated or interdicted, would remove the censure, because even in this case there would still remain some of the effects of the censure, e. g. the privation of Christian burial. The only case in which formal absolution would not be required is when a censure is inflicted with a *conditio resolutiva*, e. g. suspension pending the performance of a certain act. When suspension or interdict are inflicted as vindictive punishments, not being censures properly so called, they may cease, not by absolution, but by lapse of the time for which they were inflicted. Censures themselves, i. e. not yet incurred, cease by the abrogation of the law to which they were annexed, by revocation, or (usually) by the death of the superior, if issued *ab homine* as a particular precept.

Absolution, which is the loosing or relaxation of the penalty by competent authority, is an act of justice and a *res favorabilis* in censures, and hence cannot be denied to a penitent censured person. It can be given in two ways: (1) In the *forum internum*, that is, for the sin and hidden censure. This can be given by any priest having the necessary jurisdiction; can be given in confession or outside of confession, in what is called the forum of conscience (*forum conscientiæ*). In either case, however, the formula used is that of the sacramental absolution referring to censures. (2) In the *forum externum* absolution can only be given by those vested with the necessary judicial power, i. e. by the one who inflicted the censure, his successor, delegate, or his superior, e. g. the pope. The formula used here is either the solemn one or the shorter formula, as the occasion demands; both are found in the Roman Ritual. Absolution can either be given absolutely or conditionally, i. e. depending on the fulfilment of some condition for its validity. It is also given *ad cautelam* (for safety's sake) in all rescripts, Bulls, and Apostolical privileges, lest the effects of the concession be impeded by some hidden censure. Lastly, we have absolution *ad reincidentiam;* this takes effect immediately, but if the penitent, within a certain time, does not do something prescribed, he at once incurs, *ipso facto*, a censure of the same kind as that from which he has just been absolved. He who takes away the censure can impose the *reincidentia*. To-day there is only a *reincidentia ab homine*, i. e., although sometimes called for and provided for in the law, it must be applied *ab homine*, i. e. by the absolving person (Lega, lib. II, vol. III, nos. 130–31).

In regard to the question of the minister of absolution, or as to who can absolve from censures, we have the general principle: "only he can loose who can bind" (*illius est solvere cujus est ligare*); in other words, only those can absolve who have the necessary jurisdiction. This jurisdiction is either ordinary or delegated. In cases of censures *ab homine*, by particular sentence or by way of precept, also in the case of reserved censures *a jure*, only he who inflicted the censure or his successor, superior, or delegate can absolve. Hence a vicar capitular can absolve from the censures passed by the ordinary power of the late bishop, having succeeded to the power held by that prelate. In regard to the power of the superior, the pope as universal superior can always remove the censures inflicted by his inferiors, bishops, etc. An archbishop, not being the absolute superior of his suffragans, but only in certain things, can remove censures imposed by his suffragans only when on visitation or in case of appeal. When, however, the superior absolves from the censure imposed by an inferior, he must in all cases notify the inferior and must demand that the delinquent give him full satisfaction. The extent of the power of a delegated judge to absolve must be clearly stated in his letters.

When censures are passed *a jure communi* or *ab homine* by a general sentence, if these censures be not reserved, any approved confessor having jurisdiction to absolve from sin may absolve from them both in the external and the internal forum, the absolution in the one forum being valid for the other, except when the censure has been carried to the *forum contentiosum*, i. e. is already in litigation before a court, in which case the absolution of the internal forum would not hold for the external. A priest not approved or not having jurisdiction to hear confessions cannot absolve from censures, even if not reserved, except in danger of death. Lastly, when censures are reserved *a jure* no one can absolve except the one to whom they are reserved, or his superior, successor, or delegate. Censures which are reserved to the pope are either simply reserved or reserved in a special manner. In relation to the former, the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, c. vi, De ref.) formulated the common law according to which a bishop or one delegated by him can absolve, *in foro conscientiæ* and in his own diocese, his subjects from these censures when the crime is occult and not notorious, or when it has not been brought before a judicial tribunal. By bishops are here meant also abbots having ecclesiastical territory, vicars capitular, and others having episcopal jurisdiction; not, however, vicars-general by virtue of their general commission, nor regular prelates. The subjects for whom these faculties may be used are those who live in the bishop's diocese, or outsiders who come to confession in his diocese, these being his subjects in view of the absolution to be imparted. Such absolution, however, cannot be given *in foro externo*, but is limited to the *forum conscientiæ*, i. e. to the domain of conscience. If censures are reserved to the Roman pontiff in a special manner, a bishop by his ordinary power cannot absolve, except in case of necessity. Special concessions for these cases are, however, given to the bishops by the Holy See for a certain time, or for the life of the bishop, or for a certain number of cases. Censures which are reserved by pontifical law to bishops or ordinaries can be absolved by all bishops, abbots, vicars capitular and vicars-general, in any forum, and even in notorious cases. At the point of death (*in articulo mortis*) any priest, even if not approved, can absolve from all censures, even if reserved. Not only the number and character of censures, but also all absolution from them is now regularly governed by the provision of the aforesaid papal Constitution (Pius IX, 1869), "Apostolicæ Sedis Moderationi". For serious changes in the method of absolution (in cases of necessity) from papal censures, owing to the decree of S. Cong. Inquis. (23 June, 1886) and later interpretations, see Tanquerey, Synop. Th. Mor., III (II),

1907, pp. 321–24, and Gury-Ferrères, Th. Mor., II, nn. 575–76; also articles EXCOMMUNICATION; SUSPENSION.

CONDITIONS FOR ABSOLUTION.—These conditions affect both the priest who absolves and the person absolved. The absolution of a priest is invalid if obtained by force or if extorted by grave, unjust fear. Furthermore the absolution would be invalid if the principal moving cause be false, e. g. if the judge absolves precisely because the penitent alleges that he has already made satisfaction, when in reality he has not done so. The conditions to be fulfilled by the penitent to be absolved are generally expressed in the above-mentioned formula, *injunctis de more injungendis*, i. e. enjoining those things which the law requires. These are: (1) satisfaction to the offended party; (2) that the delinquent repair the scandal according to the prudent judgment of the bishop or confessor and remove the occasion of sin, if there be any; (3) that, in the case of one absolved from censures specially reserved, he promise (*in foro externo*, on oath), to abide by the further directions of the Church in the matter (*stare mandatis ecclesiæ*); (4) sometimes also, in graver crimes, an oath is required not to perpetrate them again; (5) that, apart from the penance imposed in confession, the absolved person receive and perform some other salutary penance as a satisfaction for his fault.

BUCCERONI, *De Censuris*, 4th ed. (Rome, 1896); HOLLWECK, *Die kirchlichen Strafgesetze* (Mainz, 1899), p. 86 sqq.; LEHMKUHL, *Theol. Mor.*, 10th ed. (Freiburg, 1902), II, nn. 860–1030; LAURENTIUS, *Institutiones Juris Eccl.* (Freiburg, 1903), nn. 300–327; LEGA, *De Judiciis Eccles.*, L. II, vol. III (Rome, 1899), nn. 80–197; HILARIUS A SEXTEN., *Tractatus de Censuris Eccles.* (Mainz, 1898); TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1906), s. v. *Censure*.

LEO GANS.

Censures, THEOLOGICAL, doctrinal judgments by which the Church stigmatizes certain teachings detrimental to faith or morals. They should not be confounded with canonical censures, such as excommunication, suspension, and interdict, which are spiritual punishments inflicted on delinquents.

The right of censuring adverse doctrines has ever been asserted by the Church, from St. Paul, who declares anathema upon them who should pervert the Gospel of Christ unto another Gospel (Gal., i, 8), and warns his disciple to avoid the profane novelties of words and the oppositions of knowledge falsely so called (I Tim., vi, 20), down to Pius X, who condemned the errors of "Modernism". It is an essential part of her magisterium, which, says Newman, "acts in two channels, in direct statement of truth and in condemnation of error". See the letter "Gravissimas inter" of Pius IX and the constitution "De fide" (ch. iv) of the Vatican Council (Denzinger, nos. 1524 and 1645). That right belongs to the Church herself, but she may exercise it through popes, councils, Roman congregations, universities, or special commissions. Bishops, by virtue of their office, hold the power of censuring doctrines, but their judgment is not final, and their prohibition binds only within the limits of their respective dioceses. Private theologians, either individually or collectively, have no authority officially to censure propositions; however, they may, unless expressly enjoined from so doing in special cases, judge and qualify them according to existing doctrinal standards, and their initiative often goes far towards preparing the official action of the Church. History shows considerable variation in the exercise of the censuring power. In early days, when the cardinal truths of Christianity were at stake, an author, book, or tract was purely and simply pronounced heretical and anathematized. In the Middle Ages, which were the ages of theological speculation and also of subtilty, a more minute notation had to be resorted to, and even special organs were created for that purpose (see INDEX OF PROHIBITED BOOKS). In recent times specific notes are often discarded in favour of a more comprehensive mode of censuring: *damnandas et proscribendas esse*. The various documents embodied in nearly all modern textbooks of moral theology and in Denzinger's "Enchiridion" (to which we must now add the Holy Office Decree, 3 July, "Lamentabili sane exitu" and the papal Encyclical, 8 Sept., 1907, "Pascendi dominici gregis") show a large number of theological censures or notes. Those most in use will be found in the Bulls "Unigenitus" and "Auctorem fidei" (Denzinger, CI and CXIV). We may divide them into three groups according as they bear principally upon (1) the import, or (2) the expression, or (3) the consequences, of condemned propositions.

(1) *Hæretica* (heretical), *erronea* (erroneous), *hæresi proxima* (next to heresy), *errori proxima* (next to error), *temeraria* (rash), etc.—A proposition is branded heretical when it goes directly and immediately against a revealed and defined dogma, or dogma *de fide;* erroneous when it contradicts only a certain (*certa*) theological conclusion or truth clearly deduced from two premises, one an article of faith, the other naturally certain. Even though a statement be not obviously a heresy or an error it may yet come near to either. It is styled next, or proximate, to heresy when its opposition to a revealed and defined dogma is not certain, or chiefly when the truth it contradicts, though commonly accepted as revealed, has yet never been the object of a definition (*proxima fidei*). The censure next, or proximate, to error, whose meaning may be determined by its analogy to the foregoing, is of less frequent use than that of rashness or temerity, which means opposition to sound common opinion (*communis*), and this either for paltry reasons or no reasons at all. A still finer shade of meaning attaches to such censures as *sapiens hæresim, errorem* (smacking of heresy or error), *suspecta de hæresi, errore* (suspected of heresy or error). Propositions thus noted may be correct in themselves, but, owing to various circumstances of time, place, and persons, are prudently taken to present a signification which is either heretical or erroneous. To this group belong also some special stigmata with reference to determined topics, v. g. the preambles of faith (*infidelis, aversiva a fide*), ethical principles (*improbabilis, non tuta*), history (*antiquata, nova*), and Holy Scripture (*verbo Dei contraria*), etc.

(2) *Ambigua* (ambiguous), *captiosa* (captious), *male sonans* (evil-sounding), *piarum aurium offensiva* (offensive to pious ears), etc.—A proposition is ambiguous when it is worded so as to present two or more senses, one of which is objectionable; captious when acceptable words are made to express objectionable thoughts; evil-sounding when improper words are used to render otherwise acceptable truths; offensive when the verbal expression is such as rightly to shock the Catholic sense and delicacy of faith.

(3) *Subsannativa religionis* (derisive of religion), *decolorativa candoris ecclesiæ* (defacing the beauty of the Church), *inducens in schisma* (leading to schism), *subversiva hierarchiæ* (subversive of the hierarchy), *eversiva regnorum* (destructive of governments), *scandalosa, perniciosa, periculosa in moribus* (scandalous, pernicious, dangerous to morals), *blasphema, idololatra, superstitiosa, magica* (blasphemous, leading to idolatry, superstition, sorcery), *arrogans, acerba* (arrogant, harsh), etc.—This enumeration, though incomplete, sufficiently shows the aim of the third group of censures; they are directed against such propositions as would imperil religion in general, the Church's sanctity, unity of government and hierarchy, civil society, morals in general, or the virtues of religion, Christian meekness, and humility in particular.

The authority of theological censures depends upon the source from which they come and the intention

with which they are issued. Condemnations coming from the seat of infallibility, pope or council, and vested with the usual conditions of an *ex cathedrâ* pronouncement are themselves infallible, and consequently require both our external obedience and internal assent. There is no reason for restricting the infallibility of the censures to the sole note *hæretica*, as some theologians would do. The difference between the note of heresy and other inferior notes is not one of infallibility, but of different matters covered by infallibility. The note of heresy attached to a proposition makes its contradictory an article of faith, which is not the case with other notes even if they are infallible. Condemnations coming from an official source which, however, is not infallible are to be received with the external respect and implicit obedience due to disciplinary measures, and, moreover, with that degree of internal assent which is justified by circumstances. In every case the extent of outward compliance, or of interior submission, or of both is determined by a proper interpretation of the censures:—

I. Sometimes, as in the condemned propositions of Pistoia, there is little room for doubt, the precise meaning of the condemnation being explained in the very tenor of it.

II. When categorical propositions are condemned in their import, and not in their wording or consequences only, their contradictories present themselves for our acceptance as *de fide*, *proximæ fidei*, *certæ*, or *communes* as the case may be.

III. Condemnations issued on account of bad wording or evil consequences should at least put us on our guard against the hidden falsehood or the noxious tendency of the proposition.

IV. Modal propositions require special attention. The principal modalities in use are *in individuo*, *in globo*, *prout iacent*, *in sensu ab auctore intento*. Propositions are not always, as was the case for the errors of Pistoia, condemned one by one, the proper qualifications being attached to each individually (*in individuo*). In the case of Wyclif, Hus, Luther, Baius, Molinos, Quesnel, etc., to a whole series of propositions a whole series of censures was attached generally (*in globo*). This mode of general censure is not ineffectual. To each of the propositions thus condemned apply one, or several, or all of the censures employed—the task of fitting each censure to each proposition being left to theologians. Again, some propositions are censured according to their obvious tenor and without reference to their context or author (*prout iacent);* while others, v. g. those of Baius, Jansen, etc., are stigmatized in the sense intended by their author (*in sensu ab auctore intento*). Obviously the Church does not claim to read into the mind of a writer. What she claims is an operative doctrinal power including the double faculty of pointing out to her children both the error of a doctrine and the fact that such an erroneous doctrine is contained in such a book written by such an author. In such cases a Catholic is bound to accept the whole judgment of the Church, although some theologians would make a difference between the assent due to the condemnation of the error and the assent due to the designation of the book or author.

V. Vague censures of this kind, *Damnandas et proscribendas esse*, are more in the nature of simple prohibitions than censures. They mean that a Catholic ought to keep clear of such teachings absolutely, but they do not point out the degree of falsehood or danger attached to them.

VI. In a general manner censures are restrictive laws, and, as such, to be interpreted strictly. A Catholic is not debarred from the right of ascertaining, for his own guidance or the guidance of others, their legitimate minimum; but the danger, not always unreal, of falling below that minimum should itself be minimized by what Newman calls "a generous loyalty towards ecclesiastical authority" and the *pietas fidei*.

SESSA, *Scrutinium doctrinarum* (Rome, 1709); D'ARGENTRÉ, *Collectio iudiciorum* (Paris, 1728); VIVA, *Damnatarum thesium theologica trutina* (Padua, 1737); MONTAGNE, *De censuris seu notis theologicis*, ed. MIGNE (Paris, 1837); DI BARTOLO, *Les critères théol.*, Fr. tr. (Paris, 1889), on the Index; DIDIOT, *Logique surnaturelle subjective* (Paris, 1891), No. 377; MANNING, *The Vatican Council* in *Privilegium Petri* (London, 1871); NEWMAN, *A Letter to the Duke of Norfolk in Certain Difficulties of Anglicans* (London, 1892), II; CHOUPIN, *Valeur des décisions doctrinales du Saint-Siège* (Paris, 1907); FERRARIS, *Propositiones damnatæ* in *Prompta Bibliotheca;* QUILLIET, *Censures doctrinales* in *Dict. de théol. cath.;* LAGRANGE, *Le décret "Lamentabili"* in *Rev. Bibl.* (Oct., 1907). See also treatises in moral theology, *De fide*, and in dogmatic theology, *De ecclesiâ*, chiefly SCHEEBEN, WILHELM AND SCANNELL, HUNTER.

J. F. SOLLIER.

Census, a canonical term variously defined by different writers. Zitelli (Appar. Jur. Eccl.) calls it a real obligation or annual tribute imposed on a pious institute by the bishop and payable to himself or others. Aichner (par. 79) says that it is an offering to be made by a benefice in sign of subjection, or for some exemption or other right conceded to it. Laurentius (III, p. 70) defines it as the obligation of an annual payment in money or kind perpetually imposed upon a benefice. Ferraris (s. v.) considers census as the right of receiving an annual payment from something that is fruitful and on which it is founded. He insists that the census is not the thing itself or the property which affords the tribute, but the right of drawing the annual tribute from it. Other authorities, however, as Von Scherer, seem to consider census to be the property itself or its equivalent in money, viewed as giving to some one a right to draw revenue from it.

Census canonically considered must be distinguished from *pensio*. The latter is the right which a superior concedes to a person of receiving a portion of the revenues of a benefice in the possession of a third party. Later canonists sometimes use the words census and *pensio* as practically synonymous. A census is called ancient if it is imposed on a benefice at its very foundation and has been approved by the bishop. It is called new if it is placed upon a benefice already erected. According to a canon of the Third Council of the Lateran (1179) no one but the pope can impose on a benefice a new census, or increase an ancient one. A census is said to be reservative when a person transfers the property to another, keeping only the right to an annual revenue for himself. It is named consignative when he sells or consigns to another the right to an annual pension from something of which he himself retains the dominion. Such consignative census is reducible to a species of buying and selling, and is treated as such in the decrees of Martin V and Callistus III embodied in the Corpus Juris Canonici.

The imposing of a census upon a benefice is considered as equivalent to dismemberment or division, inasmuch as it diminishes the revenues. If the census be perpetual it is looked on as a species of alienation of church property and as such falls under the ecclesiastical laws governing such alienation. Generally the census is imposed by the patron of a new benefice retaining the right to a part of its revenues, or by a bishop requiring that a portion of the income of a church which he incorporates with a monastery be paid to himself, or the census may take the form of a tribute paid to a mother church by one of its daughter establishments which has become independent. The "Liber Censuum Romanæ Ecclesiæ", edited by Fabre and Duchesne (Paris, 1889 sqq.), not only throws light on the subject at issue, but also affords an explanation of many historical events of the Middle Ages.

LAURENTIUS, *Institutiones Jur. Eccl.* (Freiburg, 1903); FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca* (Rome, 1886); AICHNER, *Compendium Jur. Eccl.* (Brixen, 1895).

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Central Verein of North America, German Roman Catholic (*Deutscher römisch-katholischer Centralverein von Nordamerika*).—The origin of the Central Verein dates back to 1854, in which year the presidents of three German Catholic benevolent societies of Buffalo, New York, issued a call to various German Catholic societies for the purpose of forming a central body. The movement was inspired and advocated by zealous missionary priests, and approved by Bishop Timon of Buffalo. The success of a similar organization among their Catholic brethren in Germany (founded at Mainz, 1848), lent additional force to the arguments for a union in the United States. The call was responded to by seventeen societies, and on 15 April, 1855, the Central Verein was duly organized in St. Alphonsus Hall, Baltimore, Maryland. The main object at the outset was to unite the energies of the various associations against freemasonry and secret societies in general. Hence the efforts of the new organization were directed chiefly towards defending the menaced rights of the Catholics in the United States, as also "to promote a vigorous religious activity in the united societies according to the spirit of the Roman Catholic Church and mutually to aid and materially to benefit one another". Membership was restricted to Catholic benevolent societies whose official language was German. The growth by decades was as follows:

1855,	17	societies,	1,500 members
1865,	62	"	8,340 "
1875,	302	"	31,672 "
1885,	378	"	32,783 "
1895,	548	"	48,989 "

From the last named date, however, the growth became less marked, and in 1901 a reorganization movement was inaugurated. Instead of affiliating local societies as heretofore, the formation of state organizations was encouraged, and these so-called "Staatsverbände" were then incorporated as a whole, the various local societies losing their direct affiliation to the Central Verein. This plan proved a complete success. In 1907 the report of the secretary showed sixteen state organizations and fifty-two local societies from states in which no "Staatsverband" existed, with a total paid-up membership of 99,291. The unreported membership would bring this total far beyond 100,000. The Holy See approved the work of the Central Verein in a reply to a letter of allegiance sent by the eleventh general convention held at Buffalo, 1866, to Pope Pius IX. The reply praises the spirit of Catholic unity prevailing among the members and wishes them success and the ever copious assistance of Divine grace. It gratefully acknowledges and appreciates the contributions the Central Verein had gathered for the support of the Holy See. During fifty-two years the society contributed about $12,000 to the Peter's-pence collection.

The care of the immigrants was made a prominent feature of the work of the society, and special agents were appointed to look after their interests in New York and Baltimore. Later on the Central Verein was affiliated to the St. Raphael's Society. The result of their combined efforts was the establishment in New York of the Leo House for the use of Catholic immigrants. Aid was extended to a similar undertaking at Galveston, Texas. The cause of Catholic education has a conspicuous advocate in the Central Verein. The Teachers' Seminary at St. Francis, Wisconsin, was founded mainly by contributions from this society. In his address to the delegates assembled in Dubuque, Iowa, 1907, Archbishop Falconio, the Apostolic Delegate, said: "What your society has done in the interest of Christian education is truly admirable and an example worthy of imitation for all Catholics". The annual conventions, under the name of "Katholikentage", have assumed large proportions. Extending over four or five days, they include solemn church festivities, parades, addresses by prominent clergymen and laymen, business meetings, and social gatherings.

Matt, *The German Roman Catholic Central Verein* (St. Paul, Minn.).

Peter J. Bourscheidt.

Centuriators of Magdeburg.—In 1559 there appeared at Basle the first three folio volumes of a work entitled "Ecclesiastica Historia . . . . . secundum singulas centurias . . . . . per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in Urbe Magdeburgicâ" (i. e. A History of the Church . . according to centuries, . . . done at Magdeburg by some learned and pious men). It was the work of a group of Lutheran scholars who had gathered at Magdeburg, and who are now known to history as the "Centuriators of Magdeburg" because of the way in which they divided their work (century by century) and the place in which the first five volumes were written; most of the others were written at Wismar or elsewhere, but the sub-title "in Urbe Magdeburgicâ" was retained. The originator of the idea and the moving spirit of the organization which produced the work was Matthias Vlacich (latinized Flacius), also known as Francovich, and, from the country of his birth (Istria), Illyricus. Born in 1520, the influence of his uncle Baldo Lupertino, an apostate friar, prevented him from becoming a monk and directed his steps in 1539 to Germany, where, at Augsburg, Basle, Tübingen, and Wittenberg, he developed a fanatical anti-Roman temper. The Augsburg Interim of 1547 led to the Adiaphoristic controversy, in the course of which he poured forth a flood of calumnious abuse upon the Reformer Philip Melanchthon; the bitter feeling generated gave rise to the hostile parties of Philippists and Flacians. All attempts to restore peace failed, and the University of Jena, where Flacius was appointed professor of theology in 1557, became a centre of rigid Lutheranism in strong opposition to Melanchthon. His wanderings after 1562, and the numerous domestic controversies between the Reformers, in which Flacius took part until his death (11 March, 1575), did not prevent him from becoming the most learned Lutheran theologian of his day, while, in addition to numerous minor controversial works, his untiring energy led him to devise the vast historical work known as "The Centuries".

After Luther's death (1546) anti-Catholic controversy tended to lose its dogmatic character and to become historical. Flacius sought historical weapons wherewith to destroy Catholicism, and in that spirit wrote his once famous and influential catalogue of anti-papal witnesses, "Catalogus testium veritatis qui ante nostram ætatem Pontifici Romano eiusque erroribus reclamarunt" (Basle, 1556; enlarged ed., Strasburg, 1562; ed. by Dietericus, Frankfort, 1672). Some four hundred anti-papal witnesses to truth were cited, St. Gregory the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas being included in the number of those who had stood up for truth against "the Papal Antichrist". As early as 1553 Flacius was seeking patrons whose financial support should enable him to carry out his comprehensive plan of a church history which was "to reveal the beginnings, the development and the ruthless designs of the Antichrist". The German princes, and the burghers particularly of Augsburg and Nuremberg, helped him generously, but no support was forthcoming from the followers of Melanchthon. He travelled through Germany in search of material, while his zealous fellow-worker, Marcus Wagner (from Weimar near Gotha), searched the libraries of Austria, Bavaria, Scotland, and Denmark for the same purpose. Into the vexed question of the dishonourable means alleged to have been used by Flacius in acquiring MSS., and his use of the knife to mutilate them, thus giving rise to the proverbial *Manus Flaciana* and *culter Flacianus*, we cannot enter here. An examination of the remains of his library, now at

Wolfenbüttel, does not tend to lessen the force of the accusation. Recent research emphasizes the importance of the assistance given by the crypto-Protestant, Caspar von Nydbruck, imperial councillor, and head of the Imperial Library of Vienna, whose influence was exerted throughout Europe on behalf of the work. The editorial board, *Gubernatores et Inspectores institutæ historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*, was composed of Flacius, John Wigand (b. 1523, d. 1587), superintendent at Magdeburg, Matthew Judex (b. 1528, d. 1564), preacher at Magdeburg, Basil Faber (b. 1525, d. 1576), humanist, who collaborated in the first four "Centuries", Martin Copus, a physician who acted as treasurer, and Ebelinck Alman, a burgher of Magdeburg, each of whom had his own assistants. Seven junior assistants were appointed to compile extracts from early Christian writers and historians in accordance with a fixed plan, two more mature scholars acted as "Architects", grouped the material, and submitted it to the editors. When approved of, the materials were worked up into chapters and again submitted before the final form was fair-copied.

Even when at Jena, and during his subsequent wanderings, Flacius retained the direction of the work. Each century was systematically treated under sixteen headings bearing uniform titles in the various volumes. An analysis of the "Quarta Centuria", which appeared in 1560, will give an idea of the contents: Title page; dedication to Queen Elizabeth (col. 3–12); (i) brief statement of the chief events of the century (col. 13); (ii) spread of the Church: where and how (13–35); (iii) persecution and peace of the Church under Diocletian and Maximian (35–159); (iv) the Church's teaching and its history (160–312); (v) heresies (312–406); (vi) rites and ceremonies (406–483); (vii) Church discipline and government (483–582); (viii) schisms and controversies (583–609); (ix) councils (609–880); (x) leading bishops and doctors (880–1337); (xi) leading heretics (1338–1403); (xii) the martyrs (1403–1432); (xiii) miracles and miraculous occurrences (1433–1456); (xiv) political relations of the Jews (1456–1462); (xv) other non-Christian religions (1462–1560); (xvi) political changes (1560–1574); Scriptural index (8 cols.); general index (92 pages of four columns). This method was applied only to the first thirteen centuries, which were published separately in folio volumes at Basle; I–III in 1559; IV in 1560; V and VI in 1562; VII and VIII in 1564; IX in 1566; X and XI in 1567; XII in 1569; and XIII in 1574. The three remaining centuries were completed in manuscript by Wigand (who was largely responsible for all the work done between 1564–74), but never published, and the various attempts made in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to continue the work came to naught. In 1624 a complete edition of the "Centuries" in six folio volumes was issued at Basle by Louis Lucius, who omitted the authors' names and the dedications, and introduced various modifications of the text in a Calvinistic sense. A third edition appeared at Nuremburg 1757–1765, but did not get beyond the fifth "century".

The underlying idea of the work, and that which determined the choice and use of materials, was to show that while "at the beginning of the Church it was not popish anti-Christian doctrine, but evangelical doctrine and religion, which had prevailed", from the death of the last of the Apostles down to the restoration of the true religion by Martin Luther, the Church had gone astray, misled by the Roman Antichrist. Consequently as early as the second century errors are discovered in the teachings of Clement, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus on the fundamental doctrines of free will and justification. On the other hand Catholic controversialists were not slow to make use of the numerous and important admissions of the early appearance of characteristic Catholic teaching. The plan of the book was a noble one, and, as the work of the first among modern writers on ecclesiastical history who profess to treat the subject critically, it marks an epoch in church history; its method, with its return to original sources, is quite sound, and the skill with which the vast masses of material were marshalled is worthy of all praise, hampered though it is by the chronological division of the work. Yet noble as was the plan, the same cannot be said of its execution; virulent anti-papal abuse is common to the whole work. The exercise of the critical faculty is limited by the demands of anti-Roman controversy, and no attempt is made to take a calm and impartial survey of the Church's history. Its constant polemical tone, its grouping of facts coloured by party spirit, its unjust treatment of the Church, its uncritical accumulation of anti-papal story and legend, made the "Centuries" for a long time the arsenal of Protestant controversialists. From its pages they learnt to look upon St. Boniface as "the apostle of lies", who "shamelessly imposed the yoke of Antichrist upon the necks of the Germans"; and upon Pope Gregory VII as a man to whom every imaginable crime was ascribed, and whose iniquities were the despair even of the vituperative vocabulary of Flacius. "The marks of Antichrist" were to be found in Pope Alexander III, who is said to have "worshipped strange gods, strengthened and confirmed the teaching of the devil, and thought highly of Baalism". Through the ages no crime is too monstrous, no story too incredible, provided it furnish a means of blackening the memory of the occupants of Peter's Chair. It was this work, stigmatized by Canisius as *opus pestilentissimum*, that led Cæsar Baronius (q. v.) to write his "Annales Ecclesiastici", in twelve folio volumes (Rome, 1588–1607), covering the period from the birth of Christ to the year 1198. Such was its success that it completely superseded the work of the Centuriators, the principal value of which now is its use as a key to the historical arguments of Protestant controversial writers in the late sixteenth and the seventeenth century.

Döllinger, *Die Reformation* (Ratisbon, 1848), II, 224–62; Janssen, *Gesch. des d. Volkes seit d. Ausgang d. M. A.* (Freiburg, 1876–94), V, 312, VII, 299, tr. of I–V (London, 1896–1906); *Historisches Jahrb.* (1896), XVII, 79–87; Niemöller, *Matthias Flacius und der flacianische Geist in der ält. prot. Kirchen-Hist.* in *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol.* (1888), XII, 75–115; Baur, *Die Epochen der kirchl. Geschichtschreibung* (Tübingen, 1852), 39–71; Cabrol in *Rev. bénédictine* (1905), XXII, 151 sq.; Schulte, *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgesch. der Magdeburger Centurien* (1877); Schaumkell, *Beitrag zur Entstehungsgesch. d. Magd. Cent.* (Ludwigslust, 1898); Kawerau, in *Realencykl. f. prot. Theol. und Kirche*, s. v. *Flacius* (Leipzig, 1899), VI, 82–92; Preger, *Matthias Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit* (Erlangen, 1859–61). For the important eleventh century liturgical MS. (episcopal ceremonial) known as the *Missa Illyrica* or *Flaciana*, because it once belonged to Flacius (Cod. Helmstad. 1151, at Wolfenbüttel), see Braun in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (1905), LXIX, 143 sq.

Edward Myers.

Centurion (Lat. *Centurio*, Gr. κεντυρίων, ἑκατόνταρχος, ἑκατοντάρχης), a Roman officer commanding a century or company, the strength of which varied from fifty to one hundred men; but in the Vulg. and the D. V. the term is also applied to an officer of the Hebrew army. In New Testament times there were sixty centurions in a legion, two to the maniple and six to the cohort. They were not all of equal rank. The centurion who commanded the first of the two centuries composing the maniple ranked above the commander of the second; the first centurion of the first maniple (*triarii*) of the cohort was higher than the first centurion of the second (*principes*), and he higher than the ranking centurion of the third (*hastati*), etc. There was also precedence of rank according to the number of the cohort. The chief centurion in the legion was the *primipilus* or first centurion of the *triarii* of the first cohort. He

had charge of the legion's eagle, assisted at the councils of war, and in the absence of a superior officer took command of the legion. The auxiliary cohorts had six or ten centurions according as they consisted of 500 (*cohortes quingenariæ*) or 1000 men (*cohortes milliariæ*). These were inferior to the legionary centurions. The centurions carried as insignia of their rank a staff made of a vine-branch, with which, on occasion, they chastised their men; whence *vitis* (vine) was used to designate the centurionship. Ordinarily they could rise no higher than the rank of *primipilus* and at the expiration of their term of service they retired into private life. With the grant of land they received and with what they acquired during the wars they were usually well off. The *primipili* often became wealthy enough to gain entrance into the equestrian order. The post of centurion, it should be noted, was not, as a rule, held by men of family, though occasionally a young man of rank aspiring to a higher military career served first as centurion in a legion.

Of the two centurions mentioned in the Gospels only one was a Roman officer. He who asked Our Saviour to cure his servant and whose faith the Saviour so highly commended (Matt., viii, 5 sq.; Luke, vii, 2 sq.), though a Gentile, belonged to the army of Herod Antipas, since Capharnaum lay in this prince's territory. The tetrarch's army was probably organized after the manner of the Roman auxiliary troops. The other, who commanded the detachment of soldiers at the Crucifixion (Matt., xxvii, 54; Mark, xv, 39, 44, Luke, xxiii, 47), was of course an officer of the imperial cohort stationed at Jerusalem (Acts, xxi, 31). In the Acts two centurions are mentioned by name, Cornelius, centurion of "the Italian band" or cohort, the first Gentile admitted into the Church (Acts, x, 1 sq.), and Julius, centurion of "the band Augusta", who brought St. Paul to Rome (Acts, xxvii, 1, etc.). Others are spoken of in connexion with the Apostle's arrest and transfer to Cæsarea (Acts, xxi, 32, xxii, 25, xxiii, 23). Since no legion was stationed in Palestine before the time of Vespasian, these centurions all belonged to auxiliary cohorts. For this reason it is unlikely that either Cornelius or Julius was a member of the patrician family whose name he bore; both were probably the sons of freedmen. In a number of places in the O. T. *centuriones* stands in the Vulg. for שׂרי מאות, *sārê mē'ôth* ("captains of hundreds"), once [I Sam. (I K.), viii, 12] even for שׂרי חמשים, *sārê hamishshîm* ("captains of fifty"), though here the agreement of the Sept. with the Vulg. would seem to show that the Hebrew text is defective. In several of these places the D. V. has "centurions", but in the others "captains", "captains of" or "over hundreds"; in two cases (Ex., xviii, 21, 25) "rulers of" or "over hundreds". The *centuriones* of Ex., xviii, 21, 25, Num., xxxi, 14, etc., Deut., i, 15 were both civil and military officers.

SMITH, *Dict. Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* (London, 1901), I, 787, 790; MOMMSEN, *Nomina et Gradus Centurionum*, in *Ephemer. Epigraph.* (1879), 226–245; MÜLLER, *Die Rangordnung und das Avancement d. Centurionen*, in *Philologus* (1879), 126–149; DESJARDINS, in *Mélanges Graux* (1884), 676–679; MARQUARDT, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung* (2nd ed.,) 430 sq.; MOMMSEN AND MARQUARDT, *Manuel des Antiqu. Rom.* (Paris, 1891), XI, 65 sq.

F. BECHTEL.

Ceolfrid, SAINT, Benedictine monk, Abbot of Wearmouth and Jarrow, b. 642, place of birth not known; d. 29 Sept., 716, at Langres on the frontier of Burgundy. His family belonged to the highest rank of the Anglo-Saxon nobility. The name Ceolfrid is the Teutonic form of Geoffrey. At the age of eighteen he became a monk in the monastery of Ripon, then ruled over by St. Wilfrid. After ten years of study and preparation he was ordained priest by St. Wilfrid. He soon afterwards visited Canterbury and spent some time with Botulph, founder and Abbot of Icanhoe, now the town of Boston (Botulph's town) in Lincolnshire. On his return to Ripon he fulfilled the duties of novice-master, in which capacity he became noted for his profound humility and love of menial work. His fame reached the ears of St. Benedict Biscop, then in the midst of his great monastic enterprise on the banks of the Wear. He begged him from St. Wilfrid, and soon after reaching Wearmouth Ceolfrid was made prior of the monastery and left in charge during the absence of Benedict on his journeys to Rome. Meeting with difficulties as superior, he went back to Ripon, but was afterwards persuaded to return. From this time he became the constant companion of Benedict and accompanied him to Rome on his fifth journey to the Holy City.

About 681 Benedict began the foundation of a second monastery at Jarrow on the banks of the Tyne about six miles from Wearmouth. Ceolfrid was appointed the first abbot to act as the deputy of Benedict, who in reality was abbot of both houses. He took with him seventeen monks from Wearmouth, and from an inscription formerly on the wall of the church we learn that the monastery was completed about 684 or 685. Benedict died 12 January, 690, and directed the brethren to elect Ceolfrid to be his successor. Ceolfrid proved himself a worthy disciple of his master, carefully carrying out the ideals of Benedict. His disciple, the Venerable Bede, has thus described his character and work: "This last [Ceolfrid] was himself a man of most extraordinary diligence and superior quickness of apprehension; prompt in carrying into effect but prudent in forming designs and unrivalled in piety . . . During this long administration Ceolfrid brought to a happy conclusion all the admirable plans for promoting piety which his distinguished predecessor had begun. Time also suggested and enabled him to carry into execution numerous improvements of his own. Amongst a great variety of these, we ought particularly to notice that he considerably augmented the number of private oratories or chapels of ease; added largely to the plate and sacred vestments of the Church, and with an ardour which equalled the past energy of Benedict in founding, he nearly doubled the libraries of both his monasteries. Besides innumerable other literary acquisitions he procured three pandects of the new, added to one of the old translations of the Bible which he had brought from Rome. In his latter days, departing again for that city, he took with him as a donative one of these three valued volumes, leaving to his monasteries the other two" (Liber de Vitis Abbat. Wirim, Wilcock tr.).

This volume, which Ceolfrid carried with him on his last journey to Rome, was the famous "Codex Amiatinus". Until recent years it was thought to have been the work of Servandus, abbot of a monastery near Alatri in Italy (sixth century). The name of Cassiodorus has also been connected with this MS., owing to its striking resemblance to his Bible; but Vigouroux concludes that it is absolutely independent of Cassiodorus, though the prologue it contains on the divisions of the Bible may possibly be of Cassiodorian origin. The famous Catholic antiquarian, De Rossi (1888), discovered its true origin. He has conclusively proved that it was written at Wearmouth or Jarrow between the years 690 and 716; that it was one of the three copies of St. Jerome's Vulgate which Bede refers to in the passage quoted above; and that Ceolfrid carried it with him on his last journey to Rome to present it to the sovereign pontiff. He died on the journey, but some of his party reached Rome and presented the MS. to the pope. For many years it was preserved in the Abbey of Monte Amiato near Siena; it now rests in the Laurentian Library at Florence, where it was transferred at the suppression of the abbey in 1786. This Codex gives the oldest text of St. Jerome's Vulgate and has played a most important rôle in its history; in the publication of the

Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Bible it was preferred to all other MSS. Samuel Berger says of it: "It is from Northumberland that the correct texts of the Vulgate were sent out not only throughout Italy, to which England was thus paying a debt, but also throughout France. Alcuin was from York and had been chosen by Charlemagne to correct the text of the Bible." He was instrumental in extinguishing the last remnants of Celtic particularism in the celebration of Easter (q. v.).

Ceolfrid obtained from Pope Sergius I letters of immunity for his two monasteries, and had them presented before a synod of English bishops in the presence of King Alcfrid, thus obtaining both royal and episcopal sanction. With the advance of years came sickness and infirmity, and he resigned his office with the intention of journeying to Rome, there to end his days. He also wished to give his brethren an opportunity of "living under the direction of a younger abbot, that the example of a more active leader might inspire them with greater ardour in the pursuit of virtue". He died on this last journey at Langres, and was buried in the church of the three martyrs, Sts. Speusippus, Eleusippus, and Meleusippus. His relics were afterwards transferred to Jarrow and thence, in the time of the Danish invasions, to Glastonbury.

BEDE, *Ecclesiastical History of England* (London, 1840), 229, 317, 318, 342; IDEM, *Liber de vitis Abbat. Wirim.*; MONTALEMBERT, *Monks of the West*, IV, xiii; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, September 25th; *Weremuth-Jarrow und Rom im 7. Jahrhundert* in *Der Katholik* for September, 1901; CORNELY, *Introd. Gen. in S. Scripturas*, I, 436; BERGER, *De l'histoire de la Vulgate en France*, 4; WHITE, *The Codex Amiatinus and its Birthplace* in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, II, 273–308.

G. E. HIND.

Ceolwulf (CEOLWULPH or CEOLULPH), King of Northumbria and monk of Lindisfarne, date and place of birth not known; d. at Lindisfarne, 764. His ancestry is thus given by the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle": "Ceolwulf was the son of Cutha, Cutha of Cuthwin, Cuthwin of Leoldwald, Leoldwald of Egwald, Egwald of Aldhelm, Aldhelm of Ocga, Ocga of Ida, Ida of Eoppa." Harpsfeld says that he succeeded Osred on the throne, but most authorities say that he was adopted as heir by Osric in 729. Learned and pious, he lacked the vigour and authority necessary for a ruler. Bede bears witness to his learning and piety in the introductory chapter of his "Ecclesiastical History". He dedicated this work "to the most glorious King Ceolwulph", sent it to him for his approval, and addresses him thus: "I cannot but commend the sincerity and zeal, with which you not only give ear to hear the words of Holy Scripture, but also industriously take care to become acquainted with the actions and sayings of former men of renown."

His unfitness for his duties as king prompted his subjects to seize him and confine him in a monastery in the second year of his reign. He escaped from this confinement and reascended the throne. During his reign he appointed his cousin Egbert to be Bishop of York, and Bede tells us that the ecclesiastical affairs of his kingdom were presided over by the four bishops, Wilfrid, Ethelwald, Acca, and Pecthelm. After a reign of eight years he wearied of "the splendid cares of royalty", and voluntarily resigned to become a monk at Lindisfarne (738). His cousin Eadbert succeeded him. Ranulphus Cestrensis speaks of his retirement to St. Bede's monastery of Jarrow, but all others agree that it was Lindisfarne. He brought to the monastery many treasures and much land, and after his entrance the monks were first allowed to drink wine and beer, contrary to the tradition handed down from St. Aidan, who only allowed them milk or water. Henry of Huntingdon, when entering into detail with regard to his retirement, says he was principally urged to it by reading the writings of Bede on the lives of former kings who had resigned their thrones to enter the monastic state. He was buried in the cathedral of Lindisfarne next to the tomb of St. Cuthbert, and, according to Malmesbury, many miracles were wrought at his tomb. The body was afterwards transferred to the mainland of Northumberland, probably along with St. Cuthbert's, in order to preserve it from desecration at the time of the Danish invasion. His feast day in the calendar is the 15th of January.

BEDE, *Eccles. History* (ed. GILES), I, 334, 335, 340; *Acta SS.*, Jan. 25, I; LINGARD, *Hist. of England* (London, 1854), I, 71. 72; DIXON AND RAINE'S *Fasti Eborac.*, 94; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (ed. GILES), index; RAINE, *Hist. of North Durham*, 68.

G. E. HIND.

Cepeda, FRANCISCO (also called ZEPEDA and ZEPEDAS), b. in the province of La Mancha, 1532; d. at Guatemala, 1602. He became a Dominican at the convent of Ocaña, and was sent to Chiapas in Mexico. He was a very active missionary among the Indians, and when the differing modes of instructing them became an obstacle to their conversion, Cepeda was sent to Mexico to simplify the Indian grammars printed there, and obtain a standard for the guidance of the missionaries. In consequence of that journey, the "Artes de los idiomas Chiapanecos, Zoque, Tzendal y Chinanteco" (probably the work of several authors) was published in 1560 under his name. The book has disappeared, but its former existence is well established, by Remesal at first, and by subsequent authors. It is the first book printed in America in four languages (five with the Spanish). The title is given variously, but the above is the correct one. Cepeda became Provincial of the Dominicans in Guatemala, 1593, and Commissary of the Inquisition.

REMESAL, *Historia general de las Indias occidentales &ca.* (Madrid, 1619); LEON Y PINELO, *Epítome* (Madrid, 1737, &ca.); ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Hispana nova* (1737–1738); BERISTAIN, *Biblioteca &ca.* (Amecameca, 1883); YCAZBALCETA, *Bibliografía* (1886); PIMENTEL, *Cuadro descriptivo &ca.* (Mexico, 1862).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Cephalonia, DIOCESE OF. See ZANTE.

Ceramus, a titular see of Asia Minor. Ceramus (or Keramos) was a city of Caria, subject at first to Stratonicea, afterwards autonomous, and one of the chief cities of the Systema Chrysaorikon (Bulletin de corresp. hellén., IX, 468). In Roman times it coined its own money. It is mentioned in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" until the twelfth or thirteenth century as suffragan to Aphrodisias, or Stauropolis. We know but three bishops: Spudasius, at Ephesus in 431; Maurianus, at Nicæa in 787; and Symeon, at the council which reinstated Photius in 879. Ceramus has preserved its old name, but is now only a small village in the vilayet of Smyrna, on the north shore of Gueuk-Abaa bay (the Keramic Gulf), not far from the sea.

SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878), s. v. *Cerameicus.*

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cerasus, a titular see of Pontus Polemoniacus in Asia Minor. Cerasus (Κερασοῦς) is remembered for the sojourn of Xenophon and his Ten Thousand on their famous retreat. It seems to have stood in the valley at a short distance from the modern city. The latter was founded by Pharnaces, after whom it was called Pharnacia; but owing to the abundance of cherry-trees in the country, it was soon named Cerasus like the old town, and this appellation has remained. It was from Cerasus that Pompey imported the first cherry-trees to Rome, whence they afterwards spread through all Europe. The city is mentioned by Pliny and Greek geographers, but does not appear to have been very important. It was a suffragan of Neocæsarea (Niksar); in the eleventh century it became a metropolis, and was still extant at the end of the fifteenth century, but by the seventeenth the see was suppressed. From the fifth to

the twelfth century Lequien (II, 513) mentions nine titulars; his list might be increased. The Turkish Kerassoun, or Ghiresson, is a port on the Black Sea, and the chief town of a caza in the vilayet of Trebizond; it has about 10,000 inhabitants (5000 Greeks, 1000 Armenians, and a few Catholics, visited from time to time by Capuchins from Trebizond). The climate is mild. The town is surrounded by a large forest of hazel- and cherry-trees, the latter being still very numerous. There are ruins of ancient walls, of an amphitheatre, a fortress, and of Byzantine churches.

CUINET, *Turquie d'Asie*, I, 64–78; PAPAMICHALOPOULOS, *A Tour in Pontus* (Greek; Athens, 1903), 256–282; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.* (London, 1878), I, 590.

S. VAILHÉ.

Cerdo, GNOSTIC. See GNOSTICS.

Cerdonians. See GNOSTICS.

Ceremonial, the book which contains in detail the order of religious ceremony and solemn worship prescribed to be observed in ecclesiastical functions. At present there are only two official liturgical books that bear the titles, "Cæremoniale Romanum" and "Cæremoniale Episcoporum". The Missal, Breviary, Ritual, and Pontifical likewise contain directions for the celebration of Mass, the recitation of the Office, the administration of the sacraments, and episcopal functions respectively. They may, therefore, in a certain sense be considered ceremonials; but since the primary purpose of these books is to serve as texts of the liturgical prayers, the added directions being only general, they are not looked upon as ceremonials in the accepted sense of the term. The most ancient ceremonials and rituals of the Roman Church are the so-called "Ordines Romani". Mabillon (Musæum Italicum, Paris, 1687-89, II) enumerates fifteen of them. They treat of the election of the Roman pontiff, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Orders, the functions for special days of the year, etc. Authors do not agree as to the date at which they were composed. Abbot Hilduinus, Walafridus Strabo, Sigebertus (in his chronicle), and after them Leopoldus Bambergensis, record that the Roman pontiff sent a copy of one of these "Ordines" to Pepin of Heristal (d. 714) or to Charles Martel (d. 741). It was probably composed by the pontifical master of ceremonies and contained, besides the functions observed in the various churches at that time, many rites and customs taken from a similar book which dates back to the time of Gelasius I (d. 496), and was corrected and augmented by Gregory the Great (d. 604).

The "Ordines Romani" were the ground-work of the "Cæremoniale Romanum", compiled by Augustinus Patricius, surnamed Piccolomineus, Bishop of Pienza (1483–1496), who had been formerly pontifical master of ceremonies. The work, which was dedicated to Innocent VIII, 1 March, 1488, was not intended originally for publication, but in 1516 it was printed by pontifical permission at Rome and Venice by Christophorus Marcellus, Archbishop of Corcyra, under the title "Rituum Ecclesiasticorum, sive Sacrarum Cæremoniarum S. Romanæ Ecclesiæ libri tres non ante impressi". The pontifical master of ceremonies at that time, Paris de Grassis, was incensed at its publication, averring that it would lower the papal dignity in the estimation of the masses, and asked Leo X to destroy the copies of it and censure the editor. It was, however, not suppressed, but reissued at Florence (1521); Cologne (1557); Rome (1560); Venice (1573, 1582, 1616); Leipzig (1733), and at Rome (1750), with a commentary by Joseph Catalanus under the title "Sacrarum Cæremoniarum, sive Rituum Ecclesiasticorum S. Romanæ Ecclesiæ libri tres, ab Augustino Patricio ordinati et a Marcello Corcyrensi Archiepiscopo primum editi". It consists of three books, the first of which contains extra-liturgical functions, such as the election and consecration of the Roman pontiff, the coronation of an emperor, the canonization of saints, the creation of cardinals, etc.; the second describes the liturgical functions at Mass, Vespers, and the other canonical Hours; the third gives general rules and instructions. In 1587 Sixtus V established the Congregation of Ceremonies for the purpose of watching over the rites and ceremonies which are to be observed in the Papal Court, to decide questions regarding pre-eminence among the persons who assist at the papal functions, to arrange all the details for the presentation of princes and their envoys to the Roman pontiff, and to give directions to the ablegates who carry the insignia of the cardinalate to newly-created cardinals residing outside of Rome. Many dioceses and monastic orders have their proper ceremonials, and those compiled by individual authors for giving assistance to the clergy in the performance of their ecclesiastical functions are very numerous.

ZACCARIA, *Bibliotheca Ritualis*, tom. I, lib. I, cap. vii, art. 1 (Rome, 1776).

A. J. SCHULTE.

Ceremony (Skt., *karman*, action, work; from *kar* or *ker*, to make or create; Lat. *cæremonia*), in liturgy an external action, gesture, or movement which accompanies the prayers and public exercise of divine worship. To these the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. v.) adds the things over which or with which the prayers are pronounced, e. g. blessings, lights, incense, vestments, etc. Ceremony is the necessary outcome of the twofold nature of man, intellectual and sensible, on account of which, as St. Thomas Aquinas says (Contra Gentiles, III, cxix), he must pay God a twofold adoration, one spiritual, which consists in the interior devotion of the soul, the other corporal, which manifests itself in the outward form of worship, for there is no inward sentiment or feeling which man is not wont to express outwardly by some suitable gesture or action. Ceremonies are employed to embellish and adorn sacred functions; to excite in the faithful sentiments of respect, devotion, and religion, by which the honour of God is increased and the sanctification of the soul is obtained, since these constitute the principal object of all liturgical acts; to lead the illiterate more easily to a knowledge of the mysteries of religion; to indicate the dispositions necessary to receive the sacraments worthily; and to induce the faithful to fulfil with greater docility the obligations which the reception of the sacraments imposes on them.

Some ceremonies owe their institution to purely physical reasons or necessity, e. g. the lights used in the catacombs, which were retained by the Church for the mystical reason that they represent Christ, the Light of the World; others are founded on mystical or symbolical reasons, e. g. all the ceremonies at baptism which precede the pouring of the water on the person to be baptized; many are founded on historical, natural, and mystical reasons at the same time, e. g. the mixing of wine and water at Mass recalls to our mind what Christ did at the Last Supper, and represents the blood and water that flowed from His side on the Cross as well as the union of the faithful with Christ. Catholic ceremonies, therefore, are not superstitious practices, meaningless observances or relics of heathen and Jewish customs, but regulations of Divine, Apostolic, and ecclesiastical institution. They may be grouped, according to Suarez (De Sacramentis, Disp. lxxxiv) into three classes: (a) Some invest a function with decorum, dignity, and reverence, e. g. washing the hands, striking the breast, approaching the altar with downcast eyes. (b) Others serve as external acts of worship, e. g. bending the knee, bowing the head. (c) Many are prescribed for a moral and mystical signification, e. g. elevating the bread and wine at the Offertory of the Mass.

raising the hands and eyes, giving the kiss of peace, frequently making the sign of the cross. To these may be added another class which not only symbolize, but produce, spiritual effects, and obtain Divine grace, e. g. the imposition of the hands of the bishop together with the form of words by which priestly power and inward grace are conferred on the recipient of Holy orders. The sum total of the ceremonies of an individual function is called a rite (*ritus*), e. g. the rite of Mass, baptism, extreme unction; the totality of the rites of religion is called its cult (*cultus*). (See RITE).

MENGHINI, *Elementa juris liturgici* (Rome, 1906); COPPIN-STIMART, *Sacræ liturgiæ compendium* (Tournai, 1903); STELLA, *Institutiones liturgicæ* (Rome, 1895); MAGAÑA, *Sagrada liturgia* (Pamplona, 1905); VAN DER STAPPEN, *Sacra Liturgia* (Mechlin, 1904), I.

A. J. SCHULTE.

Cerenza, DIOCESE OF. See CARIATI.

Cerignola, DIOCESE OF. See ASCOLI, SATRIANO AND CIRIGNOLA.

Cerinthus (Gr. Κήρινθος), a Gnostic-Ebionite heretic, contemporary with St. John; against whose errors on the divinity of Christ the Apostle is said to have written the Fourth Gospel. We possess no information concerning this early sectary which reaches back to his own times. The first mention of his name and description of his doctrines occur in St. Irenæus (Adv. Hær., I, c. xxvi; III, c. iii, c. xi), written about 170. Further information is gathered from Presbyter Caius (c. 210) as quoted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, xxviii, 2). Hippolytus, in "Philosphoumena", VII, 33 (c. 230), practically transcribes Irenæus. Cerinthus is referred to by Pseudo-Tertullian in "Adv. Omnes Hæres", written about 240. A fragment of Dionysius of Alexandria, taken from "De Promissionibus", written about 250, is given by Eusebius after his quotation from Caius. The most detailed account is given by St. Epiphanius ("Adv. Hæres", xxviii, written about 390), which, however, on account of its date and character must be used with some caution. A good summary is given by Theodoret ("Hær. Fab.", II, 3, written about 450). Cerinthus was an Egyptian, and if not by race a Jew, at least he was circumcised. The exact date of his birth and his death are unknown. In Asia he founded a school and gathered disciples. No writings of any kind have come down to us. Cerinthus's doctrines were a strange mixture of Gnosticism, Judaism, Chiliasm, and Ebionitism. He admitted one Supreme Being; but the world was produced by a distinct and far inferior power. He does not identify this Creator or Demiurgos with the Jehovah of the Old Testament. Not Jehovah but the angels have both made the world and given the law. These creator-angels were ignorant of the existence of the Supreme God. The Jewish law was most sacred, and salvation to be obtained by obedience to its precepts. Cerinthus distinguished between Jesus and Christ. Jesus was mere man, though eminent in holiness. He suffered and died and was raised from the dead, or, as some say Cerinthus taught, He will be raised from the dead at the Last Day and all men will rise with Him. At the moment of baptism, Christ or the Holy Ghost was sent by the Highest God, and dwelt in Jesus teaching Him, what not even the angels knew, the Unknown God. This union between Jesus and Christ continues till the Passion, when Jesus suffers alone and Christ returns to heaven. Cerinthus believed in a happy millennium which would be realized here on earth previous to the resurrection and the spiritual kingdom of God in heaven.

Scarcely anything is known of Cerinthus's disciples; they seem soon to have fused with the Nazareans and Ebionites and exercised little influence on the bulk of Christendom, except perhaps through the Pseudo-Clementines, the product of Cerinthian and Ebionite circles. They flourished most in Asia and Galatia.

BAREILLE, in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, s. v.; DUCHESNE, *Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1907); *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*; MANSEL, *The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Cent.* (1875); DAVIDSON, *Introductions to N. Test.* (1894), I, 345; II, 245–6; KUNZE, *De Hist. Gnosticismi Fontibus* (Leipzig, 1894).

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Cerne, BOOK OF. See CELTIC RITE.

Cerreto-Sannita. See TELESE.

Certitude.—The word *certitude* indicates both a state of mind and a quality of a proposition, according as we say, "I am certain", or, "It is certain". This distinction is expressed in the technical language of philosophy by saying that there is subjective certitude and objective certitude. It is worthy of notice, as regards the use of English terms, that Newman reserves the term *certitude* for the state of mind, and employs the word *certainty* to describe the condition of the evidence of a proposition. Certitude is correlative to truth, for truth is the object of the intellect. Knowledge means knowledge of truth; and hence we are in the habit of saying simply of a proposition that "it is certain", to express that it is true, and that its truth is so evident as legitimately to produce certitude. Certitude is contrasted with other states of mind in reference to a proposition: the state of ignorance, the state of doubt, and the state of opinion. The last-named signifies, in the strict use of the term, the holding of a proposition as probable, although in common parlance it is loosely used in a wider sense, as in speaking of a man's religious opinions, meaning not his speculations or theories about religious questions, but his dogmatic convictions. Certitude is such assent to the truth of a proposition as excludes all real doubt. Here it is proper to observe a distinction between merely undoubting assent, i. e. the mere absence of doubt, and an assent that positively excludes doubt, an assent with which doubt is incompatible. Thus one may give to a statement in the morning newspaper an undoubting assent and credence, yet readily withdraw that assent if the statement be contradicted in the afternoon papers. Such assent, though undoubting, is not certitude. But there is a kind of assent from which doubt is not only in fact absent but absent of necessity, because such assent and doubt are incompatible. Such is the assent which one gives to the truth that he really exists, and that he feels well or ill, or to the truth of the proposition that it is impossible for a thing in the same respect both to be and not to be, or to the moral law, the existence of God, and the immortality of the soul. Of these truths we are *certain*, and such assent is properly called certitude. Certitude differs from opinion in kind, not in degree only; for opinion, that is assent to the probability of a proposition, regards the opposite proposition as not more than improbable; and therefore opinion is always accompanied by the consciousness that further evidence may cause a change of mind in favour of the opposite opinion. Opinion, therefore, does not exclude doubt; certitude does. It has been disputed among philosophers whether certitude is susceptible of degrees, whether we may rightly say that our certitude of one truth is greater than our certitude of another truth. In Zigliara's judgment, this question may easily be solved if a distinction is made between the exclusion of doubt (in which our various certitudes of different truths are all equal, and by which they are all equally marked off in kind from opinion) and the positive firmness of assent, which may be more intense in one case than in another, though in both it be equally true that we are certain. And, in fact, if we examine experience on this point, it is clear that our certitude of a self-evident truth, e. g. of

the axioms of geometry, is greater than our certitude of a proposition demonstrated by a long and complex series of proofs, and that our certitude of such a fact as our own existence or our own state of feeling (gladness or health) is greater than our certitude of the existence, for instance, of a republican form of government in this country, though we are certain in both cases. We are more certain when we assent to a truth as certain which falls in with our inclination than when we are forced to a conviction. It should be noted, too, that in the common opinion of theologians there is a greater certitude in Divine faith than in any human science.

There are several kinds of certitude. In the first place, it is divided into metaphysical, physical, and moral certitude. Metaphysical certitude is that with which self-evidently necessary truth is known, or necessary truth demonstrated from self-evident truth. The demonstrative sciences, such as geometry, possess metaphysical certitude. The contingent fact of one's own existence, or of one's present state of feeling, is known with metaphysical certitude. Physical certitude is that which rests upon the laws of nature. These laws are not absolutely unchangeable, but subject to the will of the Creator; they are not self-evident nor demonstrable from self-evident truth; but they are constant, and discoverable as laws by experience, so that the future may be inferred from the past, or the distant from the present. It is with physical certitude that a man knows that he shall die, that food will sustain life, that electricity will furnish motive power. Astronomers know beforehand with physical certitude the date of an eclipse or of a transit of Venus. Moral certitude is that with which judgments are formed concerning human character and conduct; for the laws of human nature are not quite universal, but subject to occasional exceptions. It is moral certitude which we generally attain in the conduct of life, concerning, for example, the friendship of others, the fidelity of a wife or a husband, the form of government under which we live, or the occurrence of certain historical events, such as the Protestant Reformation or the French Revolution. Though almost any detail in these events may be made a subject of dispute, especially when we enter the region of motives and try to trace cause and effect, and though almost any one of the witnesses may be shown to have made some mistake or misrepresentation, yet the occurrence of the events, taken in the mass, is certain. Father John Rickaby (First Principles of Knowledge) observes that certitude is not necessarily exclusive of all misgiving whatsoever (such as the thought of the bare possibility that we may be mistaken, for we are not infallible), but of all solid, reasonable misgivings. The term *moral certitude* is used by some philosophers in a wider sense, to include an assent in matters of conduct, given not on purely intellectual grounds of evidence, but through the virtue of prudence and the influence of the will over the intellect, because we judge that doubt would not be wise. In such a case, we know that an opinion or a course of action would be right as a rule, let us say, in nine cases out of ten, though we cannot shut our eyes to the possibility that the particular case which we are considering *may* be the exceptional case in which such a judgment would be wrong. Other philosophers say that in such a case we are not certain, but only judge it wise to act as if we were certain, and put doubts aside because useless. But it seems clear that in such a case we are certain of something, whether that something be described as the truth of a proposition or the wisdom of a course of action. This certitude might perhaps better be called practical certitude, since it mainly concerns action. Hence, it is said that in cases in which it is necessary to act, in which great issues are involved, and yet the evidence, when logically set forth, would seem to amount to no more than a higher probability for one course than for another, the standard of judgment, or criterion, is the *judicium prudentis viri*, the judgment of a wise man, whose mind is unclouded by passion or prejudice, and who has some knowledge derived from experience of similar cases. Such a judgment is totally different from the spirit of the gambler's throw, which is reckless not only of certainty but even of probability.

Certitude is likewise divided into natural certitude (termed also direct, or spontaneous) and philosophical. Natural certitude is that which belongs to "common sense", or the spontaneous working of the judgment, which is common to all men not idiots or insane. This certitude belongs chiefly to self-evident truth and to the truths necessary for the conduct of life, e. g. the existence of other beings besides ourselves, the duties existing between husband and wife, parents and children, the existence of a Supreme Being deserving of reverence. To these and similar truths the mind comes with certitude, without any special education, in the ordinary course of life in human society. Philosophical (or scientific) certitude is that which results from a process of reflection, upon an analysis of the evidence for and against our convictions, a perception of the reasons which support them and of the objections which may be urged against them, together with an examination of the powers and the limits of the human intelligence. The term natural certitude is sometimes used in another sense, in contradistinction from the certitude of Divine faith, which is supernatural certitude, and which, according to theologians generally, is greater than any degree of certitude to be had in science, because it rests not upon human reason, which is liable to be mistaken, but upon the authority of God, who cannot err. (St. Thomas, Summa, I, Q. i, a. 5.)

A great part of philosophy is taken up with the questions whether certitude is possible, what is the extent of the sphere of certain knowledge, and by what tests or criteria truth may be certainly distinguished from falsehood, so that we may know when we have a right to be certain. A few philosophers in ancient and modern times have, seriously or not, denied the possibility of attaining certitude on any subject whatsoever, and professed universal scepticism. Such are Nicholas of Cusa, Montaigne, Charron, and Bayle, the last of whom aimed at producing the impression that everything is disputable by showing that everything is disputed. Literally universal scepticism is impossible, for it is a profession of knowledge to assert that nothing can be known, and to believe that there can be no belief. It is thus a contradiction in terms. A sceptic should in consistency be sceptical as to his own scepticism; but no attention would be given to such a sceptic unless as one attends, for amusement, to a jester. Nevertheless, universal scepticism may practically produce pernicious consequences, because its universality is overlooked, and its arguments are viewed as if they applied only to some particular sphere in which the reader (if it so be) is tempted to doubt. Thus, sceptical objections against the principle of causation may be employed against the proofs for the existence of God, while the reader is not warned, and does not remember, that they would equally avail against taking food and sleep for the restoration of strength, or against the anticipation that the sun will rise to-morrow. It should be added that some Christian apologists, in endeavouring to prove the necessity of Divine revelation, have used language differing but little from that of scepticism, to the disparagement of human reason. A noted example is Huet, "Traité de la faiblesse de l'esprit humain" (Paris, 1723).

What is more common than a profession of univer-

sal scepticism is a scepticism as to the possibility of philosophic certitude. Many who have no doubt as to natural certitude, or the certitude acquirable by "common sense", the natural, spontaneous action of the unsophisticated mind, regard philosophy as more apt to open questions than to settle them, and to raise objections than to solve them. This seems to have been the position of Pascal, who says: "Reason confounds dogmatists, and nature confounds sceptics"; and, "The heart has reasons of its own which the understanding does not know". This seems to have been the position also of a very different man, David Hume, who says: "Fortunately since reason is incapable of dispelling these clouds, nature herself suffices for that purpose and cures me of this philosophical delirium" (Treatise on Human Nature, I, 297). He said to a friend who spoke to him concerning the future life and the existence of God: "Though I throw out my speculations to entertain the learned and metaphysical world, yet in other things I do not think so differently from the rest of the world, as you imagine." And he gives his idea of scepticism in a remark upon Berkeley's arguments against the real externality of the sensible world: "That these arguments are in reality merely sceptical appears from this, that they admit of no answer, and produce no conviction; their only effect is to cause that momentary amazement and irresolution and confusion, which is the result of scepticism." (Inquiry Concerning Human Nature, ch. xii, note 4.) Kant's system, which denies that the speculative reason can attain to real knowledge, and admits only practical certitude, and consequently denies the possibility of any system of metaphysical philosophy, is virtually the same view. It is needless to say that, in a philosopher, such a view is self-contradictory. Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason", as well as his other works, was an exercise of the speculative reason. If certitude of knowledge is not obtainable on any subject by the speculative reason, how could he indulge in such positive and dogmatic propositions? If we consider this view of philosophy, as it is held by some men of sense and virtue, who point to the disputations and wranglings of philosophers, the variety of opinions, the number of infidel philosophers, and the general suspicion felt by earnestly religious people, the answer to it is, that this view has some measure of truth, but is a great exaggeration. It is quite true that philosophical inquiries concerning morals and religion, if not conducted with proper moral dispositions, are likely to terminate in doubt. If there be any bias, whether conscious or unconscious, against the obligations of morality and religion, there can of course be only one issue. If the understanding seeks to know everything; if it rejects facts, however well attested, because it does not see *how* they can be so; if it will accept no truth, however firmly demonstrated, unless the harmony with every other part of a system can be made clear; if the mind makes itself the measure of possibility; if it claims to see through and through the universe, and its origin, and its end; if it refuses to submit to mystery, or to acknowledge that it is limited; and if, because it cannot know everything, it will proudly not consent to know anything, of course with such a disposition philosophizing cannot issue in philosophic certitude. But that is not the fault of philosophy, nor of reason; and the abuse cannot take away the use, but only be a warning against the misuse of philosophy.

"Methodic doubt", that is, provisional doubt of every truth, was put forward by Descartes as the proper course for the discovery of truth. This philosopher teaches that in order to be certain of the truth of our convictions we should begin by doubting everything, except one thing: "I think, and therefore I am." He professes to hold that every other truth may be doubted and needs proof. He suggests that we may doubt whether we can discover the truth on any other point whatsoever, for it may appear possible that we have been created by a malign or mischievous being, who so constituted our mind that we must invariably be mistaken. The Cartesian method is self-contradictory. To make the supposition that possibly the human intellect cannot know the truth, on any point whatsoever, is to assume that this supposition may be true, and that there is such a thing as truth, and that it can be known. To attempt to disprove the supposition, to undertake to show the veracity of the cognitive faculties, presupposes their veracity or power of knowing the truth on some points at least. In fact, Descartes proved the veracity of the cognitive faculties from the veracity of God. The veracity of God, however, is known as the result of a demonstration of some length and complexity; and the undertaking of such demonstration shows a previous belief in the power of the mind to discover the truth. In fact, the very doubt on such a subject is a self-contradiction; for doubt as well as certitude is correlated to truth. To doubt whether a particular view may not be false is to suspect that the opposite may be true. To doubt that the intellect can know any truth is to question whether it may not be true that we are ignorant. But this implies that there is such a thing as truth, and that the truth, at least about our own power of knowing, can be discovered. Without such a presupposition, thought cannot be carried on at all. Nor is it a blind presupposition, or animal instinct. For in the perception of first principles, or truths evident by their own light, there is implicit the perception that there is such a thing as truth and knowledge. The error in Descartes' method is its exaggeration. It is wise to be on our guard against the prejudices, or opinions, peculiar to a particular time and place, the place of birth or education, the class or party to which our early associations have attached us; but the principles which are self-evident, or which are accepted by the human race, should be exempted from doubt. It must be remembered, too, that the Church teaches that a Catholic cannot without sin entertain doubts against the Faith; though, of course, he may lawfully doubt whether it is true that a particular doctrine is taught by the Church, or whether he has correctly apprehended what the Church intends to teach, and whether a particular teacher expounds it correctly; or, again, he may investigate the evidences of Christianity and of Catholicism, and may doubt whether a particular argument is valid proof. But the method of doubt, taken as a whole, has been condemned by the Church.

Since, then, some things can be known with certitude, some things can be seen to be probable, and some things must remain forever a matter of doubt; and since the human reason is liable to error, the need has been felt for some criterion or criteria by which we may know that we really know, and by which genuine certitude concerning the truth may be distinguished from the spurious certitude of delusion.

The proper test of truth is evidence, whether the evidence of a truth in itself or by participation in the evidence of some other truth from which it is proved. Many truths, indeed, have to be accepted on authority; but then it has to be made evident that such authority is legitimate, is capable of knowing the truth, and is qualified to teach in the particular department in which it is accepted. Many truths which are at first accepted on authority may afterwards be made evident to the reason of the disciple. Such in fact is the ordinary way in which learning and science are acquired. The error of Bonald's

system of Traditionalism (which was condemned by the Church) consists in its exaggeration, in its maintaining that the truths of natural religion are known solely on authority, that each generation simply inherits them from the preceding, and that unless they had been revealed to the first parents of the race human reason never could have discovered them.

If we take the cognitive faculties, one by one, the senses are not in themselves deceived concerning their proportionate object, but owing to circumstances they are so liable to deception that they need the vigilant supervision of the reason. The nature of sensible phenomena is not their object, but that of the reason. It should be remembered, however, that the scientific theories concerning the nature of sound, of colour and light, and of heat, have been thought out by the aid of data furnished by the senses, and therefore confirm the trustworthiness of the senses within certain limits. That men of science have no doubt as to the reality of extension, figure, movement, and space, any more than of force, is shown by their discussions concerning atoms, electrons, and ions. Consciousness is infallible as to the fact of its present states, e. g. that I am feeling warm, or well, or that I am thinking. The memory often errs, but often is trusted with certitude. Reason, within a narrow sphere, is infallible, viz. in the perception of self-evident truth, e. g. that whatever is *is*, that every movement or change must have a cause, that things equal to the same are equal to each other. Truths which are clearly and easily deducible from self-evident truth share in their certitude. Next to such certitude, we may place the certainty of truths affirmed by the whole human race, especially as regards practical principles. "That which seems to all men, this we say *is;* and he who rejects this ground of belief will not easily assign a more solid one" (Aristotle, Ethics, X, ii). Universal consent is not, however, the sole criterion. To make it such was the error of Lamennais. Besides the truths resting on self-evidence (or easy deduction from it) and those resting on the authority of the human race, there is a considerable body of truth which each man of average intelligence comes to know with certitude in the course of his life. Most of these truths are first learned upon authority and afterwards verified by one's own reflection or experience. It may even be said that a practical Christian in the course of his life has by experiential verification an additional moral certitude of the truth of revelation, since he has experience of the power of the Christian religion to sustain the soul against temptation and to strengthen every virtuous and noble aspiration.

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH CONCERNING CERTITUDE.—The Church pronounces judgment concerning the sphere of certitude, not so much for the sake of speculative knowledge, as in the interest of religion and morality. The mind of the Church upon this subject is manifested (1) by placing books dealing with the question upon the Index, or by obliging ecclesiastics, or teachers in Catholic institutions, or editors of Catholic periodicals to subscribe some proposition; (2) by "condemning" a proposition extracted from some work, in the sense in which it is found in that work; (3) dogmatically, by a solemn affirmation of some truth or the anathematization of a falsehood. When a proposition is "condemned" or anathematized, the contradictory (not the contrary) proposition is asserted as true.

Concerning the sphere of certitude in religion, "Holy Mother Church holds and teaches that God, the first cause (*principium*) and last end of all things, may be known with certainty, by the natural light of the human reason, through the medium of things created" (Vatican Council, Constitut. de Fide Cath., cap. ii); and this affirmation is supported by an anathema of the contradictory proposition (ibid., can. i). The condemnation of the Agnostic position concerning God may be studied in the Encyclical "Pascendi gregis dominici", in which the subject is admirably treated.

That "the freedom of the human will and the spirituality of the soul may be known with certainty, by the natural light of the reason", is a truth which the pope, approving of a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Index, obliged Bonnetty, editor of the "Annales de philosophie chrétienne", in 1855, to subscribe (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", n. 1506). It would seem that these truths concerning the human soul are also in some measure implied in the definition and anathema cited above, concerning our knowledge of God; for the attributes of God are known by the natural reason only, through the things that are made; and therefore freedom and morality must be known to be attributes of some creature before they can be attributed to God.

The limitation of natural knowledge and certitude has been repeatedly asserted by the process of placing books upon the Index, by the "condemnation" of propositions, by papal Briefs, and finally by a dogmatic decree, which alone is sufficient, viz: that of the Vatican Council (De Fide, cap. iv) which declares that "there are two orders of knowledge, distinct both in their source and their object; distinct in their source, for the truths of one order are known by natural reason, and those of the other by faith in divine revelation; and distinct in their object, because, over and above the truths naturally attainable, there are proposed to our belief mysteries hidden in God, which can be known through divine revelation alone". This solemn affirmation is supported by an anathema against any one who shall deny that there is an order of knowledge higher than the natural, or who shall say that man can naturally by progress attain at length to the knowledge of all truth (De Revelat., can. iii). Moreover, even as regards the natural knowledge of God, the Vatican Council teaches that "truths not unattainable by the natural light of the human reason have, by divine mercy, been revealed in order that they may be known by all easily, and *with certainty*, and without any admixture of error" (De Fide, cap. ii).

As regards certitude concerning the fact of Divine revelation, the Vatican Council teaches that the proofs are not, indeed, such as to make assent intellectually necessary (De Fide, cap. iii and can. v), but that they are sufficient to make the belief "agreeable to reason" (*rationi consentaneum*), being "most certain and accommodated to the intelligence of all" (De Fide, cap. iii). Anathema is pronounced against any one who shall say that Divine revelation cannot be made credible by "external signs" but only by "inner experience or personal inspiration" (De Fide, can. iii), and against any one who shall say that "miracles are not possible", or that "miracles can never in any case be certainly known" to be such, or that "by miracles the divine origin of the Christian religion cannot be properly proved" (*rite probari;* De Fide, can. iv). It is, then, moral certitude that is attainable by the reason as to the fact of Divine revelation. The certitude of faith is supernatural, being due to Divine grace, and is superior not merely to moral certitude, but to the certitude of physical science, and to that of the demonstrative sciences. When it is a question whether any particular truth is contained within the deposit of revelation, the certainty of faith can be obtained only from the authority of the "teaching Church", but a human certitude may be obtained by arguments drawn from the inferior and subordinate authorities such as the Fathers and the "Schola Theologica".

JOHN RICKABY, *The First Principles of Knowledge* (London, 1890); NEWMAN, *Grammar of Assent* (London, 1870); W. G.

WARD in *Dublin Review* (1869–73); BALMES, *Fundamental Philosophy*, tr. BROWNSON (New York, 1871); DE COSSOLES, *La certitude philosophique* (Paris, 1883); MIVART, *On Truth* (London, 1889); SCHMID, *Erkenntnisslehre* (Freiburg im. Br., 1890); OLLÉ-LAPRUNE, *La certitude morale* (Paris, 1898); BALFOUR, *Foundations of Belief* (8th ed., London, 1901); MERCIER, *Critériologie générale* (Louvain, 1899); FARGES, *La crise de la certitude* (Paris, 1907).

M. J. RYAN.

Certosa. See CHARTERHOUSE.

Cervantes Saavedra, MIGUEL DE, Spanish author, b. at Alcalá de Henares, Spain, in 1547; d. at Madrid, 23 April, 1616. Of Cervantes it may be most truly said that the narrative of his life is no less fraught with interest than the most exciting novel of adventure. He received the best part of his early training in a school at Madrid conducted by the cleric, Juan Lopez de Hoyos. Despite sundry affirmations to the contrary effect by this or that biographer, he does not seem to have attended any of the universities then flourishing in Spain. However, as was the case with many of the leading Spanish spirits of the age, he had early an opportunity to perfect his training by a sojourn in the land where the movement of the Renaissance had begun, for when but twenty-one years of age, he became attached to the suite of an Italian prelate who was on a mission to the Spanish Court. With this ecclesiastic, later Cardinal Acquaviva, he went to Rome. Once in Italy he doubtless began straightway to familiarize himself with Italian literature, a knowledge of which is so readily discernible in his own productions. He did not find the service of the cardinal to his liking, for in a short time he was figuring as a simple volunteer among the Spanish troops that played a part in the campaign against the Turks. He fought bravely on board a vessel in the great battle of Lepanto in 1571, and was shot through the left hand in such a way that he never after had the entire use of it.

When his wound was healed he engaged in another campaign, one directed against the Moslem in Northern Africa, and then after living a while longer in Italy he finally determined to return home. But the ship on which he was making the trip back to Spain was captured by corsairs, who took him, with his fellow captives, to Algiers. There he spent five years, undergoing great sufferings, some of which seem to be reflected in the episode of the "Captive" in "Don Quixote", and in scenes of the play, "El trato de Argel". Unsuccessful in several attempts at an escape, he was at last ransomed just when he was in great danger of being sent to Constantinople. Had he really been taken there, the world would probably be now without its greatest novel, the imperishable story of the Knight of La Mancha. Back once more in Spain, Cervantes is said, but on no too certain evidence, to have spent a year or two in military service. However that may be, he was certainly engaged in literary pursuits from 1582 on; for about this time, a love affair—his attachment to Catalina de Palacios, whom he soon made his wife—gave the impulse to the first literary work to bring him public notice. This was the "Galatea", a pastoral romance after the manner already established in the peninsula by the "Menina e moca" in Portuguese of Bernardim Ribeiro, and the "Diana enamorada" of Jorge de Montemayor. It is inferior to the "Diana" and as artificial as most works of its kind, still it exhibits a certain power of inventiveness and some depth of real emotion on the part of its author.

Cervantes next turned his attention to the drama, hoping to derive an income from that source; but the plays which he composed failed to achieve their purpose. In the main they show that he was out of his element in purveying for the stage, that he lacked dramatic instinct, and had never mastered the details of the technic of dramatic art. He is least infelicitous in two of his plays, the "Trato de Argel", already mentioned, and the impassioned tragedy, "Numancia". This latter is the best of all his dramas and yet, correctly appreciated, it is rather a powerful patriotic declamation than a piece of real scenic excellence. It was not printed until 1784.

What he did in the years directly following the time when he renounced the hope of becoming a great dramatic poet is hardly clear. It is safe to assume that he was in sore straits, or he would not have been content to earn his livelihood as a collector of taxes in the province of Granada. An irregularity in his accounts, one due rather to some subordinate than to himself, led to his incarceration for a while during 1597 at Seville. If a remark which Cervantes himself makes in the prologue of "Don Quixote" is to be taken literally, the idea of the work, though hardly the writing of its "First Part", as some have maintained, occurred to him in prison. At all events, during this period of tribulation he must have been evolving in his mind the great work of fiction soon to be published as "El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de La Mancha", whereof the first part was printed in 1605. (The English spelling, "Quixote", transliterates an early Spanish spelling with "x", current at a time when "x" and "j" were still frequently interchanged. On etymological grounds the "x" represents the original sound.)

The vogue obtained by Cervantes's story led to the publication of a continuation of it by an unknown who masquerades under the name of Fernández Avellaneda. In self-defence Cervantes produced his own continuation, or "Second Part", of "Don Quixote", which made its appearance some ten years after the first part. Two years before this event, that is, in 1613, he put forth a collection of tales, the "Novelas ejemplares", some of which had been written earlier. Not included in the original form of the "Exemplary Tales" is the novelette, "La tía fingida" (The Fictitious Aunt), now often printed with them. Some critics would deny it to Cervantes, and it appears not to have been printed until 1814. On the whole, the "Novelas ejemplares" are worthy of the fame of Cervantes; they bear the same stamp of genius as the "Don Quixote". The picaroon strain, already made familiar in Spain by the "Lazarillo de Tormes" and its successors, appears in one or another of them, especially in the "Rinconete y Cortadillo", which is the best of all. The remaining works of our author embrace his "Entremeses" (Interludes), little dramatic trifles not wholly negligible; the "Viaje del Parnaso", a rhymed review of contemporary poets, written in *terza rima;* and the "Persiles y Sigismunda", a novel of adventurous travel completed just before his death.

For the world at large, interest in Cervantes centres particularly in "Don Quixote", and this has been regarded chiefly as a novel of purpose. It is stated again and again that he wrote it in order to ridicule the romances of chivalry and to destroy the popularity of a form of literature which for much more than a century had engrossed the attention of a large proportion of those who could read among his countrymen, and which had been communicated by them to the ignorant. Byron has taken a very tragic view of the results wrought by the Spanish romancer; according to him:

> Cervantes smiled Spain's chivalry away,
> And therefore have his volumes done such harm,
> That all their glory, as a composition,
> Was dearly purchased by his land's perdition.

(Don Juan, XIII, 11.) There is a grain of truth, and much exaggeration in Byron's statement. It is true that the Spanish writer set out with the purpose of assailing the books of chivalry; the friend whom he introduces into the prologue of the work asserts that from the beginning to end it is an attack upon them. Moreover, these works had long called for attack. The countless novels of knightly daring which had followed

in the wake of the very worthy "Amadis de Gaula" had obtained an unwonted vogue and had created an air of false idealism which tended to leave Spain unduly in the rear of advancing civilization, for, cherishing them, she clung too closely to the medieval past. Serious historians had cried out against them, so had scholars, theologians, preachers and mystics, and yet many, even the greatest in the land, continued to be no less ardent admirers of them than the innkeeper in the first part of "Don Quixote". For administrative reasons, the Emperor Charles V felt compelled in 1553 to forbid the introduction of the chivalrous romances into the American Indies, and this law the Spanish Parliament would fain have extended to Spain itself in 1558, in order to penalize the further publication of works of the class. But, up to 1602, the novels of knight-errantry continued to appear in constantly new although weaker forms, for this was the date of the "Don Policisne de Beocia" of Juan de Silva. Three years later, Cervantes's book was published, and it instantly accomplished what all previous agitation had failed to achieve, for after its appearance no new chivalresque romance was issued, and the reprinting of the old ones practically ceased.

Now, granting that Cervantes gave the *coup de grace* to the books of chivalry, we must not overlook the consideration that the lasting value of "Don Quixote" is not to be sought in the fact that it killed the taste for the medieval stories of chivalrous adventure, which it parodied with fatal efficiency, but rather in the fact that the author achieved something immeasurably greater than what he had premeditated. He wrote a novel which as a social document has never been surpassed in the annals of narrative fiction, one in which the main interest is found in the behaviour of the two contrasting, yet mutually complementary, figures of Don Quixote and his squire, Sancho Panza, thrown by their creator into contact with a world of materialism, where but scanty respect is entertained for the idealistic past. To say that the decline of Spain is in any way attributable to the success of "Don Quixote" is only Byronic hyperbole; independently of the existence of this marvellous product of the fancy of the genius named Miguel de Cervantes, Spain's loss of its former power is amply explained by political, social, and moral phenomena of various kinds.

From time to time there come forward those who persist in believing that "Don Quixote" was intended to satirize certain important noble personages of the time. It was aimed at the Duke of Lerma, say some; at the Duke of Medina Sidonia, say others. This latter idea was echoed in England by Defoe in the preface to his "Serious Reflections during the Life, and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe" (1720). The sober fact is that no foundation exists for any such interpretations of the author's purpose. In the episodical by-plays, in one or another intercalated tale such as that of Lucinda and Cardenio, there may be veiled references, satirical or not, to noted characters of the time, but we have no reason to suppose that underlying "Don Quixote" as a whole there is any serious satirical purpose other than to attack the romances of pseudo-chivalry. The book was probably intended by Cervantes chiefly as a work of entertainment; as such it succeeded in his time, and as such it still elicits the enthusiastic interest of constantly increasing generations of readers. The many attempts that have been made to detect didactic purposes of different kinds in this or that by-factor of the novel may be regarded as futile. Those persons are far astray who suppose that Cervantes meant to assail the Inquisition, to attack the firmly rooted devotion to the Blessed Virgin, or to deride the clergy as a class.

During its author's lifetime, the first part of the novel passed through at least nine editions in Spanish. The edition of Brussels, 1607, went all over Northern Europe. By that date it was known in England, and it was promptly placed under contribution by the English playwrights. Thus Middleton utilized it, Ben Jonson and Fletcher drew matter from it, and there is even a tradition that Shakespere collaborated with Fletcher in the composition of a play based on one of its episodes. That a stranger should, in view of the success achieved by the book, conceive the idea of writing a sequel to it is not surprising; Cervantes, in fact, invited a continuation of it in the closing words of his first part. Notwithstanding this, he became indignant when the so-called "Avellaneda" published his prolongation of the adventures of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, and he bestirred himself to furnish his own rounding out of the story and to make all other spurious sequels impossible by killing off his hero. As to the personality back of the pseudonym "Avellaneda" many surmises have been made; Lope de Vega has been suggested, so have Tirso de Molina and Juan Ruiz de Alarcón, but all proposed identifications have to be rejected. Whoever "Avellaneda" was, it must be said in simple justice to him that his literary merits are not slight, and that those critics err who seek to minimize them. He certainly reveals much narrative power, considerable humour, a mastery of dialogue, and a forcible style. Of the two parts written by Cervantes, the first has ever remained the favourite. The second part is inferior to it in humorous effect; but, nevertheless, the second part shows more constructive insight, better delineation of character, an improved style, and more realism and probability in its action. The influence exerted by the glorious work has been enormous, for what modern man of genius has not read it? Among the more immediately imitative writings may be mentioned: in French, Charles Sorel's "Berger extravagant" and Marivaux's "Pharsimond"; in English, Butler's "Hudibras", Mrs. Charlotte Lennox's "The Female Quixote", and Smollett's "Sir Launcelot Greaves"; in German, Wieland's "Don Silvio Rosala". English and French playwrights have borrowed liberally also from the "Exemplary Tales", Hardy, Fletcher, Massinger, and Rowley, to mention but a few, are much indebted to them.

As a story, the "Persiles y Sigismunda", just completed at the time of Cervantes's death, and published posthumously, is less interesting than his other narrative works. The element of adventurous travel by sea and land, of which much is made in the late Greek romances, is prominent here; it contains a bewildering entanglement of love episodes, and the characters are always narrating interminable tales which delay the progress of the action. As a result the work is too prolix and becomes somewhat tedious despite the exuberance of fancy and fertility of resource that characterize it. Its rhetoric is more pompous, and in general there is in it greater elaboration of style than Cervantes was wont to show in his compositions.

Obras completas, ed. HARTZENBUSCH (12 vols., Madrid, 1863–4); *Obras* (exclusive of the plays), in *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, I; *Don Quijote*, critical ed. of text by FITZMAURICE-KELLY and ORMSBY (2 vols., London, 1899–1900); critical ed. by CORTEJON (Madrid, 1905); annotated ed. by CLEMENCIN (6 vols., Madrid, 1833–39), reprinted in *Biblioteca clásica;* translations into English by SHELTON, SMOLLETT, JERVIS, MOTTEUX, and ORMSBY. PASTOR, *Documentos Cervantinos* (2 vols., Madrid, 1897–1902); RIUS, *Bibliografía crítica de las obras de Cervantes* (3 vols., 1895); ASHBEE, *An Iconography of Don Quixote* (London, 1895); IDEM, *Some Books about Cervantes* (1900); articles by FOULCHE-DELBOSC, in *Revue hispanique* (Paris), VI–VII; MOREL-FATIO, in his *Etudes sur l'Espagne* (2nd ser., 2nd ed., Paris, 1895); FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *Life of Cervantes* (London, 1892); IDEM, *Introductions* to several vols. in English trans. of *Complete Works of Cervantes* (Glasgow, 1901); IDEM, *History of Spanish Literature* (see bibliography at the end of the French trans. of this (Paris, 1904); LUDWIG, *Zur Biographie des Cervantes*, in *Zeitschrift f. vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte* (new ser.), XVI, 1 sqq.; SCHEVILL, *Studies in Cervantes* in *Modern Philology* (1906); MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO, *Cultura literaria de Cervantes*, in *Revista de archivos*, etc. (May 1905).

J. D. M. FORD.

Cervantes, Salazar Francisco, b. at Toledo, Spain, probably in 1513 or 1514, went to Mexico in 1550, died there in 1575. He deserves mention, especially as one of the first professors of the University of Mexico, established by order of Charles V, and opened formally, 25 January, 1553. Cervantes occupied the chair of rhetoric. He wrote several important works on the history of the city of Mexico and the province of New Spain in general. In Spain he was a professor at the University of Osuna. He was a man of solid learning and of considerable influence during his lifetime. Of his numerous writings the "Dialogos Latinos" are best known. They give in three parts a description of the young city of Mexico as it was about 1554, and notes valuable to the historian and archæologist. Not less interesting is the "Túmulo Imperial de la gran Ciudad de México", printed 1560, and reprinted in 1886 by Ycazbalceta in his "Bibliografía". It refers to the funeral honours celebrated at Mexico on the occasion of the death of Charles V, and gives not only a minute description of the ceremonies, but of the decorations and temporary structures raised for the occasion, with one fairly executed plate. For the customs of the times it is highly valuable. The "Dialogos" were published at Mexico in 1554 in the original Latin, and in 1875 Ycazbalceta republished them in Latin, with an excellent Spanish translation and valuable notes. Cervantes has left several other works, mostly of a theological nature, and it is known that he also wrote a "History of Mexico" which is lost, but was highly praised by those who were able to consult the manuscript.

Ycazbalceta, *Tres Dialogos latinos que Francisco Cervantes Salazar escribió é imprimió en México* (Mexico, 1875); Idem, *Bibliografía Mexicana* (Mexico, 1886); Beristain de Souza, *Biblioteca hispano-americana* (Mexico, 1816); Archbishop Moya de Contreras, *Carta-Relacion* (March 24, 1575), in *Cartas de Indias* (Madrid, 1878); Antonio, *Biblioteca hispana nova* (various editions, but notice insufficient); Eguiara y Egúren, *Biblioteca mexicana* (Mexico, 1755, incomplete).

Ad. F. Bandelier.

Cervia, Diocese of (Cerviensis), suffragan of Ravenna. Cervia is a city in the province of Ravenna, Italy, on the ancient Via Flaminia in a marshy district not far from the sea. It was called anciently *Phicoclæ*, but took its present name before 997, perhaps after the destruction of the city by fire in 708. Its political vicissitudes are more or less the same as those of Ravenna. During the episcopate of Bishop Rustico (1219), Cervia was placed under an interdict for its maltreatment of an envoy of the Archbishop of Ravenna. The first known Bishop of Cervia is St. Gerontius. He was returning with Viticanus, Bishop of Cagli, from the Roman council held in 501 to treat accusations made against Pope Symmachus, when he was assaulted and killed by bandits. (The legend says "heretics", perhaps Goths, or more probably Heruli, of the army of Odoacer.) His relics are venerated at Cagli. Other bishops worthy of mention were: the Venetian Pietro Barbo (1440), later Pope Paul II; Bonifacio Bevilacqua (1601), afterwards Cardinal, and an intimate friend of Gregory XV, who made him Duke of Fornano. The diocese has a population of 12,696, with 12 parishes, 26 churches and chapels, 43 secular priests, and 1 religious house of women.

Cappelletti, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), II, 557–78; Forlivesi, *Cervia* in *Cenni Storici* (Bologna, 1889); *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 389.

U. Benigni.

Cesalpino (Cæsalpinus), Andrea, physician, philosopher, and naturalist, distinguished above all as a botanist, b. at Arezzo in Tuscany, Italy, 6 June, 1519; d. at Rome, 23 February, 1603. For his studies at the University of Pisa his instructor in medicine was R. Colombo (d. 1559), and in botany the celebrated Luca Ghini (d. 1556). After completing his course he taught philosophy, medicine, and botany for many years at the same university, besides making botanical explorations in various parts of Italy. At this time the first botanical gardens in Europe were laid out; the earliest at Padua, in 1546; the next at Pisa in 1547 by Ghini, who was its first director. Ghini was succeeded by Cesalpino, who had charge of the Pisan garden 1554-1558. When far advanced in years Cesalpino accepted a call to Rome as professor of medicine at the Sapienza and physician to Pope Clement VIII. It is not positively certain whether he also become the chief superintendent of the Roman botanical garden which had been laid out about 1566 by one of his most celebrated pupils, Michele Mercati (1541-1593). All of Cesalpino's writings show the man of genius and the profound thinker. His style, it is true, is often heavy, yet in spite of the scholastic form in which his works are cast, passages of great beauty often occur. Modern botanists and physiologists who are not acquainted with the writings of Aristotle find Cesalpino's books obscure; their failure to comprehend them has frequently misled them in their judgment of his achievement. No comprehensive summing up of the results of Cesalpino's investigations, founded on a critical study of all his works, has appeared, neither has there been a complete edition of his writings. Seven of these are positively known, and most of the seven have been printed several times, although none have appeared since the seventeenth century. In the following list the date of publication given is that of the first edition. His most important philosophical work is "Quæstionum peripateticarum libri V" (Florence, 1569). Cesalpino proves himself in this to be one of the most eminent and original students of Aristotle in the sixteenth century. His writings, however, show traces of the influence of Averroes, hence he is an Averroistic Aristotelean; apparently he was also inclined to Pantheism, consequently he was included, later, in the Spinozists before Spinoza. A Protestant opponent of Aristotelean views, Nicholas Taurellus (d. 1606, at Altdorf), who is called "the first German philosopher", wrote several times against Cesalpino. The work of Taurellus entitled "Alpes cæsæ", etc. (Frankfort, 1597), is entirely devoted to combating the opinions of Cesalpino, as the play on the name Cæsalpinus shows. Nearly one hundred years later Cesalpino's views were again attacked, this time by an Englishman, Samuel Parker (d. 1688), in a work entitled: "Disputationes de Deo et providentiâ divinâ" (London, 1678).

Cesalpino repeatedly asserted the steadfastness of his Catholic principles and his readiness to acknowledge the falsity of any philosophical opinions expounded by him as Aristotelean doctrine, which should be contrary to revelation. In Italy he was in high favour both with the secular and spiritual rulers. Cesalpino's physiological investigations concerning the circulation of the blood are well known, but even up to the present time they have been as often overestimated as undervalued. An examination of the various passages in his writings which bear upon the question shows that although it must be said that Cesalpino had penetrated further into the secret of the circulation of the blood than any other physiologist before William Harvey, still he had not attained to a thorough knowledge, founded on anatomical research, of the entire course of the blood. Besides the work "Quæstionum peripateticarum" already mentioned, reference should be made to "Quæstionum medicarum libri duo" (Venice, 1593), and to his most important publication "De plantis libri XVI" (Florence, 1583). This last work has made Cesalpino immortal; the date of its publication, 1583, is one of the most important in the history of botany before Linnæus. The permission to print the book is dated 27 September, 1581. The work is dedicated to the

Grand Duke Francesco de' Medici; including dedication and the indexes, it contains some 670 quarto pages, of which 621 are taken up with the text proper. Unlike the "herbals" of that period, it contains no illustrations. The first section, including thirty pages of the work, is the part of most importance for botany in general. From the beginning of the seventeenth century up to the present day botanists have agreed in the opinion that Cesalpino in this work, in which he took Aristotle for his guide, laid the foundation of the morphology and physiology of plants and produced the first scientific classification of flowering plants. Three things, above all, give the book the stamp of individuality: the large number of original, acute observations, especially on flowers, fruits, and seeds, made, moreover, before the discovery of the microscope; the selection of the organs of fructification for the foundation of his botanical system; finally, the ingenious and at the same time strictly philosophical handling of the rich material gathered by observation. Cesalpino issued a publication supplementary to this work, entitled: "Appendix ad libros de plantis et quæstiones peripateticas" (Rome, 1603). Cesalpino is also famous in the history of botany as one of the first botanists to make a herbarium; one of the oldest herbaria still in existence is that which he arranged about 1550–60 for Bishop Alfonso Tornabono. After many changes of fortune the herbarium is now in the museum of natural history at Florence. It consists of 260 folio pages arranged in three volumes bound in red leather, and contains 768 varieties of plants. A work of some value for chemistry, mineralogy, and geology was issued by him under the title: "De metallicis libri tres" (Rome, 1596). Some of its matter recalls the discoveries made at the end of the eighteenth century, as those of Lavoisier and Haüy; it also shows a correct understanding of fossils. The Franciscan monk, Karl Plumier (d. 1704), gave the name of Cesalpinia to a species of plants, and Linnæus retained it in his system. At the present day this species includes not over forty varieties and belongs to the sub-order Cæsalpinioideæ (family Leguminosæ), which contains a large number of useful plants. Linnæus in his writings often quotes his great predecessor in the science of botany and praises Cesalpino in the following lines:

Quisquis hic exstiterit, primos concedat honores
Cæsalpine Tibi primaque certa dabit.

Linnæus, *Classes plantarum* (Halle-Magdeburg, 1757); Fuchs, *A. Cæsalpinus* (Marburg, 1798); Flourens, *Histoire de la découverte de la circulation du sang* (Paris, 1857); Sachs, *Geschichte der Botanik* (Munich, 1875), an exhaustive work but somewhat one-sided and not always right in its judgments; Haser, *Geschichte der Medizin* (Jena, 1881), II; Marchesini, *La dottrina di A. Cesalpino* in *Rivista ital. di filos.* (1891); Saccardo, *Il primato degli italiani nella botanica* (Padua, 1893); Idem, *La botanica in Italia* (Venice, 1895), contains a bibliography on p. 49; Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Berlin, 1901), III.

Joseph Rompel.

Cesarini, Giuliano (also known as Cardinal Julian), b. at Rome, 1398; d. at Varna, in Bulgaria, 10 November, 1444. He was one of the group of brilliant cardinals created by Martin V on the conclusion of the Western Schism, and is described by Bossuet as the strongest bulwark that the Catholics could oppose to the Greeks in the Council of Florence. He was of good family and was educated at Perugia, where he studied Roman law with such success as to be appointed lecturer there, Domenico Capranica and Nicholas of Cusa being among his pupils. When the schism was ended by the universal recognition of Martin V as pope, Giuliano returned to Rome, where he attached himself to Cardinal Branda. Suggestions of wide reform were rife, and the principles of the outward unity of the Church and its reformation from within became the ideals of his life. In 1419 he accompanied Branda on his difficult mission to Germany and Bohemia, where the Hussites were in open rebellion. The cardinal thought so highly of his services that he used to say that, if the whole Church were to fall into ruin, Giuliano would be equal to the task of rebuilding it. He had all the gifts of a great ruler, commanding intellectual powers, and great personal charm. He was a profound scholar and a devoted Humanist, while his private life was marked by sanctity and austerity. In 1426 Martin V created him cardinal and sent him to Germany to preach a crusade against the reformers who were committing grievous excesses there. After the failure of this appeal to arms Cesarini was made President of the Council of Basle in which capacity he successfully resisted the efforts of Eugene IV to dissolve the council, though later (1437) he withdrew from the opposition, when he perceived that they were more anxious to humiliate the pope than to accomplish reforms. When the reunited council assembled at Ferrara he was made head of the commission appointed to confer with the Hussites and succeeded at least in winning their confidence. In 1439, owing to a plague, the council was transferred from Ferrara to Florence, where Cesarini continued to play a prominent part in the negotiations with the Greeks. After the successful issue of the council, Cesarini was sent as papal legate to Hungary (1443) to promote a national crusade against the Turks. He was opposed to the peace which Ladislaus, King of Hungary and Poland, had signed at Szegedin with Sultan Amurath III, and persuaded the former to break it and renew the war. It was an unfortunate step and resulted in the disastrous defeat of the Christian army at Varna in 1444, when Cardinal Giuliano was slain in his flight. His two well-known letters to Æneas Sylvius about the pope's relations to the Council of Basle are printed among the works of Pius II (Pii II Opera Omnia, Basle 1551, p. 64).

Vespasiano da Bisticci, *Vite di Uomini illustri*, first printed at Rome, 1763; also printed in Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum*, I, 166–184; and in the new ed. of Vespasiano (Bologna, 1892), I. Jenkins, *The Last Crusader: The Life and Times of Cardinal Julian* (London, 1861); Pastor, *History of the Popes*, tr. Antrobus (London, 1899), I; Gregorovius, *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*, tr. Hamilton (London, 1900), VII, Part I, Bk. XIII, i, ii; Chevalier, *Rep.: Bio-bibl.* (Paris, 1905–1907) gives an extensive bibliography.

Edwin Burton.

Cesena, Diocese of (Cæsenatensis). The ancient *Cæsena* is a city of Emilia, in the province of Forlì

Cesena and Castle of the Malatesta
(Fifteenth Century)

(Italy), in the former States of the Church. It is situated picturesquely on a hill at the base of which flows the Savio. It was probably of Gallic origin, and was taken by the Romans in the third century B. C. It was destroyed during the civil wars between Marius and Sylla. After the overthrow of the Ostrogoths it became a part of the exarchate.

By the Donation of Pepin (752) it became a fief of the Holy See, which was confirmed in its possession by Rudolph of Hapsburg (1278). In medieval times it was governed by various families, e. g. the Ordelaffi di Forlì and the Malatesta, the latter being remembered for their justice and good government. After the death of Cæsar Borgia, Cesena, with the rest of Romagna, acknowledged the immediate authority of the Holy See (1503). Among its many famous men we may mention two popes: Pius VI (Gian Angelo Braschi) and Pius VII (Barnaba Chiaramonti). The best known of its bishops were: St. Maurus (d. 946); Gian Battista Acciaioli (1332), exiled by Francesco degli Ordelaffi; Gregorio Malesardi (1408), who built the cathedral; Jacopo (1379), under whom occurred the massacre ordered by the pseudo-pope, Clement VII; the Dominican Vincenzo Maria Orsini, later Benedict XIII. Cesena is suffragan of Ravenna and has 59 parishes, 66,700 inhabitants, and possesses 5 convents for men and 8 for women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia*, II, 525–56; BRASCHI, *Memoriæ Cæsenates* (Rome, 1738); *Annales Cæsen.* in MURATORI, *Rer. Ital. Script.*, XIV, 1089–1186.

U. BENIGNI.

Ceslaus, SAINT, b. at Kamien in Silesia, Poland (now Prussia), about 1184; d. at Breslau about 1242. He was of the noble family of Odrowatz and a relative, probably a brother, of St. Hyacinth. Having studied philosophy at Prague, he pursued his theological and juridical studies at the University of Bologna, after which he returned to Cracow, where he held the office of canon and custodian of the church of Sandomir. About 1218 he accompanied his uncle Ivo, Bishop of Cracow, to Rome. Hearing of the great sanctity of St. Dominic, who had recently raised to life the nephew of Cardinal Orsini, Ceslaus, together with St. Hyacinth, sought admission into the Order of Friars Preachers. They received the religious habit from the hands of St. Dominic in the convent of Santa Sabina. Their novitiate completed, St. Dominic sent the two young religious back as missionaries to their own country. Establishing a monastery at Friesach in Austria, they proceeded to Cracow, whence Ceslaus was sent by St. Hyacinth to Prague, the metropolis of Bohemia.

Labouring with much fruit throughout the Diocese of Prague, Ceslaus went to Breslau, where he founded a large monastery, and then extended his apostolic labours over a vast territory, embracing Bohemia, Poland, Moravia, Pomerania, and Saxony. Sometime after the death of St. Hyacinth he was chosen provincial of Poland. Whilst he was superior of the convent of Breslau all Poland was threatened by the Tatars. The city of Breslau being besieged, the people sought the aid of St. Ceslaus, who by his prayers miraculously averted the impending calamity. Four persons are said to have been raised to life by him. Having always been venerated as a saint, his cult was finally confirmed by Clement XI in 1713. His feast is celebrated throughout the Dominican Order on 16 July.

Acta SS., 16 July, IV; CHRZÁSZCY, *Drei schlesische Landesheilige, der heil. Hyacinth, der selige Ceslaus, und die heil. Bronislawa* (Breslau, 1897); CHRISIUS, *Vergnügungen müssiger Stunden*, V, 106 sq.; *Pol. Jahrb. der Stadt Breslau*, I, 51, 57; V, 62.

A. WALDRON.

Cestra, a titular see of Asia Minor. Hierocles (709), Georgius Cyprius (ed. Gelzer, p. 836), and Parthey (Notitiæ episcopatuum) place this city in Isauria, as a suffragan of Seleuceia. Bishop Epiphanius was present at Chalcedon in 451, and subscribed the letter to Emperor Leo in 458 (Lequien, II, 1025). Another, Elpidius, was a partisan of Severus (Chronique de Michel le Syrien, ed. Chabot, 267; Brooks, The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, 159, 161). Lequien supposes that the town was situated near the River Cestros, in Pamphylia, and took its name from that stream. This inadmissible hypothesis caused an odd mistake in the "Gerarchia cattolica" (Rome, 1895, 302), according to which Cestra is Ak-Sou; this is the name of the River Cestros, not a city. The site has not yet been identified.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cethim. See CYPRUS.

Ceylon, an island (266½ miles long and 140½ miles broad), to the south-east of India and separated from it only by a chain of reefs and sand-banks called Adam's Bridge. The maritime districts, which are flat and low, are distinguished from the central parts, which are mountainous, by great difference in temperature. The mean temperature has been calculated at 76.3°, the lowest being 28.2° at Newera Eliya, and the highest 103.8° at Anuradhapura, the ancient sacred capital of the island. The climate of Ceylon is influenced by two monsoons: the south-west prevailing from May to September, and the north-east from November to February. Pidurutalagala (8296 ft.) is the highest mountain, and Adam's Peak (7353 ft.) is the best known, as containing the legendary footprints of Buddha worshipped by Buddhists and Mohammedans alike, and as the yearly resort of a multitude of pilgrims. The country is well watered by rivers, of which the Kelani-ganga enters the sea at Colombo, the capital of the island, and the Mahaviliganga at Trincomalee. Ceylon is rich in vegetation and scenery, and as the traveller proceeds from Colombo to Kandy (the seat of the ancient kings) and thence to Newara Eliya, it presents a panorama of beauty. The country abounds in tropical fruits, such as pineapples, plantains, oranges, and mangoes, and in such trees as ebony, satin, calamander, and ironwood. The plantations produce, principally, cocoanuts and cinnamon, tea, cinchona, cocoa, and, more recently, rubber. The most noted up-country product formerly was coffee. This has given place to tea, Ceylon now being one of the chief tea-growing countries in the world. The island has from very ancient times been famous for its gems, of which the chief are sapphires, rubies, and cat's-eyes; the Gulf of Manaar on the north-west coast is the scene of the famous pearl fishery. Plumbago or graphite is the only mineral product of any importance. The animal kingdom is well represented in Ceylon, which has from olden times been renowned for its elephants.

HISTORY AND PEOPLE.—Ceylon's history goes back to a remote past. Galle in the south of the island is by some believed to be the seaport of ancient Tarshish from which King Solomon drew his "ivory, apes, and peacocks". Under the name of Taprobane it was known to the ancient Greeks and Romans. Hence Milton's reference to Ceylon as "India's utmost isle, Taprobane". To the people of India, however, it was "Lanka", the resplendent, a name still in use. It is celebrated in the great Indian epic, the "Ramayana" in which is related the story of the abduction of the Indian Princess Sita by Ravena, King of Ceylon, and of the war which followed in consequence. We pass from legend to actual history at about the year 543 B.C. when Wijeya, a prince of Northern India, invaded Ceylon and conquered the natives known as *Yakkos* and, having married the native princess Kuveni, settled in the country with his 700 followers. Wijeya was son of King Sihabahu, "the slayer of the lion" (*siha* or *sinha*), hence the name "Sinhalese", given to the people of Ceylon. The Sinhalese (Cingalese) being thus the descendants of the Wijeyan settlers belong to the Aryan stock, and their language and customs bear out this origin. The wild men of Ceylon, known as the Veddas, "hunters", who inhabit a small area in the remote interior of the island and live principally by the bow and arrow, are the representatives of the aboriginal inhabitants whom Wijeya subdued. The Wijeyan dynasty was not allowed undis-

puted sway in Ceylon, for from the third century B. C. Tamil princes from Southern India made incursions into Ceylon, while at times the tide of invasion was rolled back into India by the much-harassed Sinhalese. The Sinhalese kings most famous for success in their conflict with the Tamils, as well as for the internal development of the country during their reigns, were Dutugemunu (200 B. C.), Gajabahu (100 B. C.), and Prakramabahu (A. D. 1150). The ancient capital of the Sinhalese kings was Anuradhapura, whose splendour is even now attested by its vast ruins. In the eighth century it was transferred to Polonnaruwa, which was soon abandoned to the conquering Tamils. The seat of government was thence shifted to various places, until in the fifteenth century it was finally fixed at Kandy, now the second city of the island and famous for the Buddhist temple known as the "Dalada Maligawa", the repository of the tooth-relic of Buddha. During this period of trouble the trade of the country fell principally into the hands of the Arabs. Many of these formidable warriors settled in the maritime parts of the island; their trading instincts are inherited by their descendants, generally known as "Moors"; with accretions from their co-religionists of the neighbouring continent they form the Mohammedan community of Ceylon.

It was in the beginning of the sixteenth century that modern Europe first came in contact with Ceylon. In 1505 a Portuguese fleet, while operating in the Indian seas against Arab traders, touched accidentally at Galle on the southern coast; in 1517 the Portuguese re-appeared and with the consent of the Sinhalese king established a factory at Colombo. The Portuguese having begun as traders soon made themselves political masters of the entire sea-board, forts were established, and European civilization was introduced. In 1658 the Portuguese were driven out by their rivals the Dutch, who then added Ceylon to their East Indian possessions. The descendants of the Dutch, being the product of intermarriage with the Portuguese and the natives, constitute the "Burgher" community of Ceylon. The English first cast their eyes upon Ceylon in 1782 during the war with Holland, when a British force reduced and took possession of Trincomalee, which was, however, soon retaken by the French and restored to the Dutch. But in 1795 an appeal came to the British from the Sinhalese king who was then maintaining an unequal contest against Dutch aggression, and in 1796 the Dutch were overcome by the British forces and yielded Ceylon to England; the cession was formally confirmed by the Treaty of Amiens in 1802. The English thus succeeded the Portuguese and the Dutch in the possession of the maritime districts of the island, but the central provinces were still under the feeble rule of the Sinhalese king who reigned at Kandy. The king was out of favour with his subjects on account of his cruelty and misgovernment, and at the request of the disaffected chiefs a British force was dispatched to Kandy in 1815. King Sri Wickrama Raja Sinha was taken prisoner and the Kandyan provinces were added to the British Crown which has since held the sovereignty of the whole of Ceylon. What may be called the indigenous population of Ceylon comprises various races; to which must be added the European residents either in the employ of the Government or engaged in commerce or industries, and the Indian immigrants, some of whom carry on a petty trade, but who in their larger number constitute the labour-supply of the island. The chief native races are: (1) the Sinhalese, consisting of the low-country Sinhalese and the up-country or Kandyan Sinhalese; (2) the Tamils, inhabiting chiefly the Northern and Eastern Provinces; (3) the Moors; (4) the Burghers. According to the decennial census of 1901 the total population of Ceylon was 3,565,954 distributed according to nationality as follows: Sinhalese, 2,330,807; Tamils, 951,740; Moors, 228,034; Burghers, 23,482; Europeans, 6,300; others, 25,591. The last includes the Veddas of Ceylon (3971) who are gradually disappearing.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.—Ceylon has the distinction of being the premier Crown Colony of England. It is accordingly under the direct control of the Secretary of State for the Colonies whose authority, subject to the will of the sovereign and the Imperial Parliament, is supreme. The local administration is vested in a governor assisted by an executive council and a legislative council. The executive council is an advisory board and consists of the colonial secretary, the officer commanding the military forces, the attorney-general, the auditor-general, and the treasurer. The legislative council whose president is the governor comprises the members of the executive council and twelve other members, of whom four are official and eight unofficial. The unofficial members who are nominated by the governor, subject to the approval of the secretary of state, represent (1) the low-country Sinhalese; (2) the Kandyan Sinhalese; (3) the Tamils; (4) the Moors; (5) the Burghers; (6) the European merchants; (7) the European planters, and (8) the general European community. The unofficial members are supposed to be selected in accordance with the wishes of the respective communities, though this is not often the case, except in regard to the mercantile and planter members whose selection is practically left to the Ceylon Chamber of Commerce and the Ceylon Planters' Association respectively. The members of the legislative council may speak and vote on all questions brought forward; still not only are the official members in the majority but they are bound to vote for the Government in matters of policy, whatever their private opinions may be. For administrative purposes Ceylon is divided into provinces, of which there are now nine, viz.: the Western, Central, Northern, Southern, Eastern, North-Western, North Central, Uva, and Sabaragamuwa, each of which is presided over by a superior officer called the Government agent. Other important departments are those of the director of public works, the surveyor-general, the principal collector of customs, the registrar-general of lands, the principal civil medical officer, and the director of public instruction. The civil service is recruited in England by means of a competitive examination which is open to all British subjects including Ceylonese; a limited number of locally-born persons appointed by the governor form a subordinate service, while the minor officers in the clerical service are partly selected by competitive examination and partly nominated without examination. Colombo, Kandy, and Galle have municipal councils the members of which are partly elected by the rate-payers and partly nominated by the governor, and local boards are established in many smaller towns. An important part of the machinery of government in the country districts is the system of native headmen of various grades, who perform both revenue and police duties under the direction of the Government agents or their assistants.

LAW AND JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION.—The Dutch, during the existence of their rule, had applied to Ceylon their admirable system of laws known as the Roman-Dutch Law, and after the annexation of the country by England it was declared by proclamation, dated 23 September, 1799, that the administration should thenceforth "be exercised according to the laws and institutions that had subsisted under the ancient government of the United Provinces" of Holland, subject to such deviations and alterations as might thereafter be enacted. Accordingly the Roman-Dutch Law became and has continued to be what may be called the common law of Ceylon, but by various subsequent ordinances and other legislative enact-

ments this law has been either repealed or modified. In addition to the general laws applicable to the whole island, there are certain special laws or customs peculiar to certain communities in matters relating to inheritance, marriage, and other personal questions. Thus, the Moors are governed in such matters by their own customs, which conform more or less to the general Mohammedan law as found in the Koran and the commentaries thereon. The Tamil inhabitants of the Jaffna peninsula, or what is now the Northern Province, have their customary code of laws known as the "Thesawalamai" (customs of the country), and similarly the Kandyan Sinhalese observe their ancient customs, which they were allowed to retain by the Kandyan Convention made between the British and the chiefs on the annexation of the Kandyan provinces. These various systems of laws are administered by a series of courts, viz: (1) the Supreme Court of Judicature, consisting of a chief justice and three puisne judges with unlimited original criminal jurisdiction and an appellate jurisdiction with an ultimate appeal to His Majesty the King in civil cases above 5000 rupees in value; (2) District courts, with unlimited original civil jurisdiction and limited criminal jurisdiction; (3) Courts of Request, with limited civil jurisdiction; (4) Police courts, which are courts both of trial and of preliminary investigation for committal to the Supreme Court or District courts; (5) Gansabhawas, or village tribunals, which have jurisdiction over natives in regard to small civil claims and trivial offences, especially breaches of communal rules, and in which the proceedings are conducted in the native language of the inhabitants.

Marriage.—In the eye of the law all marriages are civil contracts and may be contracted freely between persons who are not within prohibited degrees of kindred or within the prohibited ages. The law now applicable generally in the island is the Ordinance No. 2 of 1895, under which a marriage may be entered into before the registrar of marriages after certain formalities as to previous notice of marriage and the issue of a certificate thereof, while marriage by special license is also provided for. But the ordinance so far recognizes the Christian views of marriage that according to it the parties holding the above-mentioned registrar's certificate as to notice may present themselves to a Christian minister and have the ceremony performed in a place of Christian worship. In this case the minister is required to register the marriage in a book and to transmit a duplicate of the entry to the registrar of marriages, and the ordinance further provides that no minister shall be compelled to solemnize a marriage between persons either of whom shall not be a member of the church denomination or body to which such minister belongs nor otherwise than according to the rules, customs, rites, and ceremonies of such church denomination or body. An absolute divorce can be obtained only by decree of court after full inquiry and upon the ground either of adultery or malicious desertion or incurable impotency at the time of marriage. The ordinance above mentioned does not apply to the Moors, who, as already indicated, are governed by the Mohammedan law both as to marriage and divorce, nor to the Kandyan Sinhalese, with regard to whom there is a special ordinance (No. 3, of 1873) which, while abolishing their ancient custom of "associated marriages" or polyandry and in other respects giving effect to British public policy, makes provision for the contract of marriage and its dissolution in a manner more or less in conformity with ancient Kandyan sentiment, such as the liberty to dissolve marriage by mutual consent without the intervention of a court of justice. The main difference, however, between marriages generally and Kandyan marriages is that, while in regard to the former, registration is the best though not the only proof of marriage, thus admitting of proof *aliunde* of an actual marriage or the presumption of a valid marriage from cohabitation and repute, registration is essential in the case of the latter. The system of caste prevails in Ceylon though not in such a vigorous form as in India, and while the contact with Western civilization has weakened social barriers in many respects, intermarriage between various castes does not take place to any appreciable extent among the pure native population.

Education.—The educational system of Ceylon is as simple as it is efficient, and is controlled by the Department of Public Instruction. It comprises English, vernacular, and mixed schools, which are either Government or (with the exception of private unregistered schools) "Grant-in-Aid schools". The Government maintains an English high school called the Royal College, having the standard of an English grammar school. It maintains also a technical school mainly for the purpose of supplying the Government departments, and a training school for teachers. The Grant-in-Aid schools belong to the missionary and other religious bodies, and receive yearly grants according to certain scales on the result of examinations in secular subjects held by Government inspectors. The system of payment by results has helped to solve the religious difficulty so often experienced in many other countries. The chief institutions belonging to religious communities and having the same status as the Royal College are St. Thomas's College (Anglican), Wesley College (Wesleyan), St. Joseph's College (Catholic), and Ananda College (Buddhist). Ceylon forms a centre for the Cambridge University local examinations, which are largely used as educational tests. The Government also maintains a medical college whose diploma is a qualification for practising medicine. Law studies for the admission of advocates and proctors (solicitors) are under the control of a Council of Legal Education consisting of the judges of the Supreme Court and a number of members of the Bar. There is no special organization for the systematic prosecution of the study of Oriental languages and literature, but one at least of the temple schools conducted by the Buddhist priesthood, in which Sanscrit and Pali are taught, receives a subsidy from the Government. According to the statistics published for 1905 the number of the Government schools and the scholars was 554 and 70,715; and of the Grant-in-Aid schools, 1582 and 156,040.

Religion.—The chief religions in Ceylon are Buddhism, Hinduism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity. Buddhism is professed by the great bulk of the Sinhalese population. Being first propounded by Gautama Buddha in Magadha in Northern India in the sixth century B. C., it was introduced into Ceylon in the reign of the Sinhalese King Devanampiyatissa about 300 B. C., when the great Buddhist King Asoka of India sent his son Mahinda to Ceylon to preach the faith. The Sinhalese king became a zealous convert and under his patronage the new religion spread rapidly among his subjects. Ceylon thus became a stronghold of Buddhism, and it was here that the Buddhist scriptures were first reduced to writing in 88 B. C. The magnificent ruins of *dagobas* and *viharas* in the ancient cities attest the piety of the ancient kings and people of Ceylon. Buddhism suffered much during the Tamil wars, with the further consequence that by reason of the contact thus brought about with India popular Buddhism received an admixture of Hinduism which is still traceable in the *devalas* in which Kali and other Hindu gods are worshipped by the Buddhists. After the advent of Europeans to Ceylon and the consequent introduction of Western civilization, Buddhism lost much of its prestige just as it had previously lost much of its purity and activity. But within the last twenty-five years there has been a great Buddhist revival, mainly due to the efforts of the Theosophical Society founded by Col.

Olcott and Madame Blavatsky. Schools have sprung up, pride in the ancient religion has revived, and under the leadership of educated Buddhists the masses have learned to resist Christian influences and have even shown a spirit of aggression. The large majority of the Tamil population are Hindus, especially in the Northern and Eastern Provinces, and the form of Hinduism most in favour is Sivaism or the worship of Siva. Besides the Moors already mentioned a community of Malays, said to be descendants of the natives of Java imported into Ceylon during the Dutch period and recruited by later immigrants from the Straits Settlements, profess Mohammedanism.

The first form of Christianity in Ceylon was of course Catholicism. The conversion of heathens was part of the public policy of the Portuguese, and accordingly we find that in 1518 a number of Franciscan friars arrived in Ceylon and under the protection of the Portuguese Government, preached the Faith, and converted many thousands. We read of many churches built and many monasteries established within the Portuguese territories, and of the conversion of many even of noble and royal blood among the Sinhalese. Among the more notable converts was Prince Dharmapala, grandson of a Sinhalese king, who was baptized and crowned king in Lisbon in 1541 under the name of Don Juan and reigned a Christian monarch in Ceylon from 1542 to 1597. About this time also took place the visit to Ceylon of St. Francis Xavier, the Apostle of the East, by whom large numbers were converted to the Faith, especially among the Tamils of the North. Catholicism progressed until it encountered the antagonism of the Dutch who were all of the Dutch Reformed Church, and who made that form of Christianity the established religion of the State. The Catholic religion was proscribed during the Dutch rule, penal laws were enacted, and the Catholics suffered severe persecution. Nevertheless the light of the Faith was not wholly extinguished and the practice of religion was continued especially through the exertions of missionaries from the Portuguese settlement of Goa, who amidst persecution and hardship ministered to the Catholic people and even converted many heathens. A new era, however, dawned with the conquest of the island by the British Government which put in practice the principles of religious liberty, though the Church of England became in turn the established form of Christianity. The greater part of the "Dutch Christians" among the natives were either absorbed by the Anglican Church or relapsed into Buddhism, and at the present day Dutch Presbyterianism is represented only by a few hundred Dutch descendants who are served by Presbyterian ministers from Scotland. The Church of England in Ceylon is governed by a bishop who is suffragan to the Bishop of Calcutta. The clergy consist of members of the Church Missionary Society and of the sister Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The Anglican Church continued to be maintained by the Government till the year 1881 when by act of the local legislature it was disestablished and provision was made for the constitution of a synod, consisting of clergy and laity under the presidency of the bishop, for the regulation of its affairs, and for the election of trustees to hold and administer its property and funds. Other Protestant bodies are: Wesleyan Methodist mission, begun in 1814, it holds many important stations and does much for education; Baptist Missionary Society, first missionary landed in Ceylon in 1812; American Mission (Congregationalists), under the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, whose work is confined to the Tamils of the Northern Province. The decennial census of 1901 gave the following religious statistics: Buddhists, 2,141,404; Hindus, 826,826; Christians, 349,239; Mohammedans, 246,118; others, 2367. The Christians were: Catholics, 287,119; Anglicans, 32,514; Presbyterians, 3337; Wesleyan Methodists, 14,991; Baptists, 3309; Congregationalists, 2446. Authentic Catholic statistics gave a total of 293,929 Catholics in 1904 and this number has since probably reached 300,000.

The Catholic Church, as the above figures show, is the largest Christian body in the island. As it was first in the field, so it has been the most fruitful in results. At the date of the British occupation (1796) the Catholic population was only 50,000. At first Ceylon was under the jurisdiction of the Portuguese Diocese of Cochin with a local vicar-general. In 1834 it was erected into a separate vicariate Apostolic by Pope Gregory XVI, and in 1845, as the Catholics were increasing in numbers, the island was divided into two vicariates Apostolic, Colombo and Jaffna, the former being entrusted to the Benedictine Congregation of the Silvestrines, and the latter to the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Again, in 1883, the central provinces of the island were separated from Colombo and constituted as the Vicariate Apostolic of Kandy under the same Benedictines, while Colombo was transferred to the Oblates. The year 1886 witnessed a notable development of the Church in Ceylon, the Right Rev. C. Bonjean, O. M. I., being then the Vicar Apostolic of Colombo, the Right Rev. C. Pagnani, O. S. B., the Vicar Apostolic of Kandy, and the Right Rev. A. Melizan, O. M. I., the Vicar Apostolic of Jaffna. In that year the Holy See by agreement with the Crown of Portugal abolished the royal patronage which had been exercised in the East Indies from the time of the Portuguese domination; as a consequence, and in accordance with the needs of the time, the Catholic hierarchy was established in India and Ceylon. Monsignor (afterwards cardinal) Agliardi was sent as delegate Apostolic to put in force the new arrangements and on the 6th of January, 1887, the hierarchy was formally established in Ceylon, Bishop Bonjean being appointed Archbishop of Colombo, Dr. Pagnani, Bishop of Kandy, and Dr. Melizan, Bishop of Jaffna. Further changes took place in 1893, when two new dioceses, Galle and Trincomalee, were formed from the Archdiocese of Colombo, and the Diocese of Jaffna respectively. Jesuits of the Belgian province were placed in the former and Jesuits of the French province in the latter, with Fathers Van Reith, S. J. and Lavigne, S. J. as the first bishops. These five bishops have assisting them nearly 200 priests, both European and native, and communities of Sisters of the Good Shepherd, the Sisters of the Holy Family, the Franciscan nuns, Missionaries of Mary, the Little Sisters of the Poor, and the Sisters of Charity of Jesus and Mary, in charge of various schools and institutions. Although Monsignor Agliardi was sent especially to establish the hierarchy, the Apostolic Delegation to the East Indies was intended to be permanent; accordingly when he departed in 1887 he was succeeded by Monsignor Aiuti, who in turn was succeeded in 1892 by Monsignor Ladislaus M. Zaleski, who took up his residence at Kandy. At the same time the Holy See took steps to place the education and the supply of native priests in the East on a solid and more secure basis, and accordingly in 1893 a general seminary was established by Leo XIII, which is conducted by professors of the Society of Jesus at Kandy, Ceylon, the students being of various nationalities and races, recruited from all parts of the East. The Catholic bishops are on excellent terms with the British Government and are held in high esteem by the people of the island generally. Their legal status, however, was not quite assured in respect of succession to ecclesiastical property though no practical difficulty was experienced; but the Supreme Court of Ceylon, having recently held that the Catholic bishops had no legal corporate capacity and could not

therefore claim, merely by virtue of their office, title to property held by their predecessors, the legislature, in consequence of representations made to the Government on the subject, passed the Ordinance No. 19 of 1906, whereby the Catholic archbishop and bishops, and their respective successors, appointed according to the laws and usages of the Catholic Church, are constituted corporations sole with perpetual succession, and with full power to acquire and hold all species of property, and to sue or be sued in respect of such property in all courts of justice. While the ecclesiastical system of the Church is thus complete, the Catholic laity are not backward in respect to organization and public action, for in addition to various religious and social institutions they have formed an association representative of all Catholics under the name of "The Catholic Union of Ceylon", having for its object the protection and advancement of Catholic interests. The general statistics for 1905 are: churches and chapels, 592; schools, 570, with 45,549 pupils; seminaries, 5, with 174 students (in the central or "Leonianum" Seminary at Kandy there are 88); orphan asylums, 16, with 975 orphans; 133 European secular priests, 43 native priests, and 288 religious (Oblates, Jesuits, Benedictines); and 430 sisters in the various educational and charitable institutions.

Catholic Directory (Madras, 1908); *Ceylon Handbook and Directory* (Colombo, 1908); TENNENT, *A History of Ceylon* (London, 1860); CARPENTER, *From Adam's Peak to Elephanta* (London, 1904); *Statesman's Year Book* (London, 1908) 120–27.

T. E. DE SAMPAYO.

Chabanel, NOEL, Jesuit missionary among the Huron Indians, b. in Southern France, 2 February, 1613; slain by a renegade Huron, 8 December, 1649. Chabanel entered the Jesuit novitiate at Toulouse at the age of seventeen, and was professor of rhetoric in several colleges of the Society in the province of Toulouse. He was highly esteemed for virtue and learning. In 1643, he was sent to Canada and, after studying the Algonquin language for a time, was appointed to the mission of the Hurons, among whom he remained till his death. In these apostolic labours he was the companion of the intrepid missionary, Father Charles Garnier. As he felt a strong repugnance to the life and habits of the Indians, and feared it might result in his own withdrawal from the work, he nobly bound himself by vow never to leave the mission, and he kept his vow to the end. In the "Relation" of 1649–50, Father Ragueneau describes the martyr deaths of Chabanel and Garnier, with biographical sketches of these two fathers.

THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations*, Sketch XXIII, 328, Eulogy, XXXV, 151–59, and XL, 37–43; SHEA, *History of the Catholic Missions* (New York, 1855), 194; *Menology of the English-speaking Assistancy* (Roehampton, 1902), II, 273; TANNER, *Societas Jesu Militans* (German ed.), 687.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Chabor. See HABOR.

Chachapoyas, DIOCESE OF, in Peru, created by Pius VII in 1803, under the name of Chachapoyas and Maynas; made a suffragan to Lima by Gregory XVI in 1843, under the name of Chachapoyas. It has about 96,000 souls, divided into 45 parishes. The population of the episcopal city is about 6,000; it has a fine cathedral.

HERNAEZ, *Colección de bulas, breves*, etc. (Brussels, 1876); BATTANDIER, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1907), 221.

J. MONTES DE OCA Y OBREGÓN.

Chadwick, JAMES, second Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, b. at Drogheda, Ireland, 24 April, 1813; d. at Newcastle, 14 May, 1882, and buried at Ushaw. He was the third son of a gentleman of an old Catholic Lancashire family, John Chadwick, who had settled in Ireland, and an Irish lady, Frances Dromgoole. He was educated at Ushaw College from May, 1825, until his ordination as priest on 17 Dec., 1836. He then was general prefect at the college for three years, after which he taught humanities until he was appointed professor of philosophy, a post he occupied for five years. In 1849 he became vice-president of the college and professor of dogmatic theology. After a few months his health broke down, and he found the change he needed among a little body of secular priests who devoted themselves to preaching missions and retreats. In 1856 their house at Wooler was burnt, and Father Chadwick returned once more to Ushaw as professor of philosophy. From 1859 to 1863 he was chaplain to Lord Stourton, but again returned to Ushaw as professor of pastoral theology. He was fulfilling these duties when he was elected bishop of the diocese in 1866; he was consecrated 28 Oct. in the college chapel by Archbishop Manning. For sixteen years he ruled the diocese, and for one year during that time (1877) he also held the dignity of president of Ushaw, being the eighth in that office. A man of great personal dignity and charm, he is remembered for his meekness and sweetness of manner. His works include: an edition of Leuthner's "Cœlum Christianum" (London, 1871); "St. Teresa's Own Words: Instructions on the Prayer of Recollection" (Newcastle, 1878); "Instructions How to Meditate" (published anonymously), and many pastoral letters.

BRADY, *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy* (Rome and London, 1877); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1885), I, 444; ANON., *Records and Recollections of Ushaw* (Preston, 1889), 127; LAING, *Ushaw College Centenary Memorial* (Newcastle, 1895), 222–23.

EDWIN BURTON.

Chagas, ANTONIO DAS. See FONSECA SOARES, ANTONIO DA.

Chaignon, PIERRE, b. at Saint-Pierre-la-Cour, Mayenne, France, 8 October, 1791, entered the Society of Jesus 14 August, 1819; d. at Angers, 20 Sept., 1883. He passed his whole life in the ministry, chiefly in the spiritual direction of priests. In thirty years he gave three hundred retreats to the clergy of the principal dioceses of France. His chief literary work is his "Méditations sacerdotales" which has appeared in several languages, Bohemian, Polish, Italian, and English. Bishop De Goesbriand of Burlington, Vermont, U. S. A., translated it into English from the eleventh edition. Chaignon wrote also "Le salut facilité aux pécheurs par la dévotion au très saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie"; "Les six dimanches de St. Louis de Gonzague"; "Le prêtre à l'autel"; "Paix de l'âme"; and also several brochures on a good death, the jubilees of 1869 and 1875, etc. He established a Union of Prayer for Deceased Priests which was canonically erected into a confraternity in 1861.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* (Paris, 1891), V, 11; *Lettres de Jersey* (1885); SEJOURNÉ, *Vie du P. Chaignon* (Paris, 1888); *Sacerdotal Meditations*, tr. DE GOESBRIAND (Montpelier, Vt., 1889), Preface.

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Chair of Peter.—Under this head will be treated: I. The annual Feast of the Chair of Peter (*Cathedra Petri*) at Rome; II. The Chair itself.

I. THE ANNUAL FEAST OF CATHEDRA PETRI AT ROME.—From the earliest times the Church at Rome celebrated on 18 January the memory of the day when the Apostle held his first service with the faithful of the Eternal City. According to Duchesne and de Rossi, the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" (Weissenburg manuscript) reads as follows: "XV KL. FEBO. Dedicatio cathedræ sci petri apostoli qua primo Rome petrus apostolus sedit" (fifteenth day before the calends of February, the dedication of the Chair of St. Peter the Apostle in which Peter the Apostle first sat at Rome). The Epternach manuscript (Codex Epternacensis) of the same work, says briefly: "cath. petri in roma" (the Chair of Peter in Rome).

In its present (ninth-century) form the "Martyro-

logium Hieronymianum" gives a second feast of the Chair of St. Peter for 22 February, but all the manuscripts assign it to Antioch, not to Rome. Thus the oldest manuscript, that of Berne, says: "VIII kal. mar. cathedræ sci petri apostoli qua sedit apud antiochiam". The Weissenburg manuscript says: "Natl [natale] sci petri apostoli cathedræ qua sedit apud antiocia." However, the words *qua sedit apud antiochiam* are seen at once to be a later addition. Both feasts are Roman; indeed, that of 22 February was originally the more important. This is clear from the Calendar of Philocalus drawn up in the year 354, and going back to the year 311; it makes no mention of the January feast but speaks thus of 22 February: "VIII Kl. Martias: natale Petri de cathedra" (eighth day before the Calends of March, the birthday [i. e. feast] of the Chair of Peter). It was not until after the insertion of Antioch in the copies of the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" that the feast of February gave way in importance to that of

Chair of St. Peter (Vatican Basilica)

January. The Roman Church, therefore, at an early date celebrated a first and a second assumption of the episcopal office in Rome by St. Peter. This double celebration was also held in two places, in the Vatican Basilica and in a cemetery (*cæmeterium*) on the Via Salaria. At both places a chair (*cathedra*) was venerated which the Apostle had used as presiding officer of the assembly of the faithful. The first of these chairs stood in the Vatican Basilica, in the baptismal chapel built by Pope Damasus; the neophytes *in albis* (white baptismal robes) were led from the baptistery to the pope seated on this ancient cathedra, and received from him the *consignatio*, i. e. the Sacrament of Confirmation. Reference is made to this custom in an inscription of Damasus which contains the line: "una Petri sedes, unum verumque lavacrum" (one Chair of Peter, one true font of baptism). St. Ennodius of Pavia (d. 521) speaks of it thus ("Libellus pro Synodo", near the end): "Ecce nunc ad gestatoriam sellam apostolicæ confessionis uda mittunt limina candidatos; et uberibus gaudio exactore fletibus collata Dei beneficio dona geminantur" (Behold now the neophytes go from the dripping threshold to the portable chair of the Apostolic confession; amid abundant tears called forth by joy the gifts of Divine grace are doubled). While therefore in the apse of the Vatican Basilica there stood a cathedra on which the pope sat amid the Roman clergy during the pontifical Mass, there was also in the same building a second cathedra from which the pope administered to the newly baptized the Sacrament of Confirmation. The Chair of St. Peter in the apse was made of marble and was built into the wall, that of the baptistery was movable and could be carried. Ennodius calls the latter a *gestatoria sedes;* throughout the Middle Ages it was always brought on 22 February from the above-mentioned *consignatorium* or place of confirmation to the high altar. That day the pope did not use the marble cathedra at the back of the apse but sat on this movable cathedra, which was, consequently, made of wood. The importance of this feast was heightened by the fact that 22 February was considered the anniversary of the day when Peter bore witness, by the Sea of Tiberias, to the Divinity of Christ and was again appointed by Christ to be the Rock of His Church. According to very ancient Western liturgies, 22 February was the day "quo electus est 1. Petrus papa" (on which Peter was first chosen pope). The Mass of this feast calls it at the beginning: "solemnitatis prædicandæ dies præcipue nobilis in quo .... beatus Bar-Jona voce Redemptoris fide devotâ prælatus est et per hanc Petri petram basis ecclesiæ fixus est", i. e. this day is called especially praiseworthy because on it the blessed Bar-Jona, by reason of his devout faith, was raised to pre-eminence by the words of the Redeemer, and through this rock of Peter was established the foundation of the Church. And the *Oratio* (collect) says: "Deus, qui hodiernâ die beatum Petrum post te dedisti caput ecclesiæ, cum te ille vere confessus sit" (O God, who didst this day give us as head of the Church, after Thyself, the Blessed Peter, etc.).

The second of the aforementioned chairs is referred to about 600 by an Abbot Johannes. He had been commissioned by Pope Gregory the Great to collect in special little phials oil from the lamps which burned at the graves of the Roman martyrs (see Catacombs; Martyr) for the Lombard queen, Theodolinda. According to the manuscript list of these oils preserved in the cathedral treasury of Monza, Italy, one of these vessels had on it the statement: "oleo de sede ubi prius sedit sanctus Petrus" (oils from the chair where St. Peter first sat). Other ancient authorities describe the site as "ubi Petrus baptizabat" (where Peter baptized), or "ad fontes sancti Petri; ad Nymphas sancti Petri" (at the fountain of Saint Peter). Formerly this site was pointed out in the *cæmeterium majus* (principal cemetery) on the Via Nomentana; it is now certain that it was on the Via Salaria, and was connected with the *cæmeterium*, or cemetery, of Priscilla and the villa of the Acilii (Acilii Glabriones), situated above this catacomb. The foundation of this villa, showing masonry of a very early date (*opus reticulatum*), still exists. Both villa and cemetery, in one of whose burial chambers are several epitaphs of members of the family, or *gens*, of the Acilii, belong to the Apostolic Period. It is most probable that Priscilla, who gave her name as foundress to the catacomb, was the wife of Acilius Glabrio, executed under Domitian. There is hardly any doubt that the site, "ubi prius sedit sanctus Petrus, ubi Petrus baptizabat" (where Saint Peter first sat, where Peter baptized), should be sought, not in an underground *cubiculum* (chamber) in the catacombs, but in an oratory above ground. At least nothing has been found in the oldest part of the cemetery of Priscilla now fully excavated, referring to a cathedra, or chair.

The feast of the *Cathedra Petri* was therefore celebrated on the Via Salaria on 18 January; in the Vatican Basilica it was observed on 22 February. It is easy to believe that after the triumph of Christianity the festival could be celebrated with greater pomp in the magnificent basilica erected by Constantine the Great over the *confessio*, or grave of Peter, than in a

chapel far distant from the city on the Via Salaria. Yet the latter could rightly boast in its favour that it was there Saint Peter first exercised at Rome the episcopal office ("ubi prius sedit sanctus Petrus", as Abbot Johannes wrote, or "qua primo Rome petrus apostolus sedit", as we read in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" at 18 January). This double festival of the Chair of St. Peter is generally attributed to a long absence of the Apostle from Rome. As, however, the spot, "ubi s. Petrus baptizabat, ubi prius sedit" was distant from the city, it is natural to think that the second feast of the cathedra is connected with the opening of a chapel for Christian worship in the city itself.

II. The Chair Itself.—The Goths, who conquered and pillaged Rome in 410, advanced towards the city by the Via Salaria and the Via Nomentana; the same roads were traversed in the sixth and seventh centuries by later German invaders of Roman territory. Not only the churches, therefore, but even the cemeteries on these thoroughfares were easily given to plunder and devastation. We have seen, moreover, that as late as 600 a lamp was burning on the site "ubi prius sedit sanctus Petrus". If the original chair of the Apostle had still been there at that time, would it have been saved from destruction in the pillage that did not spare the sarcophagi in the catacombs? The words of the Abbot Johannes, "oleo de sede, ubi prius sedit sanctus Petrus", seem to leave scarcely a doubt as to this. The fact, evidenced by the martyrologies (see above), that by the ninth century one of the two feasts of the Roman cathedra had drifted away to Antioch, shows that the cathedra of the Via Salaria must have perished as early as the sixth or seventh century.

We come now to the question, where stood originally the chair shown and venerated in the Vatican Basilica during the fourth century? On the strength of ancient tradition it has been customary to designate the church of Santa Pudenziana as the spot where, in the house of the supposed Senator Pudens, the two great Apostles not only received hospitable entertainment, but also held Christian services. But the legends connected with Santa Pudenziana do not offer sufficient guarantee for the theory that this church was the cathedral and residence of the popes before Constantine. At the close of his Epistle to the Romans (xvi, 5), St. Paul mentions a place where religious services were held, the house of Aquila and Prisca (*τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν*—now Santa Prisca on the Aventine). Aquila and Prisca are first among the many to whom the Apostle sends salutations. Aquila's connexion with the Catacomb of Priscilla is still shown by the epitaphs of that burial place. In 1776 there was excavated on the Aventine, near the present church of Santa Prisca, a chapel with frescoes of the fourth century; in these frescoes pictures of the two Apostles were still recognizable. Among the rubbish was also found a gilded glass with the figures of Peter and Paul. The feast of the dedication of this church (an important point) still falls on the same day as the above-described cathedra feast of 22 February; this church, therefore, continued to celebrate the traditional feast even after the destruction of the object from which it sprang. In the crypt of Santa Prisca is shown a hollowed capital, bearing in thirteenth-century letters the inscription: Baptismus Sancti Petri (Baptism of Saint Peter), undoubtedly the echo of an ancient tradition of the administration of baptism here by Peter. In this way we have linked together a series of considerations which make it probable that the spot "ubi secundo sedebat sanctus Petrus" (where Saint Peter sat for the second time), must be sought in the present church of Santa Prisca; in other words, that the chair referred to by St. Damasus was kept there in the period before Constantine. It was there, consequently, that was celebrated the "natale Petri de cathedrâ", set for 22 February in the calendars beginning with the year 354. It follows also that this is the cathedra referred to in the oldest *testimonia* which speak of the chair from which Peter taught at Rome. The (third-century) poem, "Adversus Marcionem", says (P. L., II, 1099):—

> Hâc cathedrâ, Petrus quâ sederat ipse, locatum
> Maxima Roma Linum primum considere iussit.

(On this chair, where Peter himself had sat, great Rome first placed Linus and bade him sit.) Further, St. Cyprian, writing about 250, during the vacancy of the chair after the death of Pope St. Fabian, describes it as follows: "Cum locus Fabiani, id est locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret" (when the place of Fabian, i. e. the place of Peter and the step of the sacerdotal chair were vacant). Still earlier, about 200, Tertullian writes, in his "De præscriptione hæreticorum": "Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident. Si Italiæ adjaces habes Romam" (Visit the Apostolic churches in (among) which the very chairs of the Apostles still preside in their places. If you are near Italy, there is Rome).

How Pope Damasus might be led to transfer the *Cathedra Petri* from Santa Prisca to the Vatican, can be readily understood from the circumstances of that time. From the reign of the first Constantine the Lateran had been the residence of the popes, and its magnificent basilica their cathedral, while the neighbouring baptistery of Constantine served for the solemn administration of baptism on the eve of Easter. In the half-century from 312 to 366 (date of the accession of Damasus), the importance of Santa Prisca, its baptistery, and its cathedra must naturally have declined. Damasus could therefore be certain of the approval of all Rome when he transferred the venerable Apostolic relic from the small chapel in Santa Prisca to his own new baptistery in the Vatican, where it certainly remained to the first quarter of the sixth century, after which it was kept in different chapels of the Vatican Basilica. During the Middle Ages it was customary to exhibit it yearly to the faithful; the newly-elected pope was also solemnly enthroned on this venerable chair, a custom that ceased at the transfer of the papal capital to Avignon, in the early part of the fourteenth century. In order to preserve for posterity this precious relic, Alexander VII (1655–67) enclosed, after the designs of Bernini, the *Cathedra Petri* above the apsidal altar of St. Peter's in a gigantic casing of bronze, supported by four Doctors of the Church (Ambrose, Augustine, Athanasius, Chrysostom). Thenceforth, for 200 years, it was not exhibited to the public. In 1867, however, on the occasion of the eighteenth centenary of the martyrdom of the two great Apostles, it was exposed for the veneration of the faithful. At that time the Alessandri brothers photographed the chair, and that photograph is reproduced here. The seat is about one foot ten inches above the ground, and two feet eleven and seven-eighths inches wide; the sides are two feet one and one-half inches deep; the height of the back up to the tympanum is three feet five and one-third inches; the entire height of the chair is four feet seven and one-eighth inches. According to the examination then made by Padre Garucci and Giovanni Battista de Rossi, the oldest portion (see illustration, preceding page) is a perfectly plain oaken arm-chair with four legs connected by cross-bars. The wood is much worm-eaten, and pieces have been cut from various spots at different times, evidently for relics. To the right and left of the seat four strong iron rings, intended for carrying-poles, are set into the legs. At a later date, perhaps in the ninth century, this famous chair was strengthened by the addition of pieces of acacia wood. The latter wood has inlaid in it a rich ornamentation of ivory. For the adornment of the

front of the seat eighteen small panels of ivory have been used, on which the labours of Hercules, also fabulous animals, have been engraved; in like manner it was common at this period to ornament the covers of books and reliquaries with ivory panels or carved stones representing mythological scenes. The back is divided by small columns and arches into four fields and finishes at the top in a tympanum which has for ornamentation a large round opening between two smaller ones. The tympanum is surrounded on all sides by strips of ivory engraved in arabesques. At the centre of the horizontal strip a picture of an emperor (not seen in the illustration) is carved in the ivory; it is held to be a portrait of Charles the Bald. The arabesque of acanthus leaves filled with fantastic representations of animals, and the rough execution of the work, would make the period of this emperor (884) a probable date. What still remains of the old cathedra scarcely permits an opinion as to the original form. In any case it was a heavy chair made of plain, straight pieces of wood, so that it cannot be considered a *sella curulis* of Pudens, as earlier tradition held it to be. If the four rings on the two sides belong to the original chair (Ennodius of Pavia about the sixth century used the term *sedes gestatoria* as an expression universally understood in reference to this chair), then it was probably an ordinary carrying-chair, such as was commonly used in ancient Rome.

While the two chairs were the visible memorials of the earliest origins of Peter's Apostolic work at Rome, the recollection of his first arrival in the city is still preserved in the *litaniæ majores* (greater litanies) on 25 April. On this day is also celebrated the feast of St. Mark, whom St. Peter had sent to Alexandria in Egypt. Antioch and Alexandria, the two most important patriarchates of the East, were, in common with Rome, founded by Peter. Gregory the Great refers as follows to this spiritual relationship with the Roman Patriarchate of the West, in a letter to the Patriarch Eulogius (P. L., LXXVII, 899): "Quum multi sint Apostoli, pro ipso autem principatu sola Apostolorum principis sedes in auctoritate convaluit, quæ in tribus locis unius est. Ipse enim sublimavit sedem, in quâ etiam quiescere et præsertim vitam finire dignatus est. Ipse decoravit sedem, in quâ Evangelistam (Marcum) discipulum misit. Ipse firmavit sedem, in quâ septem annis, quamvis discessurus, sedit. Quum ergo unius atque una sit sedes, cui ex auctoritate divinâ tres nunc episcopi præsident, quidquid ego de vobis boni audio, hoc mihi imputo" (Though there are many Apostles, pre-eminence of authority belongs permanently to none other than the Chair of the Prince of the Apostles, which Chair, though established in three places remains nevertheless that of one and the same [Apostle]. He lifted it to the highest dignity in the place [Rome] where he deigned to fix his residence and end his life. He honoured it in the city [Alexandria] to which he sent his disciple, the Evangelist Mark. He strengthened it in the city [Antioch] where, though destined to depart, he sat for seven years. Since therefore the Chair in which now by divine authority three bishops preside is the identical chair of the self-same [Peter], I take to myself whatever good I hear concerning you).

We conclude, therefore, that there is no reason for doubting the genuineness of the relic preserved at the Vatican, and known as the *Cathedra Petri*. According to Eusebius, Jerusalem preserved the cathedra of St. James (Hist. Eccl., VII, xix), Alexandria that of St. Mark (G. Secchi, La cattedra alessandrina di San Marco, Venice, 1853). Tertullian, in the above-quoted passage, refers to the value placed by the Apostolic Churches on the possession of the chairs of their founders (apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsident), and in enumerating them he puts Rome first. Moreover, the other writers above quoted, and whose testimony reaches back to the second century, all postulate the presence in Rome of an actual *Cathedra Petri*. See also PETER, SAINT; PRIMACY.

The most exhaustive study of these subjects is that of DE ROSSI, in *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana* (Rome, 1867), 33, sqq.—Cf. STEVENSON, in KRAUS, *Realencyklopädie d. christlichen Alterthümer* (Freiburg im Br., 1886), II, 156–61; SANGUINETTI, *De Sede romanâ beati Petri, etc., commentarius historico-criticus* (Rome, 1867); RAMPOLLA, *De Cathedrâ romanâ beati Petri* (Rome, 1868); NORTHCOTE-BROWNLOW, in *Roma Sotterranea*, I, 494; BARNES, *St. Peter in Rome and his Tomb on the Vatican Hill* (London, 1900), 35, 55, 79–82; SMITH AND CHEETHAM (non-Catholic), *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (Hartford, 1880), II, 1625–27.—Among the older works consult, PHŒBEUS, *De identitate Cathedræ Petri Romanæ libri II* (Rome, 1666); ed. PIERALISI (Rome, 1886); TORRIGIO, *Grotte Vaticane* (Rome, 1639); CANCELLIERI, *De Secretariis basilicæ Vaticanæ* (Rome, 1788); *Acta SS.*, June, V, 425–75; also FOGGINI, *De romano beati Petri itinere* (Florence, 1741; and MAMACHI'S similar work, Rome, 1872). Cf. ZACCARIA, *De sancti Petri apost. princ. primatu* (Rome, 1776).

For the feast of the Chair see KELLNER, *Die Feste Cathedra Petri und des antiochenischen Episkopats dieses Apostels*, in *Zeitschrift f. kath. Theologie* (1889), XIII, 566–76; MARUCCHI, *Le memorie dei SS. Apostoli Pietro e Paolo nella città di Roma* (ibid., 1894); MORIN, *Un sermon ancien pour la fête de la Chaire de St-Pierre*, in *Revue bénéd.*, 1896, XIII, 343–46. Cf. BENEDICT XIV, *Su le feste della Cattedra di San Pietro, due dissertazioni inedite* (Rome, 1828). ANTON DE WAAL.

Chalcedon, a titular see of Asia Minor. The city was founded 676 B. C. by the Megarians on the Bithynian coast, opposite the place where a little later Byzantium rose. It was captured by the Persian general Otanes after the expedition of Darius against the Scythians. Allied alternately with Athens and Sparta, it became eventually a part of Bithynia, and in 74 B. C. passed over to the Romans, who lost it temporarily to Mithradates. In the imperial period it was a free city, but was dismantled by Valens (364–78). The Persians held it from 616 to 626. Chalcedon was the birthplace of the philosopher Xenocrates, a disciple of Plato, and of the sculptor Beotes. The virgin St. Euphemia and her companions suffered martyrdom there, probably under Galerius (305–11). It is in her magnificent church that the Fourth General Council against Eutyches, known as the Council of Chalcedon (451), was held. This church was situated on the top of the hill at Haïdar-Pasha (Haider Pasha); it was destroyed by Suleiman to build his mosque in Constantinople. Among other martyrs who suffered at Chalcedon mention may be made of the Persian St. Sabel and his companions. Chalcedon was an episcopal see at an early date; after the great council it became a metropolis, but without suffragans. There is a list of its bishops in Lequien (I, 599), completed by Anthimus Alexoudes in "Anatolikos Aster" (XXX, 108), revised for the early period by Pargoire in "Echos d'Orient" (III, 85, 204; IV, 21, 104). Among others are St. Adrian, a martyr; St. John; Sts. Cosmas and Nicetas, during the Iconoclastic period; Maris, the Arian; Heraclianus, who wrote against the Manichæans and the Monophysites; Leo, persecuted by Alexius Comnenus. The titular Latin see is suffragan of Nicomedia. Lequien (III, 1019) mentions eight Latin bishops, from 1345 to 1443; Eubel (I, 190; II, 141) has ten names, from 1293 to 1525. Five other titular bishops of the sixteenth century are mentioned in the "Revue bénédictine" (1904, 144–45, 155–56).

Chalcedon is to-day Kadi-Keui (Kadikoi). It has about 30,000 inhabitants: 15,000 Greeks, 5000 Armenians (500 Catholics), 2000 Latins, 6000 Mussulmans, 2000 Jews 200 Protestants. The Latin parish is conducted by the Assumptionists; they have also a seminary for Catholic Greeks, with a Greek chapel, and a high school for Oriental studies, which publishes a review, the "Echos d'Orient". The Christian Brothers have there a large college with commercial and elementary courses. The Dames de Sion have a school for girls; the Sisters of the Immaculate Conception of Lourdes a convent;

the Capuchins a scholasticate. There are also public chapels belonging to the Franciscans and the Catholic Armenians. The Armenian Sisters of the Immaculate Conception have a house at Chalcedon, and the Armenian Mechitarists a college. Two Greek churches, one Armenian, and one English Protestant church complete the list of Christian institutions. At Haïdar-Pasha, the port of Kadi-Keui and head station of the Anatolian railway to Bagdad, the Assumptionists have a public chapel, and there are schools conducted by the Christian Brothers and the Oblate Sisters of the Assumption, also a synagogue, German Protestant and Jewish schools, and an English cemetery, with a monument to the soldiers who died in the Crimean War. At Fanaraki (ancient Hiereia) the Assumptionists have a chapel, and the Oblate Sisters of the Assumption a school. Near Kadi-Keui and within the limits of the Greek diocese are places of interest. Scutari is the Turkish name of Chrysopolis, a city which the Mussulmans consider sacred on account of its cemetery and its beautiful mosques. It has a hospital for lepers and a Catholic church, cared for by Georgian Benedictines, also schools in charge of the Marists and of Sisters of Charity. It was there that Licinius was defeated by Constantine (324); there also lived St. Maximus, the Confessor (580–662), the hero of the Monothelite controversies. Tchiboukli, on the Bosphorus, is the Byzantine Irenaion, where stood the famous monastery of the Acœmetæ, founded by St. Marcellus; at Kalamish (the port of Eutropius) lived the stylite, St. Luke; Djadi-Bostan is the ancient Rufiniana, where the famous councils *Ad Quercum* were held in 397 and 403. In the vicinity were the monasteries of St. Hypatius and St. John. On the Kaish-Dagh lived St. Auxentius, St. Bendidianus, and St. Stephen, and at Touzla (Cape Acritas) St. Athanasius of Paulopetrion and St. Gregory. Finally, in full view of Kadi-Keui, are the celebrated Prince's Islands, with their numberless political and ecclesiastical associations.

LEQUIEN, *Oriens Christianus* (1740), I; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.* (London, 1878); *Echos d'Orient*, III, 85 sqq.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Chalcedon, COUNCIL OF, the Fourth Œcumenical Council, held in 451, from 8 October until 1 November inclusive, at Chalcedon, a city of Bithynia in Asia Minor. Its principal purpose was to assert the orthodox Catholic doctrine against the heresy of Eutyches and the Monophysites, although ecclesiastical discipline and jurisdiction also occupied the council's attention. Scarcely had the heresy of Nestorius concerning the two persons in Christ been condemned by the Council of Ephesus, in 431, when the opposite error of the Nestorian heresy arose. Since Nestorius so fully divided the Divine and the human in Christ that he taught a double personality or a twofold being in Christ, it became incumbent on his opponents to emphasize the unity in Christ and to exhibit the God-man, not as two beings but as one. Some of these opponents in their efforts to maintain a physical unity in Christ held that the two natures in Christ, the Divine and the human, were so intimately united that they became physically one, inasmuch as the human nature was completely absorbed by the Divine. Thus resulted one Christ, not only with one personality but also with one nature. After the Incarnation, they said, no distinction could be made in Christ between the Divine and the human. The principal representatives of this teaching were Dioscurus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Eutyches, an archimandrite or president of a monastery outside Constantinople. The Monophysitic error, as the new doctrine was called (Gr. *μόνη φύσις*, one nature), claimed the authority of St. Cyril, but only through a misinterpretation of some expressions of the great Alexandrine teacher.

The error of Eutyches was first detected by Domnus, Patriarch of Antioch. A formal accusation was preferred against the former by Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylæum (Phrygia), at a synod of Constantinople in November of that year. This synod declared it a matter of faith that after the Incarnation, Christ consisted of two natures (united) in one hypostasis or person; hence there was one Christ, one Son, one Lord. Eutyches, who appeared before this synod, protested, on the contrary, that before the Incarnation there were two natures, but after the union there was only one nature in Christ; and the humanity of Christ was not of the same essence as ours. These statements were found contrary to Christian orthodoxy; Eutyches was deposed, excommunicated, and deprived of his station in the monastery. He protested, and appealed for redress to Pope Leo I (440–61), to other distinguished bishops, and also to Theodosius II. Bishop Flavian of Constantinople informed Pope Leo and other bishops of what had occurred in his city. Eutyches won the sympathy of the emperor; through the monk's representations and those of Dioscurus, Patriarch of Alexandria, the emperor was induced to convoke a new council, to be held at Ephesus. Pope Leo, Dioscurus, and a number of bishops and monks were invited to attend and investigate anew the orthodoxy of Eutyches. The pope was unable to go, but sent three delegates as his representatives and bearers of letters to prominent personages of the East and to the impending synod. Among these letters, all of which bear the date of 13 June, 449, is one known as the "Epistola Dogmatica", or dogmatic letter, of Leo I, in which the pope explains the mystery of the Incarnation with special reference to the questions raised by Eutyches. Thus, he declares that after the Incarnation what was proper to each nature and substance in Christ remained intact and both were united in one person, but so that each nature acted according to its own specific qualities and characteristics. As to Eutyches himself, the pope did not hesitate to condemn him. The council was held at Ephesus, in August, 449. Only the friends and partisans of Dioscurus and Eutyches were allowed to have a voice. The Alexandrine patriarch presided; he ignored the papal delegates, would not permit the letters of Pope Leo, including the "Epistola Dogmatica", to be read in the assembly. Eutyches was declared orthodox and reinstated in his priestly and monastic office. On the other hand, Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylæum were deposed. The former was banished, and died shortly afterwards in consequence of ill-treatment; he was succeeded by the deacon Anatolius, a partisan of Dioscurus. Owing to the gross violence of Dioscurus and his partisans, this assembly was called by Leo I the "Latrocinium", or Robber Council, of Ephesus, a name that has since clung to it.

Theodosius II, who sympathized with Eutyches, approved these violent deeds; Leo I, on the other hand, when fully informed of the occurrences at Ephesus, condemned, in a Roman synod and in several letters, all the Acts of the so-called council. He refused also to recognize Anatolius as lawful Bishop of Constantinople, at least until the latter would give satisfaction concerning his belief. At the same time he requested the emperor to order the holding of a new council in Italy, to right the wrongs committed at Ephesus. As a special reason for the opportuneness, and even necessity, of the new council, he alleged the appeal of the deposed Flavian of Constantinople. Theodosius, however, positively declined to meet the wishes of the pope. At this stage the sudden death of the emperor (28 July, 450) changed at once the religious situation in the East. Theodosius was succeeded by his sister, Pulcheria, who offered her hand, and with it the imperial throne, to a brave general named Marcian (450–57). Both Mar-

cian and Pulcheria were opposed to the new teaching of Dioscurus and Eutyches; and Marcian at once informed Leo I of his willingness to call a new council according to the previous desire of the pope. In the meantime conditions had changed. Anatolius of Constantinople, and with him many other bishops, condemned the teaching of Eutyches and accepted the dogmatic epistle of Pope Leo. Any new discussions concerning the Christian Faith seemed therefore superfluous. Western Europe, moreover, was in a state of turmoil owing to the invasion of the Huns under Attila, for which reason most of the Western bishops could not attend a council to be held in the East. Leo I therefore protested repeatedly against a council and wrote in this sense to the Emperor Marcian, the Empress Pulcheria, Anatolius of Constantinople, and Julian of Cos; all these letters bear the date of 9 June, 451. Meanwhile, 17 May, 451, a decree was issued by Marcian—in the name also of the Western Emperor Valentinian III (425–55) —ordering all metropolitan bishops with a number of their suffragan bishops to assemble the following September at Nicæa in Bithynia, there to hold a general council for the purpose of settling the questions of faith recently called in doubt.

Though displeased with this action, the pope nevertheless agreed to send his representatives to Nicæa. He appointed as legates Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum (Marsala) in Sicily, Lucentius, also a bishop, Julian, Bishop of Cos, and two priests, Boniface and Basil; Paschasinus was to preside over the coming council in the pope's place. On 24 and 26 June, 451, Leo I wrote letters to the Emperor Marcian, to his legate Paschasinus, to Anatolius of Constantinople, to Julian of Cos, and to the synod itself, in which he expressed the desire that the decrees of the synod should be in conformity with his teaching as contained in the aforesaid dogmatic epistle. A detailed instruction was also given to the papal legates, which contained directions for their guidance in the council; this document, however, has perished, with the exception of two fragments preserved in the Acts of the council. In July the papal legates departed for their destination. Many bishops arrived at Nicæa during the summer, but the opening of the council was postponed owing to the emperor's inability to be present. Finally, at the complaint of the bishops, who grew weary of waiting, Marcian requested them to come to Chalcedon, in the near vicinity of Constantinople. This was done, and the council opened at Chalcedon 8 October.

In all likelihood an official record of the proceedings was made either during the council itself or shortly afterwards. The assembled bishops informed the pope that a copy of all the "Acta" would be transmitted to him; in March, 453, Pope Leo commissioned Julian of Cos, then at Constantinople, to make a collection of all the Acts and translate them into Latin. Very ancient versions of the Acts, both in Greek and Latin, are still extant. Most of the documents, chiefly the minutes of the sessions, were written in Greek; others, e. g. the imperial letters, were issued in both languages; others, again, e. g. the papal letters, were written in Latin. Eventually nearly all of them were translated into both languages. The Latin version, known as the "versio antiqua", was probably made about 500, perhaps by Dionysius Exiguus. About the middle of the sixth century the Roman deacon Rusticus, then in Constantinople with Pope Vigilius (537–55), made numerous corrections in the "versio antiqua", after comparison with Greek manuscripts of the Acts, chiefly with those of the "Acœmetæ" monastery either at Constantinople or at Chalcedon. As to the number of sessions held by the Council of Chalcedon there is a great discrepancy in the various texts of the Acts, also in the ancient historians of the council. Either the respective manuscripts must have been incomplete; or the historians passed over in silence several sessions held for secondary purposes. According to the deacon Rusticus, there were in all sixteen sessions; this division is commonly accepted by scholars, including Bishop Hefele, the learned historian of the councils. If all the separate meetings were counted, there would be twenty-one sessions; several of these meetings, however, are considered as supplementary to preceding sessions. All the sessions were held in the church of St. Euphemia, Martyr, outside the city and directly opposite Constantinople. The exact number of bishops present is not known. The synod itself, in a letter to Pope Leo, speaks of 520, while Pope Leo says there were 600; according to the general estimate there were 630, including the representatives of absent bishops. No previous council could boast of so large a gathering of bishops, while the attendance at later councils seldom surpassed or even equalled that number. The council, however, was not equally representative as to the countries whence came so many bishops. Apart from the papal legates and two African bishops, practically all the bishops belonged to the Eastern Church. This, however, was well represented; the two great civil divisions (prefectures), of the Orient and of Illyricum, comprising Egypt, the Orient (including Palestine), Pontus, Asia, Thrace, Dacia, and Macedonia, sent their contingents. The more prominent among the Eastern bishops were Anatolius of Constantinople, Maximus of Antioch, Dioscurus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Stephen of Ephesus, Quintillus of Heraclea, and Peter of Corinth. The honour of presiding over this venerable assembly was reserved to Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum, the first of the papal legates, according to the intention of Pope Leo I, expressed in his letter to Emperor Marcian (24 June, 451). Shortly after the council, writing to the bishops of Gaul, he mentions that his legates presided in his stead over the Eastern synod. Moreover, Paschasinus proclaimed openly in presence of the council that he was presiding over it in the name and in the place of Pope Leo. The members of the council recognized this prerogative of the papal legates. When writing to the pope they professed that, through his representatives, he presided over them in the council. In the interest of order and a regular procedure the Emperor Marcian appointed a number of commissioners, men of high rank, who received the place of honour in the council. Their jurisdiction, however, did not cover the ecclesiastical or religious questions under discussion. The commissioners simply directed the order of business during the sessions; they opened the meetings, laid before the council the matters to be discussed, demanded the votes of the bishops on the various subjects, and closed the sessions. Besides these there were present several members of the Senate, who shared the place of honour with the imperial commissioners.

At the very beginning of the first session, the papal legates, Paschasinus at their head, protested against the presence of Dioscurus of Alexandria. Formal accusations of heresy and of unjust actions committed in the Robber Council of Ephesus were preferred against him by Eusebius of Dorylæum; and at the suggestion of the imperial commissioners he was removed from his seat among the bishops and deprived of his vote. In order to make a full investigation of his case the Acts of the Robber Council, with those of the synod held in 448 by Flavian of Constantinople, were read in full; this occupied the whole first session. At the end the imperial commissioners declared that since Flavian of Constantinople and other bishops had been unjustly deposed by the Robber Council it would be just that Dioscurus and the leaders in that synod should now suffer the same punishment. A number of bishops agreed, but finally all

declared themselves satisfied with the deposition of Dioscurus alone. The second session (10 October) was occupied with the reading of *testimonia* bearing on questions of faith, chiefly those under discussion. Among them were the symbols or creeds of the Councils of Nicæa (325) and of Constantinople (381); two letters of St. Cyril of Alexandria, viz. his second letter to Nestorius and the letter written to the Antiochene bishops in 433 after his reconciliation with them; finally the dogmatic epistle of Pope Leo I. All these documents were approved by the council. When the pope's famous epistle was read the members of the council exclaimed that the faith contained therein was the faith of the Fathers and of the Apostles; that through Leo, Peter had spoken.

The third session was held 13 October; the imperial commissioners and a number of bishops were absent. Eusebius of Dorylæum presented a new accusation against Dioscurus of Alexandria in which the charges of heresy and of injustice committed in the Robber Council of Ephesus were repeated. Three ecclesiastics and a layman from Alexandria likewise presented accusations against their bishop; he was declared guilty of many acts of injustice and of personal misconduct. At the end of the session the papal legates declared that Dioscurus should be deprived of his bishopric and of all ecclesiastical dignities for having supported the heretic Eutyches, for having excommunicated Pope Leo, and for having refused to answer the charges made against him. All the members present agreed to this proposition; and the decree of deposition was communicated to Dioscurus himself, to the Alexandrine ecclesiastics with him at Chalcedon, to the Emperors Marcian and Valentinian III, and to the Empress Pulcheria. The fourth session, which comprised two meetings, was held on 17 and 20 October. At the request of the imperial commissioners the bishops again approved the dogmatic epistle of Pope Leo I; Juvenal of Jerusalem, Thalassius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Eusebius of Ancyra, Eustathius of Berytus, and Basil of Seleucia in Cilicia, former partisans of Dioscurus in the Robber Council of Ephesus, were pardoned and admitted to the sessions; an investigation was made into the orthodoxy of a number of bishops from Egypt, and of a number of monks and archimandrites suspected of Eutychianism; finally a dispute between Photius of Tyre and Eustathius of Berytus concerning the territorial extent of their respective jurisdiction was adjudicated.

The most important of all the sessions was the fifth, held 22 October; in this the bishops published a decree concerning the Christian Faith, which must be considered as the specific dogmatic decree of the Fourth General Council. A special commission, consisting of the papal legates, of Anatolius of Constantinople, Maximus of Antioch, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and several others, was appointed to draw up this creed or symbol. After again approving the decrees and symbols of the Councils of Nicæa (325), Constantinople (381), and Ephesus (431), as well as the teaching of St. Cyril against Nestorius and the dogmatic epistle of Pope Leo I, the document in question declares: "We teach . . . one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, known in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation." After the recitation of the decree all the bishops exclaimed that such was the true faith, and that all should at once sign their names to it. The imperial commissioners announced that they would communicate to the emperor the decree as approved by all the bishops. The sixth session (25 October) was celebrated with special solemnities; Marcian and Pulcheria were present with a great attendance, with all the imperial commissioners and the Senate. The emperor made an appropriate address; the decree of faith made in the preceding session was read again and approved by the emperor; and with joyful acclamations to the emperor and to the empress, in which they were compared to Constantine and Helena, the proceedings were closed.

The object of the council was attained in the sixth session, and only secondary matters were transacted in the remaining sessions. The seventh and eighth sessions were both held 26 October. In the seventh an agreement between Maximus of Antioch and Juvenal of Jerusalem was approved, according to which the territory of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem was restricted to the three provinces of Palestine. In the eighth session Theodoret of Cyrus, a former partisan of Nestorius, was compelled to condemn the name of his friend under threats of expulsion from the council. He was then reinstated in his bishopric. The ninth and tenth sessions (27 and 28 October) dealt with the case of Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, who had been deposed on charges made by some of his ecclesiastics. The accusation proved to be unfounded, and Ibas was reinstated in his office. A decision was also given to the effect that a pension should be paid by Maximus of Antioch to his deposed predecessor Domnus. The eleventh and twelfth sessions (29 and 30 October) dealt with a conflict between Bassianus and Stephen, both raised successively but irregularly to the See of Ephesus. The council declared that a new bishop should be chosen for Ephesus, but the two aforesaid should retain their episcopal dignity and receive a pension from the church revenues of Ephesus. The thirteenth session (30 October) decided a case of conflicting jurisdiction. Eunomius of Nicomedia and Anastasius of Nicæa both claimed metropolitan rights, at least for a part of Bithynia. The council decreed that in a province there could be only one metropolitan bishop, and in favour of the Bishop of Nicomedia.

The fourteenth session (31 October) decided the rival claims of Sabinian and Athanasius to the See of Perrha in Syria. Sabinian had been chosen in place of Athanasius deposed by an Antiochene synod in 445; later Athanasius was reinstated by the Robber Council of Ephesus. The council decreed that further investigation should be made into the charges against Athanasius, Sabinian meanwhile holding the see. If the charges should prove untrue, Athanasius should be reinstated and Sabinian receive a pension from the diocese. In the same session a letter of Pope Leo was read, and the council approved the decisions in regard to Maximus of Antioch in his conflict with Juvenal of Jerusalem, and his obligation of providing for his predecessor Domnus. In the fifteenth session (31 October) the council adopted and approved twenty-eight disciplinary canons. The papal legates, however, as well as the imperial commissioners departed at the beginning of the session, probably foreseeing that the hierarchical status of the Bishop of Constantinople would be defined, as really occurred in canon xxviii. The first canon approved the canons passed in previous synods. The second established severe penalties against those who conferred ecclesiastical orders or positions for money, or received such orders or positions for money, and acted as intermediaries in such transactions. The third forbade secular traffic to all ecclesiastics, except in the interest of minors, orphans, or other needy persons. The fourth forbade the erection of a monastery or an oratory without the permission of the proper bishop; recommended to the monks a life of retirement, mortification, and prayer; and forbade the reception of a slave in a monastery without the permission of his master. The fifth inculcated the canons of previous synods concerning the transfer of bishops and clerics from one city to another. The sixth recommended that no one should be ordained except he were assigned to some ecclesiastical office. Those ordained contrary to this provi-

sion were not to exercise their order. The seventh forbade ecclesiastics to exercise the military art or to hold a secular office. The eighth decreed that the clerics of charitable homes, monasteries, or oratories of martyrs should be subject to the bishop of the territory. The ninth ordained that ecclesiastics should conduct their lawsuits only before their bishop, the synod of the province, the exarch, or the Bishop of Constantinople. The tenth forbade ecclesiastics to be enrolled in the church-registers of different cities. The eleventh ordained that the poor and needy, when travelling, should be provided with letters of recommendation (*litteræ pacificæ*) from the churches. The twelfth forbade the bishops to obtain from the emperors the title of metropolitans to the prejudice of the real metropolitan of their province. The thirteenth forbade to strange clerics the exercise of their office unless provided with letters of recommendation from their bishop. The fourteenth forbade minor clerics to marry heretical women, or to give their children in marriage to heretics. The fifteenth decreed that no deaconess should be ordained below the age of forty; and no person once ordained a deaconess was allowed to leave that state and marry. The sixteenth forbade the marriage of virgins or monks consecrated to God. The seventeenth ordained that the parishes in rural districts should remain under the jurisdiction of their respective bishops; but if a new city were built by the emperor, its ecclesiastical organization should be modelled on that of the State. The eighteenth forbade secret organizations in the Church, chiefly among clerics and monks. The nineteenth ordained that the bishops of the province should assemble twice a year for the regular synod. The twentieth forbade again the transfer of an ecclesiastic from one city to another, except in the case of grave necessity. The twenty-first ordained that complaints against bishops or clerics should not be heard except after an investigation into the character of the accuser. The twenty-second forbade ecclesiastics to appropriate the goods of their deceased bishop. The twenty-third forbade clerics or monks to sojourn in Constantinople without the permission of their bishop. The twenty-fourth ordained that monasteries once established, together with the property assigned to them, should not be converted to other purposes. The twenty-fifth ordained that the metropolitan should ordain the bishops of his province within three months (from election). The twenty-sixth ordained that ecclesiastical property should not be administered by the bishop alone, but by a special procurator. The twenty-seventh decreed severe penalties against the abduction of women. The twenty-eighth ratified the third canon of the Council of Constantinople (381), and decreed that since the city of Constantinople was honoured with the privilege of having the emperor and the Senate within its walls, its bishop should also have special prerogatives and be second in rank, after the Bishop of Rome. In consequence thereof he should consecrate the metropolitan bishops of the three civil Dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Cappadocia. This last canon provoked another session of the council, the sixteenth, held on 1 November. The papal legates protested therein against this canon, alleging that they had special instructions from Pope Leo on that subject, that the canon violated the prerogatives of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and was contrary to the canons (vi, vii) of the Council of Nicæa. Their protests, however, were not listened to; and the council persisted in retaining this canon in its Acts. With this incident the Council of Chalcedon was closed.

At the closing of the sessions the council wrote a letter to Pope Leo I, in which the Fathers informed him of what had been done; thanked him for the exposition of Christian Faith contained in his dogmatic epistle; spoke of his legates as having presided over them in his name; and asked for the ratification of the disciplinary matters enacted, particularly canon xxviii. This letter was handed to the papal legates, who departed for Rome soon after the last session of the council. Similar letters were written to Pope Leo in December by Emperor Marcian and Anatolius of Constantinople. In reply Pope Leo protested most energetically against canon xxviii and declared it null and void as being against the prerogatives of the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, and against the decrees of the Council of Nicæa. Like protests were contained in the letters written 22 May, 452, to Emperor Marcian, Empress Pulcheria, and Anatolius of Constantinople. Otherwise the pope ratified the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, but only inasmuch as they referred to matters of faith. This approval was contained in letters written 21 March, 453, to the bishops who took part in the council; hence the Council of Chalcedon, at least as to the first six sessions, became an œcumenical synod, and was considered as such by all Christians, both in the time of Pope Leo and after him. The Emperor Marcian issued several edicts (7 February, 13 March, and 28 July, 452) in which he approved the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, forbade all discussions on questions of faith, forbade the Eutychians to have priests, to live in monasteries, to hold meetings, to inherit anything, to bequeath anything to their partisans, or to join the army. The clerics among the followers of Eutyches, hitherto orthodox, and the monks of his monastery, were to be expelled from Roman territory, as once the Manichæans were. The writings of the Eutychians were to be burned; their authors, or those who spread them, were to be punished with confiscation and banishment. Finally Eutyches and Dioscurus were both banished. The former died about that time, while the latter lived to the year 454 in Gangra in Paphlagonia.

The Council of Chalcedon with its dogmatic definition did not put an end to the controversy concerning the natures in Christ and their relation to each other. Many people in the East disliked the term *person* used by the council to signify the union of, or the means of uniting, the two natures in Christ. They believed that Nestorianism was thereby renewed; or at least they thought the definition less satisfactory than St. Cyril's concept of the union of the two natures in Christ (Bardenhewer, Patrologie, 2nd ed., 321–22). In Palestine, Syria, Armenia, Egypt, and other countries, many monks and ecclesiastics refused to accept the definition of Chalcedon; and Monophysites are found there to this day. (See DIOSCURUS; JACOBITES; EUTYCHIANISM; MONOPHYSITISM.)

The Acts of the council are in MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, VI, VII. For its history see EVAGRIUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, in *P. G.*, LXXXVI; FACUNDUS OF HERMIANE, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*, in *P. L.*, LXVII; LIBERATUS, *Breviarium*, in *P. L.*, LXVIII; also BARONIUS, *Annales eccl., ad an.* 451 (Lucca, 1741); NATALIS ALEXANDER, *Historia ecclesiastica* (Venice, 1778), V; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires* (Venice, 1732), XV; HEFELE, *History of the Councils* (tr. Edinburgh, 1871), II, and vol. II of the new Benedictine (French) translation (Paris, 1908); SCHWANE, *Dogmengeschichte der patristischen Zeit* (Freiburg, 1895); HARNACK, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg, 1894), II; RIVINGTON, *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter* (London, 1894); LUCCHESINI, *Historia polemica pontificia Concilii Chalcedonensis*, in his *Opera* (Rome, 1715), II; AMELLI, *San Leone Magno e l'Oriente* (Monte Cassino, 1890); MARTIN, *Le pseudo-synode connu sous le nom du Brigandage d'Ephèse, étudié d'après ses actes retrouvés en syriaque* (Paris, 1875); BLÖTGER, *Der Heilige Stuhl und die ökumenischen Synoden des Alterthums*, etc., especially *Chalcedon*, in *Zeitschrift f. kath. Theologie* (1886); KUHN, *Die Christologie Leos des Grossen in systematischer Darstellung* (Würzburg, 1894).

FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER.

Chalcis, a titular see of Greece. The city was the capital of the island of Eubœa (Negropont), and has been called Eubœa, Stymphelos, Halicarne, Hypochalcis, and later Euripos, and Negropont. It was founded in prehistoric times, was prosperous in the

tenth century B. C., and sent colonies as far as Macedonia and even Italy. From 506 B. C. to the reign of Alexander the Great it was alternately the ally and enemy of Athens. In 194 B. C. it fell into the power of the Romans. Justinian fortified it; the Arabs captured it in 880, but it was reconquered by the Byzantines, and during the Middle Ages its trade was extensive. It was captured by the Venetians in 1209 and by Mohammed II, 12 July, 1470. Since 1833 it has formed a part of the Kingdom of Greece. Chalcis has to-day about 10,000 inhabitants. Lequien (II, 214) mentions eleven bishops of Chalcis from the fourth to the eighteenth century. The see was originally a suffragan of Corinth, then of Athens; finally it became an independent metropolis. The Greek titular bears to-day the double title "Chalcis and Carystia" (from *Carystus*). The Latin bishops bore in the thirteenth century the title of Negropont (Lequien, III, 845; Eubel, I, 384). On 8 February, 1314, the see was united by Clement V to the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople and remained so till the sixteenth century, when it was again independently established. Chalcis in Thrace was another see, suffragan of Heracleia (Lequien, I, 1149); its site has not been identified. A third Chalcis, known by the sojourn of St. Jerome, was a bishopric depending on Seleucia Pieriæ in Syria Prima (Lequien, II, 785). This city is often mentioned in Jacobite documents under its native name Kinnesrîn.

LEAKE, *Northern Greece*, II, 254–266; BAUMEISTER, *Topograph. Skizze der Insel Euboia;* DONDORFF, *De rebus Chalcidicis* (Halle, 1855); OBERHUMMER, *Chalcis*, in PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Encyclopädie*, III, 2078–2088; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.* (London, 1878), I, 599–600.

S. VAILHÉ.

Chaldea. See BABYLONIA.

Chaldean Christians, the name of former Nestorians (see NESTORIANISM) now reunited with the Roman Church. Ethnologically they are divided into two groups (Turco-Persian and Indian), which must be treated apart, since in their vicissitudes one group differs considerably from the other. The first group is usually known as Chaldeans, the second as Christians of St. Thomas (see SYRO-MALABAR CHURCH).

I. NAME AND TERRITORY OF CHALDEANS.—Strictly, the name of Chaldeans is no longer correct; in Chaldea proper, apart from Bagdad, there are now very few adherents of this rite, most of the Chaldean population being found in the cities of Kerkuk, Arbil, and Mosul, in the heart of the Tigris valley, in the valley of the Zab, and in the mountains of Kurdistan. It is in the former ecclesiastical province of Atōr (Assyria) that are now found the most flourishing of the Catholic Chaldean communities. The native population accepts the name of Atōraya-Kaldaya (Assyro-Chaldeans), while in the neo-Syriac vernacular Christians generally are known as Syrians. The territory now occupied by these Chaldeans belonged once to the ancient Sassanid Empire of Persia, later Omayyad and then the Abbassid caliphs of Islam. Turkish and Mongol invasions, and later efforts to reconstruct the former Kingdom of Persia shattered effectually the earlier political unity of this region; since the end of the sixteenth century the territory of the Chaldeans has been under Turkish or Persian rule. In fact, however, a number of the mountain tribes are only nominally subject to either.

II. CHALDEANS IN TURKEY AND PERSIA.—From the fifth century, the Persian Church quietly, almost unconsciously, adopted the Nestorian errors. Previous to that period, its relations with Rome had been insignificant owing to distance, language, racial temper, and a certain ardour of nationalism begotten by the almost perpetual wars with the Roman Empire. Up to the end of the Middle Ages, there also lay between Persia and Rome another, and insuperable, obstacle, the Byzantine Church. It is true that at the end of the seventh century a Nestorian prelate, Sahdona, accepted the Council of Chalcedon and returned to Christian orthodoxy, but this implied only a renewal of union with the Melchite (Orthodox Greek) Church of Antioch and the East, by no means a recognition of the supremacy of the Pope of Old Rome. The present Chaldeans do not therefore descend from Sahdona. It was not until the thirteenth century that the political revolutions of Central and Farther Asia permitted closer relations between the Nestorian Christians and the Roman Church, whose missionaries then reached the valley of the Tigris by way of the new Latin principalities. Innocent IV, an earnest promoter of the Eastern missions, had sent two Dominicans to Sabhrishô'ibn-al-Masih, the Catholicos of the Nestorians. Through his vicar Ard (perhaps Addaï) the catholicos sent to Rome a profession of faith and a theological treatise by the Archbishop of Nisibis, Išo'yahb bar Malkon (1247). The result of this mission is unknown; certainly Makkika and Denḥa, successors of the aforesaid catholicos pursued the matter no further. Yahbalaha III, however, elected in 1281, sent to the pope, in his own name and in that of Argun, King of the Tatars, the Chinese monk, Barṣauma (1287). Nicholas IV welcomed the Nestorian envoy and sent him home with many gifts for the catholicos, requesting kind treatment for such Dominican missionaries as might traverse his province.

In 1304 the same Yahbalaha took advantage of the return to Rome of the Dominican James to address to Benedict XI a profession of faith dated from the city of Maraga. The frightful disturbances of the fourteenth century interrupted these friendly relations. Towards the middle of the fifteenth century the office of catholicos became hereditary and passed from uncle to nephew in the same family. Meanwhile the Nestorian communities, dispersed throughout the former Arabian Empire, cut off from all communication with their natural religious centre, dwindled to insignificant proportions or disappeared altogether. In 1445 Andreas, Archbishop of Colossæ, was sent by Eugene IV to reconcile with Rome the Nestorian prelate Timothy, known as the Archbishop of Tarsus, but then resident in Cyprus. After obtaining from this prelate certain modifications of the Nestorian Liturgy, Andreas forbade the Latin Christians of Cyprus to treat the Chaldeans as heretics. In 1551 the Catholicos Simeon bar Mâmâ was succeeded by his nephew, Simeon Denḥa. According to a custom then about a century old, the latter was consecrated by Ḥenanishô', the only remaining metropolitan. A numerous anti-synod met at Mosul, convoked by the Bishops of Arbil, Salamas, and Aderbaidjan. In agreement with the principal laymen they chose for bishop a monk of the monastery of Rabban-Hormizd Se'ûd bar Daniel, known as Sulaga (Ascension). Probably at the suggestion of some Latin missionary, they sent him to Rome, where he received episcopal consecration from Julius III, with the title of Patriarch of the Chaldeans. On his return to his own country, Sulaga consecrated two metropolitans and three bishops. In the meantime, the aforesaid Nestorian catholicos, Simeon Denḥa, won over the Pasha of Diarbekir; John Sulaga was imprisoned and later on (1555) was put to death. The united Chaldeans soon chose as his successor Abdišhô', the Metropolitan of Djeziret ibn-Omar (Beit-Zabdaï), who went to Rome (1562) during the pontificate of Pius IV, received there the pallium, and was invited to assist at the Council of Trent. He declined this honour, but addressed to the assembly a profession of faith that was read at the twenty-second session. He returned to his people, and after a few years died among them at Seert (1567). The patriarchal office remained vacant for some time. Though very little is known of Aïtalaha, the successor of Abdišhô', it is

certain that he did not go to Rome for the pallium, as did his predecessors. His energetic auxiliary, however, Hormizd-Elias Amas Abid, who had been consecrated by Sulaka as Archbishop of Amid and Jerusalem, was always in friendly communication with the Latins. In the meantime a large body of Nestorians headed by Denha Simeon, the Archbishop of Gelu, Salamas, and Seert, rejected the authority of the successor of bar Mâmâ and submitted to Aïtalaha, on whose death Simeon was chosen to succeed him. The Turco-Persian wars obliged Simeon to reside in the mountains, near Salamas in Persia, whereas his predecessors had resided at Amid (Amida). This change of residence had important consequences: the successors of Simeon in the end retained jurisdiction only over the provinces subject to the Persians, and had no longer any intercourse with Rome except at long intervals. In this way many Chaldeans returned to the Nestorian heresy (if, indeed, they had ever abandoned it). Simeon died in 1593. In 1619 his successor, Simeon II, wrote that he would visit Rome, which promise, however, he was unable to execute. In 1650 Simeon III corresponded with Innocent X, and in 1658 Simeon IV entered on relations with the Congregation of Propaganda, for which attitude his subjects tried to depose him. Alexander VII, however, defended him earnestly in a letter to the King of Persia and urged that he might be permitted to retain his patriarchal office. There is still extant a letter of Simeon V (1670) to Clement X, also one of Simeon VI (1770) to Clement XIV. Since the election of Simeon VII (1839) no further attempts have been made by the Chaldeans of Persia to renew relations with Rome. The establishment (1837) of a Protestant mission near Urmia probably accounts for this regrettable attitude. Nevertheless, the present Nestorian patriarch, resident at Kotchannes in the mountains of Kurdistan, is a direct successor of John Sulaga, one of those who initiated the aforesaid union with Rome.

Simeon bar Mâmâ was succeeded in 1576 by Elias Simeon Denha who in 1586 sent a profession of faith to Sixtus V. It was, however, judged heretical. Elias II (1591–1617) took up again the question of reunion and in a letter to Rome (1610) complained that he and his people were regarded as heretics by the Franciscans of the Holy Land. In 1616 he assembled at Amid (Diarbekir) a general synod, attended by eight metropolitans and in which Padre Tommaso da Novara, superior of the Franciscan convent of Aleppo, took part. In preparation for this synod an embassy had been sent to Rome (1612) headed by the archimandrite, Addaï. The union was consummated, but in appearance only. Two persons appeared to have been sincere in their conversion: Addaï, consecrated at the aforesaid synod as Bishop of Amid and Jerusalem, and (perhaps) the patriarch. The latter, however, died the following year. His successor, Elias (III) Simeon (1617–1660) also solicited from Rome the pallium, but his profession of faith was not found orthodox. The negotiations soon ceased and were not resumed, either by Elias (IV) John (1660–1700), or by Elias (V) (1700–1723). It is said that Elias (VI) Denha (1723–1778) corresponded with Rome. If so, his successor, Elias (VII) Ishô'yahb, observed an attitude of independence. Finally, John Hormizd, the last descendant of the patriarchal family of bar Mâmâ, went over definitely to the Catholic Church (1830) and took with him the See of Bagdad-Mosul and many Nestorians.

In 1672, Joseph, the Nestorian Archbishop of Diarbekir, following the advice of the Capuchin missionaries, withdrew from communion with the Patriarch Elias IV. The latter tried to have him assassinated, and roused against him the vigorous enmity of the Turkish authorities. Joseph fled to Rome (1675), but after an understanding with the Propaganda, and with the sanction of Clement X, returned to his own country where he was very active in organizing the union of his people with Rome. Innocent XI granted him the pallium (1681) and the title of patriarch. He resigned in 1693 and died at Rome. The learned Joseph (II) Ma'aruf (1693–1713), received from Clement XI (1701) the title of Patriarch of Babylon. His successor, Joseph (III) Moses Timothy (1714–1756), had a very troubled career. In 1731 he went to Constantinople to protest against the incessant annoyances of the Nestorians. Thence he proceeded to Rome, where he promptly received an intimation to return to his diocese. He was unable, however, to reach it and appeared again in Rome (1735), where for six years he was kept in seclusion. At the end of this period he was restored, at the prayers of his flock, and returned to Amid (1741), where he died in 1756. Joseph (IV) Timothy (1759–1779) followed him in the patriarchal office. Joseph (V) Augustine Hindi succeeded (1779–1826) with the title of Archbishop and Administrator of the Chaldean Patriarchate of the Province of Diarbekir; for the Diocese of Mosul he had as auxiliary the priest George of Alkosch. Owing to the scarcity of documents the history of this period is little known. From letters edited by Giamil (Genuinæ relationes, 391–399) it would appear that properly speaking Joseph IV had no successor, perhaps because of the aforementioned conversion to Catholicism of John Hormizd, the last descendant of bar Mâmâ. John Hormizd had been excommunicated in 1818, but was reconciled with Rome in 1830 and proclaimed Patriarch of Babylon by Pius VIII; he owed this happy settlement to the kind efforts of Pierre Coupperie, the Latin Bishop of Babylon. In 1838 Nicholas Isaias Jacob, Bishop of Aderbaidjan, and a former pupil of the College of Propaganda at Rome, was appointed his coadjutor with right of succession. The same year John Hormizd died, and in 1847 Isaias Jacob resigned. His successor, Joseph (VI) Audo (1848–1878), entered on a serious conflict with Pius IX. Though the Bull "Reversurus" had provoked (1867) a schism in Armenia, it was imposed upon the Chaldeans in 1869. Joseph Audo maintained his prerogative in the matter of episcopal ordinations and was threatened with excommunication by the papal Encyclical of September, 1876. Audo died in 1878, but had previously been reconciled with Pius IX. Leo XIII appointed as his successor Elias (XII) Abolionan (1878–1894), who was followed by the learned George 'Abdishô' (V) Khayyath (1894–1899) and Joseph Emmanuel (II) Thomas.

III. Present Status.—The latest and most complete statistics of the Catholic Chaldeans were furnished in 1896 by Mgr. George 'Abdishô' Khayyath to the Abbé Chabot (Revue de l'Orient Chrétien, I, no. 4). The patriarch considers Bagdad as the principal city of his see. His title of Patriarch of Babylon results from the erroneous identification (in the seventeenth century) of modern Bagdad with ancient Babylon. As a matter of fact the Chaldean patriarch resides habitually at Mosul and reserves for himself the direct administration of this diocese and that of Bagdad. There are five archbishops (resident respectively at Bassora, Diarbekir, Kerkuk, Salamas, and Urmia) and seven bishops. Eight patriarchal vicars govern the small Chaldean communities dispersed throughout Turkey and Persia. The Chaldean clergy, especially the monks of Rabban-Hormizd, have established some missionary stations in the mountain districts inhabited by Nestorians. Three dioceses are in Persia, the others in Turkey. There are in all 233 parishes and 177 churches or chapels. The Catholic Chaldean clergy number 248 priests; they are assisted by the religious of the Congregation of St. Hormizd (Rabban-Hormizd) who number about one hundred. There are about fifty-

two Chaldean schools (not counting those conducted by Latin nuns and missionaries). At Mosul there is a patriarchal seminary, distinct from the Syro-Chaldean seminary directed by the Dominicans. The total number of the Chaldeans according to the above-mentioned authority is nearly 78,000, 24,000 of whom are in the Diocese of Mosul. This number is perhaps a little exaggerated. The figure of about 66,000 given by Dr. Oussani (see ASIA) as against 140,000 Nestorians is more correct. The liturgical language of the Chaldean Church is Syriac. Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Kurd are variously spoken by the people; in some districts the vernacular is neo-Syriac. The liturgical books are those of the ancient Nestorian Church, corrected in the sense of Catholic orthodoxy. Unfortunately, without doctrinal necessity, they have in some places been made to conform with Latin usage.

Religiously and morally the Chaldeans are on a level with the other Catholic communities of the Oriental Rite. They are becoming daily better instructed, owing in part to the zeal and devotion of Latin missionaries and religious (Dominicans at Mosul, Carmelites at Bagdad, Lazarists in Persia). Their clergy counts among its members such learned men, as Mgr. Giamil, Mgr. Addaï Scher, and Mgr. Manna, authors of numerous publications interesting to Orientalists. This literary revival is mostly due to the Lazarist, Père Bedjân, a Persian Chaldean. He devoted much industry and learning to popularizing among his people, both Catholics and Nestorians, their ancient chronicles, the lives of Chaldean saints and martyrs, even works of the ancient Nestorian doctors.

IV. MALABAR CHRISTIANS.—The west coast of India exhibits since the sixth century a number of flourishing Christian communities subject to the Nestorian Catholicos of Persia. In the sixteenth century Portuguese invaders of India found on the aforesaid coast over 200,000 of these ancient Persian or Syriac Christians, who called themselves Christians of St. Thomas. They acknowledged their dependence on the Nestorian Church; for a long time, however, on account of the dangers of travel and continual wars, their intercourse with it was only intermittent. Most of the time, therefore, they were without bishops. The clergy of Goa tried to annex them by a process of latinization, and the Jesuits, successors of St. Francis Xavier, followed a similar policy, but with much moderation and practical sense.

After the above-described renewal of relations between Rome and the Chaldean Catholics, their procurator, Bishop Hormizd Elias, was sent to India (1562) by the pope and the Patriarch 'Abdishô', with two Dominican missionaries, one of whom was a bishop. 'Abdishô' ordained as Bishop of Malabar a certain Joseph whom the Portuguese detained at Goa, so that he was able to reach his mission only after two years. In the meantime, because of urgency, a successor had been named, Bishop Abraham of Angamale. This was the cause of misunderstandings and disputes to which Pius IV put an end (1565) by dividing the Malabar territory. This step did not greatly relieve the anxieties of the United Chaldeans of Malabar. Bishop Abraham complained to the pope "that the Fathers of the Society [of Jesus] and the Latin Portuguese" tried to withdraw him from obedience to the Chaldean patriarch and to persuade him to demand the pallium directly from the pope. In this way they sought to compel him to "conform to the Latin Rite and to turn over gradually to the Holy See the administration of this province". The King of Cochin himself asked from the pope (1576) for Bishop Abraham a safe-conduct to attend at Goa the Provincial Council of the Indies, without fear of imprisonment. In 1599, Alexis Menezes, Archbishop of Goa, convoked at Diamper a celebrated synod, in which it was decided to unify the hierarchy and to correct the rituals, missals, and other liturgical books of the Malabar Christians in the sense of the Roman Liturgy. Portuguese authority enforced these decisions on the Malabar Coast, but the policy eventually failed. Many Catholics left the Latin Church and joined the Nestorians. A little later (1653) the Jacobite (Monophysite) patriarch sent a bishop to India, whereupon more than a hundred thousand Malabar Christians accepted him with a view to the preservation of their liturgical (Syriac) tongue, heedless of his Monophysitism, which was, no doubt, quite unintelligible to them. Owing to the Carmelite missionaries, who succeeded the Jesuits, nearly 250,000 persevered in Catholic unity, and have remained to the present loyal to the Holy See and submissive to the Latin hierarchy though they have never ceased their petition to be restored to the obedience of the Chaldean patriarch. This re-affiliation has not been accorded them, even after the Encyclical of Leo XIII "Orientalium Dignitas". The pope, however, has withdrawn them from the jurisdiction of the Latin bishops and has given them three vicars Apostolic of their nation and rite. These native bishops administer the Dioceses of Trichur, Ernakulam and Changanachery, and are directly subject to Propaganda (1897). This is only a provisional solution. The Catholic Chaldeans of Malabar look always towards the (Catholic) Chaldean patriarchs, who never tire of urging the extension of their jurisdiction over the distant Malabar churches, historically united with the Church of Persia and its legitimate representatives.

GIAMIL, *Genuinæ relationes inter sedem Apostolicam et Assyriorum Orientalium seu Chaldæorum ecclesiam nunc majori ex parte primum editæ historicisque adnotationibus illustratæ* (Rome, 1902). This work contains an important collection of official letters and documents exchanged between the Roman Curia and the Chaldeans. The Syriac title, literally translated into Latin, would be: *Liber relationum ecclesiæ Chaldæorum cum Sede Apostolicâ Romæ;* CHABOT, (1) *Les Chrétiens du Malabar;* (2) *Etat religieux des diocèses formant le patriarcat chaldéen de Babylone;* (3) *Vie de Mar Joseph I* in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* (Paris, 1896); OUSSANI, *The Modern Chaldeans and Nestorians, and the Study of Syriac among them* in *Johns Hopkins, Semitic Papers* (Baltimore, 1902); among earlier works see, J. AL. ASSEMANI, *De Catholicis seu patriarchis Chaldæorum et Nestorianorum commentarius* (Rome, 1775); JOS. S. ASSEMANI: *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, III, pt. II, passim.

J. LABOURT.

Chalice—HISTORY.—The chalice occupies the first place among sacred vessels, and by a figure of speech the material cup is often used as if it were synonymous with the Precious Blood itself. "The chalice of benediction, which we bless", writes St. Paul, "is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (I. Cor., x, 16). No reliable tradition has been preserved to us regarding the vessel used by Christ at the Last Supper. In the sixth and seventh centuries pilgrims to Jerusalem were led to believe that the actual chalice was still venerated in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, having within it the sponge which was presented to Our Saviour on Calvary. Curiously enough, while Antoninus of Piacenza refers to it as made of onyx, Adamnan, less than a century later, describes it as a "silver cup holding the measure of a Gallic sextarius and with two opposite handles" (see Geyer, Itinera Hierosolimitana, pp. 154, 173, 234, 305). At a much later period two other vessels have been venerated as the chalice of the Last Supper. One, the *sacro catino* of Genoa, is rather a dish than a cup and is made of green glass, though long supposed to be an emerald, fourteen and a half inches in diameter and of priceless value. The other, at Valencia in Spain, is a cup of agate. The fact is that the whole tradition is untrustworthy and of late date. It will be referred to further under the article GRAIL, and meanwhile we may be content to quote the words of St. Chrysostom (Hom. I in Matt.): "The table was not of silver, the chalice was not of gold in which Christ gave His blood to His disciples to drink, and yet

everything there was precious and truly fit to inspire awe." So far as it is possible to collect any scraps of information regarding the chalices in use among early Christians, the evidence seems to favour the prevalence of glass, though cups of the precious and of baser metals, of ivory, wood, and even clay were also in use. (See Hefele, Beiträge, II, 323–5.) A passage of St. Irenæus (Hær., I, c. xiii) describing a pretended miracle wrought by Mark the Gnostic who poured white wine into his chalice and then after prayer showed the contents to be red, almost necessarily supposes a vessel of glass, and the glass patens (*patenas vitreas*) mentioned in the "Liber Pontificalis" under Zephyrinus (202–19), as well as certain passages in Tertullian and St. Jerome, entirely favour the same conclusion. But the tendency to use by preference the precious metals developed early. St. Augustine speaks of two golden and six silver chalices dug up at Cirta in Africa (Contra Crescon., III, c. xxix), and St. Chrysostom of a golden chalice set with gems (Hom. 1 in Matt.). As regards shape, our principal information at this early period is derived from certain representations, said to be meant for Eucharistic chalices, which are found in early mosaics, sarcophagi, and other monuments of Christian art. The general prevalence of an almost stemless, vase-shaped type with two handles, inclines us to believe that a glass vessel of this nature discovered in the Ostrian catacomb on the Via Nomentana, and now preserved in the Lateran Museum, may really have been a chalice. At an early date it became common to inscribe the donor's name upon costly vessels presented to churches. Thus it is known that Galla Placidia (d. 450) offered a chalice with such an inscription to the church of Zacharias at Ravenna, and the Emperor Valentinian III sent another to the church at Brive. Such goblets were sometimes known as *calices literati*. The earliest specimen of a chalice of whose original purpose we can feel reasonably confident is the chalice of Chelles, preserved until the French Revolution and believed to have been wrought by, or at least to date from the time of, the famous artificer St. Eligius of Noyon, who died in 659. The material was gold, richly decorated with enamels and precious stones. In shape it was without handles and like a celery glass, with a very deep cup and no stem, but the cup was joined to the base by a knop, which under the name of *nodus* or *pomellum* became a very characteristic feature in the chalices of the Middle Ages. In many of the specimens described or preserved from the Merovingian, Carlovingian, and Romanesque periods, it is possible to make a distinction between the ordinary sacrificial chalice used by bishops and priests in the Mass and the *calices ministeriales* intended for the Communion of the faithful at Easter and other seasons when many received. These latter chalices are of considerable size, and they are often, though not always, fitted with handles, which, it is easy to understand, would have afforded additional security against accidents when the sacred vessel was put to the lips of each communicant in turn. In a rude and barbarous age the practical difficulties of Communion under the species of wine must have been considerable, and it is not wonderful that from the Carlovingian period onwards the device was frequently adopted of using a pipe or reed (known by a variety of names, *fistula, tuellus, canna, arundo, pipa, calamus, siphon*, etc.) for the Communion of both clergy and people. To this day at the solemn papal high Mass, the chalice is brought from the altar to the pope at his throne, and the pontiff absorbs its contents through a golden pipe. This practice also lasted down to the reformation among the Cistercians.

THE CHALICES OF THE MIDDLE AGES.—Of chalices earlier than the time of Charlemagne the existing specimens are so few and so doubtful that generalization of any kind is almost impossible. Besides the already mentioned chalice of Chelles, now destroyed, only two of those still preserved can be referred confidently to a date earlier than the year 800. The most remarkable of these is that of Tassilo, which bears the inscription TASSILO DUX FORTIS + LUITPIRG VIRGA (*sic*) REGALIS. This beautiful piece of metal work exhibits an egg-shaped cup joined to a small conical base by a knop. The character of the ornamentation shows clearly the predominance of Irish influences, even if it be not actually the work of an Irish craftsman. Plainer in design, but very similar in form, is the chalice said to have belonged to St. Ledger. Its Eucharistic character is proved beyond doubt by the inscription which it bears: HIC CALIX SANGVINIS DNI IHV XTI. If, as is possible, these words are intended to form a chronogram, they yield the date 788. Of the succeeding period, by far the most remarkable example preserved is the magnificent relic of Irish art known as the Chalice of Ardagh, from the place near which it was accidentally discovered in 1868. This is a "ministerial" chalice and it has two handles. It is seven inches in height but as much as nine and a half inches in diameter, and the bowl is capable of containing nearly three pints of liquid. The material is silver alloyed with copper, but gold and other metals have been used in its wonderful ornamentation, consisting largely of interlacing patterns and rich enamels. An inscription in very interesting ancient characters gives simply the names of the Twelve Apostles, a list of course highly suggestive of the Last Supper. The date conjecturally assigned to this masterpiece from the letters of the inscription is the ninth or tenth century. But in any case the broadening of the cup and the firm and wide base indicate a development which is noticeable in nearly all the chalices of the Romanesque period. The chalice known as that of St. Gozlin, Bishop of Toul (922–62), is still preserved in the cathedral of Nancy. In its broad, low, circular form it much resembles the last-named chalice. Another very beautiful ministerial chalice with handles, but of later date (twelfth century?), is that of the Abbey of Wilten in the Tyrol. It may be added that although these double-handled cups of precious metal were no doubt primarily intended for the Communion of the people, they were also on great occasions used by the celebrant in the Holy Sacrifice. The fresco in the under-church of San Clemente in Rome (eleventh century?), representing the Mass of St. Clement, shows a two-handled chalice upon the altar, and the same may be seen in the famous liturgical ivory panel of the Spitza collection (Kraus, Christliche Kunst, II, 18).

THE ARDAGH CHALICE

It is certain, however, that the chalices commonly used for the private Masses of parish priests and monks were of a simpler character, and in the eighth, ninth and following centuries much legislation was devoted to securing that chalices should be made of becoming material. From a remark attributed to St. Boniface (c. 740) that in the early ages of the Church the priests were of gold and the chalices of wood, but that now the chalices were of gold and the priests of wood, it might be inferred that he would have favoured simplicity in the furniture of the altar, but the synodal decrees of this period only aimed at promoting suitable reverence for the Mass. England seems to have taken the lead in this matter, and in any case

CHALICE OF ST. GOZLIN

TENTH CENTURY. TREASURY OF THE CATHEDRAL AT NANCY

CHALICE, KNOWN AS CHALICE OF ST. REMI

TWELFTH CENTURY. TREASURY OF THE CATHEDRAL AT RHEIMS

the English canons may be quoted as typical of those which soon afterwards were enforced everywhere. Thus the Council of Celchyth (Chelsea) forbade the use of chalices or patens of horn *quod de sanguine sunt*, and the canons passed in the reign of Edgar, under St. Dunstan, enjoined that all chalices in which the "housel is hallowed" should be of molten work (*calic gegoten*) and that none should be hallowed in a wooden vessel. The laws of the Northumbrian priests imposed a fine upon all who should "hallow housel" in a wooden chalice and the so-called canons of Ælfric repeated the injunction that chalices of molten material, gold, silver, glass (*glaesen*) or tin should be used, not horn, and especially not wood. Horn was rejected because blood had entered into its composition. Probably, however, the most famous decree was that included in the "Corpus Juris" (cap. xlv, dist. i, de consecratione) "that the chalice of the Lord, together with the paten, if not gold, must be entirely made of silver. If, however, anyone is so poor, let him at least have a chalice of pewter. The chalice must not be made of brass or copper, because it generates rust (i. e. verdigris) which causes nausea. And let no one presume to say Mass with a chalice of wood or glass". This decree is traditionally attributed to a certain council of Reims, but Hefele is unable to identify it.

From the eleventh century onwards sufficient chalices and representations of chalices survive to enable us to draw conclusions regarding their evolution of form. A round knop, short stem, broad firm base, and wide, rather shallow cup are characteristic of the earlier period. One of the richest surviving examples is the chalice known as that of St. Remi. It is remarkable for the maledictory inscription engraved on its base: QUICUNQUE HUNC CALICEM INVADIAVERIT VEL AB HAC ECCLESIA REMENSI ALIQUO MODO ALIENAVERIT ANATHEMA SIT. FIAT AMEN. In the thirteenth century, while the cup of the ordinary chalice still remains broad and rather low, and the base and knop are circular, we find a certain development of the stem. On the other hand the cup, in a large number of examples of the fourteenth century, tends to assume a conical or funnel shape, while the stem and knop become angular, or prismatic in section, generally hexagonal. The base is often divided into six lobes to match the stem, and the knop itself is sometimes resolved into a group of studs or bosses, which in certain fifteenth-century specimens give place to a mass of arcading and architectural ornament set with figures. The stem is at the same time elongated and becomes much taller. Under Renaissance influences, on the other hand, the ornamentation in the more sumptuous specimens of chalices is often excessive, spending itself in the form of figured repoussé work upon the base and stem. The cup almost invariably assumes a tulip shape, which continues during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while the chalice greatly increases in height. With this, in the seventeenth century, often went a very thin stem, or again a quite inadequate base, so that many chalices of this period leave the well-founded impression of being either fragile or top-heavy. The question of the restriction of Communion under both kinds and the consequent withdrawal of the chalice from the laity is a matter of some obscurity and does not belong to the present article. In many places where the Precious Blood was no longer given to the people, it seems that to reconcile them more easily to the change, a cup containing simple wine was presented to each communicant as he left the sanctuary after receiving the Sacred Host. Parish priests were enjoined to explain very carefully to the people that this was only ordinary wine intended to enable them to swallow the Host more readily. This practice, called *purificatio*, is still prescribed as part of the rite of the General Communion on Easter Day in the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" (II, cap. xxix). Probably a special chalice of large capacity was reserved for this purpose. As it was very probably a chalice of large capacity, with handles, it seems impossible to distinguish such a goblet from the *calix ministerialis* of earlier times. Another kind of chalice referred to by archæologists is that said to have been used after baptism to give milk and honey to the neophytes, but no definite surviving example of such a vessel seems to be known.

PRESENT LEGISLATION.—According to the existing law of the Church the chalice, or at least the cup of it, must be made either of gold or of silver, and in the latter case the bowl must be gilt on the inside. In circumstances of great poverty or in time of persecution a *calix stanneus* (pewter) may be permitted, but the bowl of this also, like the upper surface of the paten, must be gilt. Before the chalice and paten are used in the Sacrifice of the Mass they require consecration. This rite is carried out according to a form specially provided in the "Pontificale" and involving the use of holy chrism. The consecration must be performed by a bishop (or, in the case of chalices intended for monastic use, by an abbot possessing the privilege), and a bishop cannot in an ordinary way delegate any priest to perform this function in his place. Further, if the chalice lose its consecration—which happens for example if it be broken or the cup perforated, or even if it has had to be sent to have the bowl regilded—it is necessary that it should be reconsecrated by the bishop before it can again be used. Strictly speaking, only priests and deacons are permitted to touch the chalice or paten, but leave is usually granted to sacristans and those officially appointed to take charge of the vestments and sacred vessels.

ADJUNCTS OF THE CHALICE.—These are the corporal, the purificator, the pall, the burse, and the chalice veil. The corporal (q. v.) will be considered separately. The purificator (*purificatorium* or more anciently *emunctorium*) now consists of a rectangular piece of linen usually folded twice lengthwise and laid across the top of the chalice. It is used for wiping and drying the chalice, or the paten, or the priest's lips, e. g. after the ablutions. Unlike the corporal and the pall, it requires no special blessing. In the Middle Ages it was not customary, as it is nowadays, for each priest to have a purificator of his own, frequently renewed, but it seems that a cloth of this kind was kept at the altar which was used in common by all. The pall is a small square of stiffened linen ornamented with a cross, which is laid upon the orifice of the chalice to protect its contents from flies or dust. The word *pallium*, or *palla*, was originally used of all kinds of coverings, notably of what we now call the altar-cloths, and also of the corporal. Even in St. Gregory of Tours (Hist. Franc., VII, xxii) we read of the sacred gifts being veiled by a pallium, which was probably some sort of corporal. But about the time of St. Anselm (c. 1100) the custom seems to have grown up in some places of using two corporals at the altar. One was spread out, and upon it the chalice and host were laid. The other, folded into smaller compass, served only to cover the chalice (see Giorgi, Liturgia Rom. Pont., II, 220, III, 79–81). This folded corporal is now represented by the little disk of linen which we call the pall. At one time it was forbidden to cover the pall with silk or rich embroidery; now the upper surface may be of silk and embroidered, but the under-side, which is in contact with the chalice, must still be linen. The original identity of the pall and the corporal is further illustrated by the fact that both alike require to be specially blessed before use. The chalice veil and the burse (q. v.) are of comparatively recent introduction. Even Burchard, the compiler of the "Ordo Missæ" (1502), now represented by the *rubricæ generales* of the Roman Missal, supposes that the chalice

and paten were brought by the priest to the altar in a *sacculum* or *lintheum*, which seems to have been the ancestor of the present veil. The burse, which is simply a cover used to keep the corporal from being soiled, and which for that reason was known in Old English as a "corporas-case", is somewhat older. Several medieval burses are still preserved in the collection at Danzig. Nowadays both burse and veil are usually made of the same material as that of the set of vestments to which they belong, and they are similarly ornamented.

CHALICE BY CELLINI, SHOWING ARMS OF EBERHARD, ARCHBISHOP OF COLOGNE (Green Vaults of Dresden)

THE CHALICE IN ART.—From what has already been said it will be clear that the chalice, as the most important of all the vessels in church use, must have exercised an incalculable influence upon the early developments of the goldsmith's craft. Such monuments as the Ardagh chalice and the Tassilo chalice, both of Irish origin, stand almost alone in the information they afford of an otherwise unsuspected mechanical skill and richness of ornament, particularly in the matter of enamels, in a remote and barbarous age. The earliest documents connected with the life of St. Patrick reveal the fact that the artificers of chalices and bells had a certain status which in that rude age won respect for the arts of peace. The chalice in a particular way was identified with the priesthood. This sacred vessel, which now stands upon the priest's coffin during his obsequies, recalls the time when a small chalice of metal or of wax was buried with him in his tomb; and the chalice which is the recognized emblem of so many saints—e. g., St. John the Evangelist—suggests in many instances the promise made by Christ to His followers, "if ye shall drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt you". To attempt to illustrate the characteristics of the artistic silver work in the different countries of Europe would take us too far. But it is much to be desired that by the favour shown to good material, skilful workmanship, and a pure type of art, the chalices constructed for the liturgical use of the Church may still serve as an encouragement of all that is best in the craft of the worker in the precious metals.

HISTORY AND ARCHÆOLOGY.—HEFELE, *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen, 1864), II, 322–30; ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *La Messe* (Paris, 1886), Vol. IV, a work which contains by far the best collection of illustrations of medieval chalices; BÄUMER in *Kirchenlex.* s. v. KELCH; THALHOFER, *Liturgik* (Freiburg, 1890), I; BOCK in the *Jahrbuch* of the Vienna Central Commission, IV; WEISS in the *Mittheilungen* of the Vienna Central Commission, IV; REUSENS, *Eléments d'archéologie chrét.* (Aachen, 1885), I, 232, 460, II, 320; OTTE, *Handbuch der Kunst-Archeologie* (1886), I; LINAS, *Orfèvrerie Mérovingienne* (Paris, 1864); CORBLET, *Histoire de l'Eucharistie* (Paris, 1886), II, 241–73; BERGNER, *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunstaltertümer* (Leipsig, 1905), 320–27; WILLIAMS, *The Arts and Crafts of Spain* (3 vols., London, 1907).

ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.—BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *Le mobilier ecclésiastique* (2 vols., Paris, 1887); VAN DER STAPPEN, *Sacra Liturgia* (Mechlin, 1903), III, 96–110; WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1903), III.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Challoner, RICHARD, Bishop of Debra, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, author of spiritual and controversial works, b. 29 Sept., 1691; d. 12 Jan., 1781. This prelate, who, during the greater part of the eighteenth century, was to be the leading figure of English Catholicism, was not born of Catholic parents, but was the son of a Presbyterian wine-cooper of Lewes, Sussex, England. After his father's death his mother became housekeeper to the Catholic family of Gage, at Firle in Sussex. It is not known whether she was already a Catholic, or whether she was converted as a consequence of her new surroundings, but her boy was not received into the Church till he was about thirteen years old. This was at Warkworth, in Northamptonshire, the seat of another well-known Catholic family, that of Holman. Lady Anastasia Holman, wife of George Holman, Esq., was a daughter of the martyred Viscount Stafford, and their chaplain, the well-known controversial writer, John Gother, instructed Richard Challoner in Catholic doctrine, and procured for him a nomination to a foundation at Douai College. The boy entered college on 29 July, 1705 (Dicconson's Diary), and spent the next twenty-five years there, first as student, then as professor, and as vice-president. His abilities enabled him to complete the usual twelve years' course in eight years, and in 1708 he took the college oath, binding himself to return to England, when required, to labour on the mission. At the age of twenty-one he was chosen to teach the classes of rhetoric and poetry, which were the two senior classes in "humanities"; and a year later his success as a teacher justified his appointment as professor of philosophy, a post which he held for eight years. Ordained priest 28 March, 1716, he graduated Bachelor in Divinity of the University of Douai in 1719, and in the following year was chosen by the president, Dr. Witham, to be his vice-president, an office which involved the supervision of both professors and students. At the same time he was appointed professor of theology and prefect of studies, so that he had the direction of the whole course of studies.

His success as a teacher was probably due rather to his untiring industry and devotion to his work than to any extraordinary mental power, for he was never an original thinker, but his gift lay in enforcing the spiritual reality of the doctrines he was expounding. His fervent piety was his chief characteristic, and this appears even in his controversial works. In 1727 he defended his public thesis and obtained the degree of Doctor in Divinity. In 1728 he published his first work, the little book of meditations so well known under the quaint title of "Think Well on't". He had long desired, however, to leave the college and to take up the harder work of the mission, and in 1730 he was at last allowed to return to London, where he threw himself with zeal into the laborious work of the ministry. Though the penal laws were no longer enforced with extreme severity, the life of the Catholic priest was still a hard one. Disguised as a layman, Dr. Challoner ministered to the small number of Catholics, celebrating Mass secretly in obscure ale-houses, cockpits, and wherever small gatherings could assemble without exciting remark. He was an untiring worker, and in the poorest quarters of the town, in the prisons and sponging-houses, he sought out souls to save. In his spare time he gave himself to study and writing, and was thus able to produce several works of instruction and controversy. One of these, "The Catholic Christian instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice and Ceremonies of the Church", led to trouble, for in the preface he assailed a recent work of Dr. Conyers Middleton, an Anglican divine, who had attacked the Church. This gentleman so resented Dr. Challoner's reply that he set the law in motion against him, and it was thought prudent for him to leave England for a time

and retire again to Douai. This was in 1738, the year in which the able president of Douai, Dr. Witham, died, and strenuous efforts were made by the superiors of the college to have Dr. Challoner appointed president. But Dr. Petre, the Vicar Apostolic of the London District, opposed this on the ground that he desired to have him as his own coadjutor bishop. Propaganda had apparently already arranged Challoner's appointment as president of Douai, but the representations of Dr. Petre were so strong that he prevailed, and Briefs were issued on 12 Sept., 1739, appointing Challoner to the See of Debra *in partibus*.

These Briefs, however, were not carried into effect, for the bishop-elect, endeavouring to escape the responsibility of the episcopate, raised the point that he had been born and brought up a Protestant. The delay so caused lasted a whole year, and it was not till 24 Nov., 1740, that the new Briefs were issued. The consecration took place on 29 Jan., 1741, in the private chapel at Hammersmith. The new bishop's first work was a visitation of the district, the first methodical visitation of which there is any record since the creation of the vicariate in 1688. The district included ten counties, besides the Channel Islands and the British possessions in America—chiefly Maryland and Pennsylvania and some West Indian islands. The missions beyond seas could not be visited at all, and even the home counties took nearly three years. In the intervals of his travels the bishop was engaged in writing. In 1740 he brought out a new prayer book for the laity, the "Garden of the Soul", which has ever since remained the favourite work of devotion, though the many editions that have since appeared have been so altered that little of the original work remains. Next, finding that the sufferings of the English martyrs were in danger of being forgotten, he published in two volumes, "Memoirs of Missionary Priests", in which he gives an account of the martyrs from 1577 to 1681. This work, laboriously compiled from original records, has been the chief means of perpetuating the tradition of the English martyrs and remains the standard work on the subject. In 1745 he produced his longest and most learned book, "Britannia Sancta", containing the lives of the British, English, Scottish, and Irish saints. Another work to which he devoted much energy and time was the preparation of a revised edition of the Douay Bible and Reims New Testament. The chief points to note in his edition are the elimination of the obscure and literal translations from the Latin in which the original version abounds, the alteration of obsolete words, a closer approximation in some respects to the Anglican version, as, for instance, in the substitution of "The Lord" for "Our Lord", and finally the printing of the verses separately. The first edition of the New Testament appeared in 1749, the second, together with the first edition of the Old Testament, in 1750. Between these two editions there are but few differences, but the third edition, published in 1752, had important changes both in text and notes, the variations numbering over two thousand. Dr. Challoner's Bible has been the groundwork of nearly all subsequent English versions. An American edition was published in Philadelphia in 1805.

In 1753 Dr. Challoner brought out another of his best-known works, the popular "Meditations for every Day in the Year", a book which has passed through numerous editions and been translated into French and Italian. In the same year Pope Benedict XIV put an end to the long disputes that had been carried on between the secular clergy and the regulars, in the last stages of which Dr. Challoner took a leading part. There were several points at issue, but the matter was brought to a head over the contention put forward by the regulars, that they did not need the approbation of the vicars Apostolic to hear confessions. The bishops opposed this and, after a struggle lasting for several years, obtained a final settlement of this and other questions, a settlement, in the main, satisfactory to the bishops. In 1758 Dr. Petre, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, died, and Dr. Challoner, as his coadjutor, succeeded him at once. He was, however, nearly seventy years old, and was so ill that he was forced immediately to apply for a coadjutor. The Holy See appointed the Hon. and Rev. James Talbot to this office, and with the help of the younger prelate, whose assistance considerably lessened his labour, his health somewhat recovered. But from this time he lived almost entirely in London, the visitations being carried out by Dr. Talbot. He continued to write, and almost every year published a new book, but they were more usually translations or abstracts, such as "The Historical Part of the Old and New Testament". One more work of original value remained, and that was his little "British Martyrology" published in 1761.

As an administrator he was always unfailing in supplying deficiencies in the face of extraordinary difficulties. He had already provided for his people a suitable prayer book and meditation book, as well as convenient editions of the Holy Scriptures, the "Imitation of Christ", and the catechism of Christian Doctrine. But, besides this literary work, he caused two schools for boys to be opened, one at Standon Lordship, now represented by St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, and the other at Sedgley Park, in Staffordshire. He also founded a school for poor girls at Brook Green, Hammersmith, besides assisting the already existing convent school there. He also instituted conferences among the London clergy, and he was instrumental in founding the still-existing "Benevolent Society for the Relief of the Aged and Infirm Poor". His manifold activity is the more remarkable because his life was spent in hiding, owing to the state of the law, and often he had hurriedly to change his lodgings to escape the Protestant informers, who were anxious to earn the government reward of £100 for the conviction of a priest. One of these, John Payne, known as "The Protestant Carpenter", indicted Dr. Challoner, but was compelled to drop the proceedings, owing to some documents, which he had forged, falling into the hands of the bishop's lawyers. For some years he and the London priests were continually harassed in this way. Finally the evil was remedied by the Catholic Relief Act of 1778, by which priests were no longer liable to imprisonment for life. This concession, slight as it was, speedily kindled a fierce blaze of bigotry, and two years later the Gordon Riots broke out. The chapels and houses of Catholics were wrecked and plundered by frenzied mobs. From his hiding-place the bishop, now nearly ninety years of age, could hear the howls of the mob, who were searching for him with the intention of dragging him through the streets. They failed to find his refuge, and on the following day he escaped to Finchley, where he remained till the riots came to an end. But he never fully recovered from the shock. Six months later he was seized with paralysis, and died after two days' illness. He was buried in the vault of his friend Bryan Barrett, at Milton in Berkshire.

His private life was marked by extraordinary mortification, while large charity passed through his hands. He had the gift of prayer in a marked degree, and on two occasions at least he spoke prophetic words, which later events verified. For these reasons, as much as for the office he held so long, his name has ever been held in singular veneration by English Catholics. The portrait which formerly hung in his own house is now preserved, with his cassock and other relics, at St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, England. Besides the works mentioned above, Dr.

Challoner's other writings were: "Grounds of Catholic Doctrine" (1732); "Unerring Authority of the Catholic Church" (1732); "Short History of the Protestant Religion" (1733); "A Roman Catholick's Reasons why He cannot Conform" (1734); "The Touchstone of the New Religion" (1734); "The Young Gentleman Instructed in the Grounds of the Christian Religion" (1735); "A Specimen of the Spirit of the Dissenting Teachers" (1736); "The Catholic Christian Instructed" (1737); "Rheims Testament", ed. with F. Blyth (1738); translation of St. Augustine's "Confessions" (1740?); "The Grounds of the Old Religion" (1742); "A Letter to a Friend concerning the Infallibility of the Church" (1743); "A Papist Misrepresented and Represented", abridged from Gother; "Remarks on Two Letters against Popery" (1751); "Instructions for the Jubilee" (1751); "The Wonders of God in the Wilderness: Lives of the Fathers of the Deserts" (1755); "The Life of St. Teresa", abridged from Woodhead (1757); "Manual of Prayers" (1758); "A Caveat against the Methodists" (1760); "The City of God of the New Testament" (1760); "The Morality of the Bible" (1762); "Devotion of Catholics to the Blessed Virgin" (1764); "Rules of Life for a Christian" (1766). He also issued some minor works in the nature of tracts and pastoral letters. A complete life of Bishop Challoner is nearing completion (1907).

MILNER, *A Funeral Discourse on the Death of the Ven. and Rt. Rev. Richard Challoner* (1782); BARNARD, *Life of Venerable and Rt. Rev. Richard Challoner* (London, 1784); MILNER, *Brief Account of the Life of the Rt. Rev. Richard Challoner* (London, 1798); BUTLER, *Biographical Account of Rt. Rev. Dr. Challoner*, published anonymously in *Catholic Spectator* (1824) and reprinted in *Catholic Magazine* (1831); BRADY, *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy* (London, 1877), III, 164; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London 1885), I; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (London, 1887), IX, 440; BURTON, *Bishop Challoner* in *Penny Biographical Series* (Catholic Truth Society, London, 1897).

EDWIN BURTON.

Châlons-sur-Marne, DIOCESE OF (CATALAUNENSIS), comprises the department of Marne, exclusive of the arrondissement of Reims. United in 1802 with the Diocese of Meaux and in 1821 with that of Reims, the diocese of Châlons was re-established in 1822, and is suffragan to Reims. Local legends maintain that the evangelization of Châlons by St. Memmius, sent thither by St. Peter and assisted by his sister Poma, also by Sts. Donatian and Domitian, took place in the first century, but in the revised list of the diocesan saints in the Breviary these legends have been suppressed. Abbé Duchesne assigns the founding of the See of Châlons to the fourth century, Amandinus, who attended the Council of Tours in 461, being its ninth bishop. St. Lumier (Leudomerus), Bishop of Châlons about 580, was noted for his miraculous power over animals. The bishops of this see played an important part in early French history, and at the coronation of the Capetian kings the Bishop of Châlons always carried the royal ring. The cathedral was consecrated in 1147 by Eugene III, assisted by St. Bernard and eighteen cardinals. Among its celebrated abbeys the diocese counted those of St. Memmius, founded in the fifth century by Alpinus; Toussaints, founded in the eleventh century; Montier-en-Der, founded in the seventh century by St. Bercharius, a monk from Luxeuil; Saint-Pierre au Mont, founded during the same period. Notre-Dame de l'Epine, near Châlons, was a place of pilgrimage as early as the beginning of the fifteenth century.

Prior to the law of 1901 there were Jesuits and Lazarists in the Diocese of Châlons, which has many schools in charge of the local congregation of Notre-Dame, founded in 1613 by Venerable Mère Alix Leclerc. In 1900 there were in the diocese the following religious institutions: 16 infant schools, 3 boys' orphanages, 9 girls' orphanages, 7 dispensaries, 15 hospitals and asylums, 11 houses for religious nurses, 1 house of retreat, and 1 insane asylum. At the close of 1905 (the end of the period under the Concordat) statistics showed that the diocese had a population of 231,411, with 25 parishes (*cures*), 312 succursal parishes (mission churches), and 6 vicariates supported by the State.

Gallia Christiana (nova) (1751), IX, 856–905; X, *Instrumenta*, 147–86; DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, I, 13; EDOUARD DE BARTHÉLEMY, *Diocèse ancien de Châlons-sur-Marne* (Paris, 1861).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Cham, Chamites. I.—CHAM (A. V. Ham), son of Noe and progenitor of one of the three great races of men whose ethnographical table is given by Gen., x. Wherever the three sons of Noe are enumerated in the Bible, Cham is placed between Sem and Japhet. We may gather, however, from Gen., ix, 24 that this enumeration is not based on their age, since Cham is there spoken of as the "younger son" of Noe, as compared, apparently, with both his brothers. The only incident of the life of Cham after the deluge, which is recorded in the Bible, is that related in Gen., ix, 21–24. Cham sees his father under the influence of wine lying naked in his tent. He tells his brothers, who respectfully cover the patriarch. The sequel makes it plain that Cham was, on this occasion, guilty of great irreverence. For when Noe hears of the conduct of his sons he blesses Sem and Japhet, with their posterity, and he pronounces a curse, not on Cham, but on his son Chanaan and his descendants, predicting that they will be the servants of their brethren. (For a fuller treatment of this point see CHANAAN, CHANAANITES.)

II.—THE CHAMITES.—The natives and tribes which descend from Cham are enumerated in Gen., x, 6–20. They are divided into four great families: Chus, Mesram, Phuth, and Chanaan. The Cushites are found in the valleys of the Euphrates and Tigris, in Arabia, and in Africa (see CHUS). Mesram is Egypt. Phuth, less known, seems to have occupied regions west of Egypt, particularly Libya. Chanaan comprised the numerous tribes whose country was subsequently occupied by Israel. The Chamites were, consequently, spread over an immense extent of territory. They founded the greatest empires of antiquity, Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Phœnicia. In Asia they were early replaced or subjugated by Semites. In Africa they have likewise been overcome, in the course of time, by the races of Sem and Japhet. This subjection has meant, in general, the triumph of a higher civilization, purer morals, and a more spiritual religion. (See Lenormant, "Hist. ancienne de l'Orient", I, 96 sq.)

W. S. REILLY.

Chambéry (CAMBERIUM), ARCHDIOCESE OF (CAMBERIENSIS), comprises the entire arrondissement of Chambéry in Savoy (with the exception of 8 communes), 10 communes in the arrondissement of Annecy (Haute-Savoie), and 8 communes in the arrondissement of Albertville (Savoie). In 1467, in the ducal chapel built for the Holy Winding-Sheet (*Santo Sudario*) by Amadeus IX, Duke of Savoy, and the Duchess Yolande of France, Paul II erected a chapter directly subject to the Holy See, and his successor, Sixtus IV, united this chapter with the deanery of Savoy. In 1515 Leo X published a Bull making the deanery an archbishopric, but Francis I objected, and it was only in 1775 that this deanery was separated from the Diocese of Grenoble by Pius VI, who, in 1779, created it a bishopric with the see at Chambéry. The Duchy of Savoy, politically subject to the King of Sardinia, had thenceforth 4 bishoprics: Chambéry, Saint-Jean de Maurienne, Tarentaise, and Geneva (with residence at Annecy). In October, 1792, the commissaries to the Convention formed the constitu-

tional Diocese of Mont-Blanc, with Annecy as the see and Lyons as the metropolitan. The Concordat of 1802 created a Diocese of Chambéry and Geneva, suffragan of Lyons. A Bull dated 17 July, 1817, made Chambéry, once more a city of the Sardinian States, the seat of an archdiocese, with Aosta for suffragan; the Dioceses of Annecy (re-established in 1822), Saint-Jean-Maurienne, and Tarentaise (in 1825), soon also became suffragans of Chambéry. After the annexation of Savoy to France, in 1860, this condition continued, except that the Diocese of Aosta was made a suffragan of Turin.

The Cistercian Abbey of Hautecombe, founded in 1135, is one of the burial places of the House of Savoy. The relic known as the Holy Winding-Sheet of Christ was kept at Chambéry until 1598, in which year the Duke of Savoy had it transported to Turin, where St. Charles Borromeo wished to venerate it. Notre-Dame de Myans (antedating the twelfth century), where St. Francis de Sales officiated, and where diocesan missionaries now reside, and Notre-Dame de l'Aumône at Romilly (thirteenth century), whither Francis I of France went as a pilgrim, are still places of pilgrimage. Before the execution of the law of 1901 there were in the archdiocese Capuchins, Cistercians of the Immaculate Conception, and Trappists; the last are there yet. The Sisters of St. Joseph, an order founded at Chambéry in 1812 and devoted to teaching and charitable work, are now widespread, having 12 establishments in Brazil, 9 in North America, 1 in Iceland, 2 in Sweden, 5 in Russia, 10 in Denmark, and 8 in Norway. In 1900 the archdiocese had the following religious institutions: 1 foundling asylum, 2 maternity hospitals, 1 orphanage for boys, 5 for girls, 1 insane asylum, 1 house of retreat, 3 houses for nursing sisters, 8 hospitals and

The Cathedral, Chambéry

asylums, and 5 industrial schools. At the close of 1905 (end of the period under the Concordat), statistics showed a population of 164,424, with 18 parishes, 153 succursal parishes (mission churches), and 49 vicariates supported by the State.

Billiet, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire du diocèse de Chambéry* (Chambéry, 1865); Morand, *Personnel ecclésiastique du diocèse de Chambéry de 1802 à 1893* (Chambéry, 1893); Poncet, *Etude historique et artistique sur les anciennes églises de la Savoie* (Annecy, 1884); Chevalier, *Topo-bibl.*, s. v.

Georges Goyau.

Champlain, Samuel de, founder of Quebec and Father of New France, b. at Brouage, a village in the province of Saintonge, France, 1570, or, according to the "Bibliographie Saintongeoise", 1567; d. at Quebec, 25 December, 1635. He was the son of Antoine Champlain, a mariner, and Marguerite Le Roy, and his early education was entrusted to the parish priest. While still a youth Champlain accompanied his father on several voyages, and thus became familiar with the life of a mariner. When about twenty years of age he tendered his services to the Maréchal d'Aumont, one of the chief commanders of the Catholic army in its expeditions against the Huguenots. The career of a soldier did not appeal to the youth, whose ambition was to become a navigator. "Navigation", he wrote, "has always seemed to me to occupy the first place. By this art we obtain a knowledge of different countries, regions, and realms. By it we attract and bring to our own land all kinds of riches; by it the idolatry of paganism is overthrown, and Christianity proclaimed throughout all the regions of the earth. This is the art . . . which led me to explore the coasts of a portion of America, especially those of New France, where I have always desired to see the lily flourish, together with the only religion, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman" (Les voyages du Sieur de Champlain, Paris, 1613, Pt. V).

Samuel de Champlain

In 1598 Champlain returned to Brouage and made preparations for a voyage to Spain in the interest of his fellow-countrymen. While at Seville he was offered the command of the Saint Julien, one of the vessels fitted out by Spain to oppose the attack made on Porto Rico by the English. It was during his cruise in the Saint Julien that Champlain first suggested the possibility of uniting the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans by cutting through the Isthmus of Panama. Champlain kept a journal of his explorations in the Gulf of Mexico, and after his return to France, in 1601 or 1602, he received a pension and the appointment of geographer to the king. It was in the year 1603 that Champlain first visited the shores of Canada, as the lieutenant of Aymar de Chastes, viceroy under Henry IV. Pierre de Chauvin had proposed to make a permanent settlement at Tadoussac, but Champlain was not in favour of this place, and, having cast anchor at the foot of Cape Diamond, he considered that the point of Quebec would be the most advantageous site for the future colony. He then proceeded with Pont-Gravé to explore the St. Lawrence as far as Sault Saint Louis, and gathered from the natives such information as he could concerning Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, the Detroit River, Niagara Falls, and the rapids of the St. Lawrence, and returned to France in August, 1603. The next year he followed the fortunes of de Monts' expedition in Acadia, as geographer and historian. The party wintered on the island of Sainte-Croix, and in the spring Champlain explored the country between the island and Port Royal, continuing this work until the fall of 1607. As the lieutenant of de Monts Champlain laid the foundation of the *Abitation de Québec* on the 3d of July, 1608, and around this modest dwelling arose the little village of Quebec. A year later the founder joined the Hurons in an expedition against the Iroquois whom they defeated. Criticism has been directed against Champlain for having become involved in Indian warfare; but with a knowledge of the conditions of trade, and of the situation of the few Frenchmen at this time, his action seems to have been in the best interests of the settlement. It was during this expedition that Champlain discovered the lake which still bears his name. On his visit to

France in 1610 he married Hélène Boullé, then a girl only twelve years of age. According to the marriage settlement the young wife remained with her parents for two years. In 1620 she arrived at Quebec, and resided in the fort until 1624. Madame Champlain was beloved in New France, and after her husband's death she founded the Ursuline Convent at Meaux.

In the year 1611 Champlain continued his exploration of the St. Lawrence. Within a short distance of Mount Royal, discovered by Jacques Cartier seventy-five years before, he found a place suitable for a future settlement, and ordered the ground to be cleared and prepared for building. *La Place Royale*, the name given to the site by Champlain, is now in the heart of the commercial portion of the city of Montreal. The island opposite, now a popular summer resort, he named Sainte-Hélène, in honour of his wife. After his return from France in 1613 he set out from Sainte-Hélène with four Frenchmen and an Indian, to explore the region above Sault Saint Louis. In the month of June he came in sight of the River Gatineau, the River Rideau, and the Chaudière Falls, and went as far as Allumette Island. Two years later, on the 14th of August, 1615, he set out from Carhagouha at the head of a small band of Frenchmen to assist the Hurons against the Iroquois. The place of rendezvous was Cahiagué. On their journey they passed by Lake Ouantaron, now known as Lake Simcoe, and proceeded by way of Sturgeon Lake. Following the River Trent they reached the Bay of Quinté, where, says Champlain, "is the entrance to the grand river St. Lawrence". Crossing Lake Ontario they penetrated the woods and passed over the River Chouagen or Oswego. This journey had occupied five weeks, and the expedition had endured many hardships before meeting the enemy. During the skirmishes Champlain had been severely wounded in the knee by an arrow, but the pain from the wound he says "was nothing in comparison with that which I endured while I was carried, bound and pinioned, on the back of one of the savages". The Hurons were forced to retreat, and it was not until the 23d of December that the party again arrived at Cahiagué. Champlain had now prepared the way for colonization in New France, but for a time his efforts were fruitless. The merchants were not disposed to assist him in developing the country, seeing that the fur trade held out prospects of large gain. After crossing the ocean several times, however, he induced a few hardy settlers of sterling merit to seek their fortune on the banks of the St. Lawrence. These were the real pioneers of New France. In 1629 the little settlement received a check, when an English fleet under three brothers named Kirke appeared before Quebec, and the fort was compelled to surrender. Under the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye Quebec was restored to France, and Champlain again took up his residence in the fort, where he died, after having spent forty years of his life in the heroic endeavour to promote the religious and commercial interests of the land of his fathers in the New World.

Champlain published the following works: "Bref discours des choses plus remarquables que Samuel Champlain de Brouage a reconnues aux Indes Occidentales" (1598); "Des sauvages: ou voyage de Sieur de Champlain faict en l'an 1603" (Paris, s. d.); "Les Voyages du Sieur Champlain Xainctongeois, 1604–1613" (Paris, 1613); "Voyages et Descouvertures faites en la Nouvelle-France, depuis l'année 1615 jusques à la fin de l'année 1618. Par le Sieur de Champlain" (Paris, 1619); "Les Voyages de la Nouvelle-France Occidentale, dicte Canada, faits par le Sieur de Champlain Xainctongeois, depuis l'an 1603 jusques en l'année 1629" (Paris, 1632); "Traité de la marine et du devoir d'un bon marinier. Par le Sieur de Champlain" (s. d.). In 1870 the Abbé Laverdière edited the works of Champlain in six volumes under the title of "Œuvres de Champlain publiées sous le patronage de l'Université Laval, par l'Abbé C. H. Laverdière, M.A., professeur d'Histoire à la Faculté des arts et Bibliothécaire de l'Université" (2d ed., Québec, 1870). While the work was in the press the plates were destroyed by fire and only the proof sheets were saved. This edition does not contain the account of the visits to Mexico and the West Indies. The first volume has an excellent biographical sketch of Champlain by Abbé Laverdière. The "Voyages du Sieur de Champlain" was published in two volumes (Paris, 1830), and another edition in the same year at the expense of the French Government. The "Voyage to the West Indies and Mexico (1599–1602)" appeared in 1859.

The literature concerning Champlain is very extensive, and only some of the best-known publications are given here. LAVERDIÈRE AND CASGRAIN, *Découverte du tombeau de Champlain* (Quebec, 1866); DRAPEAU, *Observations sur la brochure de MM. Laverdière et Casgrain*, Broc. Can., vol. CLIII, Library of Parliament, Ottawa; IDEM, *Le journal de Québec et le tombeau de Champlain*, Broc. Can., vol. CLIII; CHAVARAY, *Documents inédits sur Champlain* (Paris, 1875); AUDIAT, *Brouage et Champlain*, 1578–1667 (1879); RUSSELL, *On Champlain's Astrolabe, Found in Aug., 1867* (Montreal, 1879); DIONNE, *Le tombeau de Champlain* (Quebec, 1880); sketches by HURLBUTT (Chicago, 1885) and DIONNE (Quebec, 1891, 1906); CASGRAIN, *Champlain, sa vie, son caractère* (Quebec, 1898); the literature which appeared at the time of the unveiling of the monument to Champlain in Quebec, 21 Dec., 1898, such as the special number of the *Courrier du livre; Champlain, not Cartier, Made First Reference to Niagara Falls* (1899); GRAVIER, *Champlain, sa vie* (Paris and Toronto, 1900); SEDGEWICK in *Riverside Biog. Ser.* (Boston, 1902); DIONNE in *The Makers of Canada* (Toronto, 1905); CORBEIL, *Champlain et Maisonneuve;* DIX, *The Founder of New France* (New York, 1903).

ARTHUR G. DOUGHTY.

Champney, ANTHONY, controversialist, born in England c. 1569; died there c. 1643. He studied at Reims (1590) and Rome (1593). As priest he was imprisoned at Wisbech, and was active against the Jesuits, acting later for the Appellant Clergy in Rome (1602). Afterwards he was appointed president of the English College of Arras near Paris, becoming doctor of theology and Fellow of the Sorbonne. He was vice-president of Douai College, from 1619 to 1625, and from 1628 till he returned to England, where he died some time after 1643. He published: "An Answer to a Letter of a Jesuited Gentleman" (1601); "A Manual of Controversies" (1614); "A Treatise of the Vocation of Bishops" (1616); "Mr. Pilkington his Parallela Disparalled" (1620); "An Answer to a Pamphlet (by D. Featley) intituled, 'The Fisher catched in his owne Net'" (1623); "A Defence of the Appendix to the Antidote" (before 1624); "Legatum Fratribus suis Cleri Anglicani Sacerdotibus Testamento relictum" (in Bishop Smith's "Monita"). His "History of Queen Elizabeth" is still in manuscript. Formerly, as stated by Gillow, Cooper, Knox, etc., it was preserved in the archives of the Old Chapter, but since 1879 has been restored to Westminster Archives, to which it belonged; there are also some other works in manuscript.

DODD, *Church History* (London, 1737), III, 81; *MSS.* in British Museum, *Addit. MSS.*, 18393, 18394; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, I, 462; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, X, 35.

EDWIN BURTON.

Champollion, JEAN-FRANÇOIS (called THE YOUNGER to distinguish him from his elder brother, Champollion-Figeac), French Orientalist, born at Figeaci, Lot, 23 Dec., 1790; died in Paris, 4 March, 1832. While still young, he studied Hebrew, Syriac Ethiopic, and Arabic, to which he added later on, Persian, Sanskrit, and in particular Coptic. His special field of activity was Egyptology, and his great glory is to have recovered the key for the understanding of the hieroglyphs. In 1807 he read before the Academy of Grenoble an introduction to the geography of Egypt under the Pharaohs, which he published in 1811. This was intended as the introduction to a complete description of Egypt under the Pharaohs. The publication of the main work was begun in 1814 under the title

"L'Egypte sous les Pharaons"; only the first two volumes, bearing on geography, were issued. His efforts to decipher the hieroglyphics began in 1808. By means of the triple inscription of the Rosetta Stone, he succeeded in ascertaining several of the signs, and on 17 Sept., 1822, he read before the Academy of Inscriptions his now famous "Lettre à M. Dacier", in which he gave the fruits of his researches. The mystery of the hieroglyphics had been solved. With the exception of a brief controversy with Dr. Young, relative to the priority of the discovery, his claims have never been disputed. In 1823 he outlined his system more thoroughly in a series of memoirs read in the Institute. These memoirs were put together and printed under the title "Précis du système hieroglyphique des anciens Egyptiens" (Paris, 1824; 2nd ed., 2 vols., 1828). In 1824 he was sent to Italy by the King of France on a scientific mission, and on his recommendation a rich collection of Egyptian antiquities was secured by the Musée du Louvre. It was during his sojourn in Italy that he catalogued the Egyptian monuments of Naples, Florence, and Rome. Appointed curator of the Egyptian Museum of the Louvre, he issued his "Notice descriptive des monuments égyptiens du musée Charles X" (Paris, 1827). He then received a commission to explore Egypt, in the company of Rosellini. The enthusiastic letters which he wrote were published day by day; after his death, they were reprinted in book form by his brother, in 1833, and again by his daughter, in 1868. In 1830 he was named member of the Academy of Inscriptions and elected to the chair of Egyptian archæology, founded for him at the Collège de France. Soon, however, he retired to Quercy, and devoted the last months of his life to the completion and revision of his Egyptian grammar and dictionary. He was a genius, but it is the testimony of all those who came in contact with him that the man was even better than the scholar.

Among his other works were "Deux lettres à M. le duc de Blacas d'Aulps, relatives au musée royal égyptien de Turin" (Paris, 1824–1826); "Catalogue des monuments égyptiens du musée du Vatican" (Rome, 1826); "Panthéon égyptien", etc. (1823–1831), published in parts, the whole work was to have formed two volumes, but was not completed. His manuscripts were acquired by the French Government and published by his brother. Among these posthumous works, the most important are: "Monuments de l'Egypte et de la Nubie d'après les dessins exécutés sur les lieux", etc., 4 vols. (Paris, 1835–1845); "Monuments de l'Egypte et de la Nubie, notices descriptives" (Paris, 1844–1874); "Grammaire égyptienne", 3 parts (Paris, 1836–1841); "Dictionnaire égyptien en écriture hieroglyphique, in 4 parts (Paris, 1841–1844).

LORET in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v.; JOLOWICZ, *Bibliotheca Ægyptiaca* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1858–1861); STEINDORFF in HILPRECHT, *Explorations in Bible Lands* (Philadelphia, 1903), 629 sqq.; IBRAHAM-HILMY, *The Literature of Egypt and the Sudan* (London, 1886–88).

R. BUTIN.

Champs, ETIENNE AGARD DE, a distinguished theologian and author, b. at Bourges, 2 September, 1613; d. at Paris (according to De Backer, at La Flèche), 31 July, 1701. He entered the Jesuit novitiate in 1630, and later, in Paris, was professor of rhetoric, philosophy, and theology; he was rector at Rennes, thrice rector at Paris, head of the professed house, twice provincial of France, and once provincial of Lyons. Jansenism, the one topic of debate in the France of his day, is the theme of all his books. Writing under the name of Richard Antonius, he composed: "Defensio Censuræ Sacræ Facultatis Parisiensis—seu Disputatio Theologica de libero arbitrio" (Paris, 1645). This solid treatise was well received, and went through five editions in two years. It called forth a reply from Vincent Lenis in his "Theriaca" (Paris, 1648), which occasioned the "Antonii Ricardi Theologi Responsio ad objectiones Vincentianas" (Paris, 1648). He defends the Sorbonne in his "De Hæresi Janseniana" (1654). Among his other works the best known is "Le secret du Jansenisme découvert et réfuté par un Docteur Catholique" (Paris, 1651).

HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1876), II, pt. I, 723; RIBADENEIRA-SOTWELL, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu* (Rome, 1676), II, 1749; DE BACKER-SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Brussels, Paris, 1891), II, 1863-1869.

LEO F. O'NEIL.

Chanaan, Chanaanites.—The Hebrew word כְּנַעַן, *Kenáʻán*, denoting a person, occurs: (1) in the Old Testament as the name of one of Cham's sons; (2) in a lengthened form, *Kenáʻănah* (D. V., Chanana, Chanaana) as the name of two other people (I Par., vii, 10; II Par., xviii, 10); (3) denoting a country, as the name of the region of the Chanaanites, or descendants of Chanaan. In the days when the trading Phœnicians held a prominent place, especially among the Chanaanites, this word (*Kenáʻănî*), and even Chanaan (e. g. Is., xxiii, 8), got the signification of merchant, trader. As the name of the country it occurs under the forms *Kinaḥḥi*, *Kinaḥni*, and *Kinaḥna*, as early as two centuries before Moses in the cuneiform letters of Syrian and Palestinian princes to Egyptian Pharaos, found at Tell el-Amarna; and earlier still in Egyptian inscriptions, in the form *Ka-n-ʻ-na*. The Phœnician town of Laodicea calls itself on coins from the second century B. C. "a mother in *Kenáʻán*". In Grecian literature, too, evidence remains that the Phœnicians called one of their ancestors, as well as their country, Χνᾶ, and even at the time of St. Augustine the Punic country people near Hippo called themselves *Chanani*, i. e. Chanaanites. If the word be of Semitic origin, it should be derived from the root כנע *Kânáʻ*, and mean, originally, low; or, in a figurative sense, small, humble, despicable, subjected. Following this derivation in its original sense, "the land of Chanaan" has been explained by various scholars as "the low land"—whether the name may have originally denoted only the flat seashore, or the mountainous country of Western Palestine as well, in opposition to the still higher mountains of the Lebanon and the Hermon. But Biblical tradition rather seems to derive the name of the country from that of the person. It takes the "land of Canaan" as "the border of the Canaanites" (A. V., Gen., x, 19), i. e. of the race of Chanaan, Cham's son, and it does not seem advisable to put against this so uncertain a conjecture as the etymology given above. The less so, as the figurative meaning of the word, as a synonym of slave or servant, fits in very well with the little we know of Noe's grandson.

CHANAAN, THE SON OF CHAM.—In Gen., ix, 18 and 22, Cham appears as the father of Chanaan, and in Noe's prediction (verses 25–27) Chanaan stands side by side with his "brothers" (in the larger sense of the Hebrew word) Sem and Japheth:—

"He said: Cursed be Chanaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.

"And he said: Blessed be the Lord God of Sem, be Chanaan his servant.

"May God enlarge Japheth, and may he dwell in the tents of Sem, and Chanaan be his servant."

The curse called down on Chanaan is undoubtedly connected with the sin of his father, Cham (verse 22). But it is rather hard to indicate the precise nature of this connexion. Had Chanaan in some way a share in his father's sin, and is it for this reason that what was said in verse 18 is repeated in the story of the sin, viz.: that Cham was the father of Chanaan? Or is the latter struck by Noe's prophetic curse for the sins of his posterity, who were to imitate

Cham's wickedness? Certain it is, that this curse, as well as the blessing invoked upon Sem and Japheth, was especially fulfilled in their posterity. The descendants of Chanaan were partly rooted out, partly subjected by the Israelites; and all the Chanaanite races, as such, disappeared from the scene of history. Others have tried to solve the problem by critical methods. It was supposed that Gen., ix, 20–27 was derived from a source in which Chanaan had taken the place of his father, Cham, and so was passed off as Noe's third son. It is as conceivable that in the original prophecy the name of Cham occurred, and that the Israelites, seeing the prophecy fulfilled, especially in the posterity of Chanaan, might have changed it to that of the son. But none of these critical conjectures has any solid foundation.

Quite uncertain, too, is the opinion which represents Chanaan as the youngest of Cham's four sons. It is based on Gen., x, 6: "And the sons of Cham: Chus, and Mesram and Phuth, and Chanaan". But this whole list of the descendants of Noe's sons is, at least in substance, ethnographical, and the order of succession geographical; hence an enumeration of tribes beginning with the most distant and ending in Palestine. In verses 16–20, therefore, there is question only of Chanaanite tribes, and they occupy the last place because they dwell in, or near, Palestine. Consequently it cannot be concluded from this that Chanaan was the youngest son of Cham.

THE LAND OF CHANAAN.—With a few exceptions the Biblical writers seem to indicate by this name, at the least, the whole of Western or cis-Jordanic Palestine. It extends from the desert of Sin in the south to near Rohob and the entrance to Emath in the north (Num., xiii, 3, 18; cf. 22). A more accurate demarcation of the land of Chanaan is in Num., xxxiv, 3–12, and Ezech., xlvii, 15–20. For though the name does not occur in Ezechiel, the identity of the boundary lines drawn there is not to be doubted. In either text the western boundary is formed by the Mediterranean, and the greater part of the eastern by the Dead Sea and the lower course of the Jordan.

The southern frontier coincides with that of the territory of Juda (Jos., xv, 1–4), whilst Cadesbarne (*Ain Ḳedîs*), 30° 33′ N. lat., may be taken as the most southern point. From St. Jerome's time (In Ezech., Migne, XXV, 476–478) the northern frontier was placed in Middle or even Northern Syria. From this passage of St. Jerome even a *fons Daphnis* (Daphne near Antioch) found its way into the Vulgate (Num., xxxiv, 11) instead of the town of Ain. But though some of the border towns are not yet known with absolute certainty, we may take for granted nowadays that this northern boundary-line of Chanaan must be drawn to the south of the Lebanon and Hermon, at about 33° 18′ N. lat.; and that it completely coincides with the northern frontier of the country conquered and inhabited by the Israelites, which, according to numerous quotations, stretched "from Dan to Bershabee" or "from the entering in of Emath unto the brook of Egypt". The northern part of the eastern boundary, however, seems to follow, not the upper course of the Jordan, but the course of the *Rukkâd* from *Ḥăsâr-'Ênân* (*El-Ḥadr*) to *'Ain* (*'Ayûn*), so that here the whole of Western Jaulân still seems to be included in the land of Chanaan—not, however, the land of Galaad or the country in general beyond the Jordan to the south of the Jarmuk. All the places quoted above agree with this conception, and only twice does the name of the country Chanaan occur in a more limited sense: first for the Phœnician coast (Is., xxiii, 11), and secondly for the low land of the Philistines (Soph., ii, 5)—both in a time when only these regions along the coast were still inhabited by Chanaanites. We have already seen how the name was honoured even later still in Phœnicia itself. In Egypt the name of the country seems to be used especially for the sea-coast; at the same time the name Chanaanites is also applied to the inhabitants of the mountainous country behind it. In the Tell el-Amarna letters the country of *Kinaḫḫi* seems to include both the Phœnician coast and the mountains of Upper Galilee, and probably, farther to the north, the country of Amurri (Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon). Cf. H. Clauss, Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-vereins (1907), XXX, 17, 29, 30, 35, 36, 64, 67.

Gen., x, 15–18 enumerates as the descendants of Chanaan a series of tribes, most of which, and originally perhaps all, were settled outside Palestine proper, and up to Northern Syria: "And Chanaan begot Sidon, his firstborn, the Hethite, and the Jebusite, and the Amorrhite, and the Gergesite, the Hevite and the Aracite: the Sinite, and the Aradian, the Samarite, and the Hamathite: and afterwards the families of the Chanaanites were spread abroad." These latter are the tribes peopling Biblical Chanaan or Western Palestine: "And the limits of Chanaan were from Sidon as one comes to Gerara even Gaza, until thou enter Sodom and Gomorrha, and Adama, and Seboim even to Lesa." If we may identify Lesa (A.V. Lasha) with Lesem (Jos., xix, 47) or Lais (Judges, xviii, 14, etc.), the Dan of later days, the coast from Sidon to Gaza and Gerara is here indicated as the western boundary of Chanaan, and the valley of the Jordan from the Pentapolis to Lais-Dan as the eastern boundary. But the "Codex Samaritanus" has in verse 19 quite another statement: "And the border of the Canaanite was from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates, and [from the Euphrates] to the hindmost [or Western] Sea." Apparently by "the Canaanite" are here meant all the descendants of Chanaan, mentioned in verses 15–18, of whom the Hethites, at least, lived close to the Euphrates. It is hard to decide which reading is the original one. Both show the descendants of Chanaan settled in the Biblical "land of Chanaan", i. e. the later "land of Israel". As a rule it is the pre-Israelitish inhabitants of this "land of Chanaan", taken collectively, who are indicated by this common name of Chanaanites. Thus in the Pentateuch, especially in parts attributed to a Jahvistic source, as e. g. Gen., xii, 6, xxiv, 3, 37, xxxviii, 2, l, 11. Elsewhere, however, chiefly in so-called Elohistic parts, the name of Amorrhites is used in the same general sense. And very often as many as six or seven, or even eleven, different tribes or peoples are distinguished, one of which in particular bears the name of Chanaanites. Thus e. g. Exod., iii, 8: "The Chanaanite, and Hethite, and Amorrhite and Pherezite, and Hevite, and Jebusite." Repeatedly (e. g. Jos., iii, 10), the Gergesites, mentioned above (Gen., x, 16), are added; and in Gen., xv, 19–21, we find "the Cineans and Cenezites, the Cedmonites . . . the Raphaim also"; whilst in Num., xiv, 25, the Amalecite; in A.V. Deut., ii, 23, and Jos., xiii, 3, the Avims; and in Jos., xi, 21 (and elsewhere), the Enacims are named, leaving out other older, and probably trans-Jordanic, tribes like the Zuzim, the Emim, and the Chorreans (Gen., xiv, 5,6).

Of most of these tribes little or nothing is known. For Amorrhites see article under that title. The Hethites founded a mighty kingdom in Northern Syria, but it is uncertain whether their namesakes in the south of Palestine (Gen., xxiii, 3, xxvi, 34, etc.) had anything in common with them besides the name. About the Chanaanites in a more limited sense we learn that they had their dwelling-place to the east and west of the mountains, i. e. along the coast of the Mediterranean and in the valley of the Jordan and the Araba to the south of the Dead Sea (Num., xiii, 30, xiv, 25; Deut., i, 7, xi, 29 sq.; Jos., v, 1, xi, 3, xiii, 3). So it is by this name that the Phœnicians are still called in Abd., 20; and the "Syrophenician"

woman of Mark, vii, 26, is a Chanaanitish woman in Matth., xv, 22. It is not likely that all the various pre-Israelitish tribes remained sharply distinguished from one another. "There are good reasons for believing that at a very early period the population of Palestine already presented a mixture of races, and that through intermarriage the dividing lines between these races became fainter in the course of time, until all sharp distinctions were obliterated. The problem of distinguishing between these various groups whom the Hebrews encountered upon settling in Palestine is at present incapable of solution." (Morris Jastrow Jr., Encyclop. Bibl., I, 642.) Still it does not seem too great a venture to distinguish (with Hughes Vincent, "Canaan", p. 455) two principal groups of tribes: the Amorrhites in the mountains and the Chanaanites along the sea-coast and in the valley of the Jordan, and perhaps in the plain of Esdrelon (Jos., xvii, 12–18). On the other hand, when the Israelites under Josue penetrated into Chanaan they found this mixed "Chanaanitish" or "Amorrhitish" population, not bound together politically under one government, but divided into more than thirty petty kingdoms (Jos., xii, 7–14), a state of things which must have made the conquest considerably easier for them. This same system of cutting up the country into small parts obtained two or three centuries earlier, in the time of the Tell el-Amarna letters, which were for the greater part written by, or to a number of these city-kings—and apparently even earlier still in the days of Abraham (Gen., xiv, 2, 8, 18, xx, 2). In this respect these letters contain a striking corroboration of the Biblical story. After the campaigns of Tothmes III in the sixteenth century B. C. all these small states acknowledged the supremacy of the Egyptian Pharaos and paid them tribute. After a time, however, this sovereignty must have gradually become more and more nominal, and in spite of the later campaigns of Seti I and Ramses II against the Hethites, it left no traces after the conquest by Josue.

The further particulars given by the Bible about the Chanaanites are rather scanty. We read occasionally of their cities "great and walled up to the sky" (Deut., i, 28; cf. Num., xiii, 29); of their "chariots of iron" (Jos., xvii, 16); and repeatedly of their gods Baal and Moloch and their goddesses Astarte and Ashera; of their altars and their stone pillars (*maṣṣêbôth*) and wooden posts (*ashêrîm*); in connexion with these altars, of their sacrifices of children and manifold forms of moral perversity; the abominations on account of which "the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants" (A.V., Lev., xviii, 25), and which, in spite of the severe prohibition of the Law and the admonitions of the Prophets, found but too much imitation in Israel itself. Most of these particulars have of late received a splendid corroboration and explanation in archæological discoveries, principally in consequence of the systematic excavations conducted in Palestine by W. H. Flinders Petrie and F. J. Bliss at Tell el-Hesy; by Bliss and M. R. A. Stewart Macalister at Tell Zakarîyâ, Tell es-Sâfy, and Tell Jedeide; by Macalister at Tell Jezer; by E. Sellin at Thenac; by G. Schumacher at Tell el-Mutesallim—to all of which Sellin added in 1907 his labours at old Jericho.

Even before the tribes who are introduced to us as Chanaanites in the Bible penetrated into Palestine (between 3000 and 2500 B. C.) there must have lived for many centuries an older population, dwelling there partly in caves, but also possessing their primitive "towns" surrounded by earthen walls. This period is characterized especially by stone instruments and very primitive earthenware. The Chanaanitish tribes who gradually took their place came from the north and were for a long time, if not under the supremacy, without a doubt under the manifold influence of Babylon. In the fifteenth century B. C., when the country was already politically subject to Egypt, the kings of the Chanaanitish towns used in their correspondence, not only with the Pharaos but also between themselves, the Babylonian cuneiform characters, and—with the addition of a number of Chanaanitish words—the language of Babylon as well. Macalister (Pal. Expl. Fund Quart. Stat. 1905, 323 sq.) and, quite lately, Sellin (Mitth. und Nach. des Deutschen Palästinavereins, 1907, 70) found some scanty evidence that the Old Hebrew or Phœnician characters were also known in those days. Civilization, meanwhile, had made immense progress, as is evident from the use of bronze and other metals —soon, too, of iron; from the building of dwelling-places, city walls, towers, and strongholds; from the increasing number and value of objects of domestic and religious use; from the designs and fitting up of sanctuaries and burial caves; and from the richer variety of form, ornamentation, and painting in the products of the potter's art—though art does not appear to have enjoyed a continuous and even development.

When the Israelites (Num., xiii, 29; Deut., i, 28) speak in awe of "great cities", the hyperbole is nearly as great as in the expression "walled up to the sky"; those explored have covered, at most, seven or eight hectares (about 19 acres), but the fortifications have been excellent. The wall of Jericho, built of burnt bricks, had a width of from three to twelve metres, i. e. from about 9 to 39 feet (Sellin, op. cit., p. 69). If the ancient inhabitants offered their sacrifices in dish-like cups cut in the surface of the rocky ground, the Chanaanites had their open-air temples, or *Bâmôth* (high places), with altar, sacrificial pit, and stone pillars from about seven to nine feet high. At Gazer eight pillars were found, still standing, the smallest of which (about 5½ feet high) seems to be the oldest, and is perhaps the real emblem of the deity. Of the *ashêrîm*, or wooden posts, only the stone bases seem to be left. Two large grottos situated under the sanctuary must also have played a part in this worship. But the most disgusting traces of this idolatry are the skeletons of infants—mostly new-born babes—sacrificed to the deity, which at Gazer were found buried in jars beneath the floor of the sanctuary, and elsewhere, especially at Mageddo, in its immediate neighbourhood. Several times the remains of these human victims, among which have been adults, were found beneath or in the foundations of houses and other buildings; a striking illustration of the words of Jos., vi, 26: "Cursed be the man before the Lord that shall raise up and build the city of Jericho. In [or with] his firstborn may he lay the foundation thereof, and in [or with] the last of his children set up its gates." The naturalistic character of this religion becomes especially evident in the numerous Astarte plaques, or statuettes, of divergent types, and likewise in the often occurring phallic emblems. Among these latter some class part of the bætylic stone pillars, and find in a few bulls' heads representations of Baal or Moloch. Some representations of Babylonian deities also occur, and, still more frequently, images from Egyptian mythology. The Astarte plaques likewise show Egyptian inspiration. In short, the Chanaanitish civilization seems continually to have felt the influence of both these nations. In pottery, moreover, Ægean-Phœnician art produced marked results from the beginning of the fourteenth century B. C. On the other hand, the settlement of the Israelites in Chanaan, judging from the explorations made, opened no new period in so far as archæology is concerned, so that the "Chanaanitish" period (i. e. the various "Semitic" periods of Macalister, Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statements, 1907, p. 203) has been extended to about the ninth or eighth century B. C.

Indeed, the submission of the Chanaanites was not made effectual nearly so soon as some chapters of the Book of Josue might lead us to expect. Particularly the places that have become best known to us through the excavations, Thenac, Mageddo, and Gazer, are among those that submitted to Israel only after a lapse of time (Jos., xvii, 11–13; Judges, i, 27–29). Gazer even in the days of Solomon was still inhabited by Chanaanites (III K., ix, 16). And in the same context (verses 20–21) we learn that Solomon, through forced statute labour, subjugated "unto this day" the whole of the Chanaanitish population of his realm. Thus Chanaan had become once and for all the servant of Sem. Afterwards Phœnicia with its colonies was subjugated by the Romans, sons of Japheth, and soon vanished altogether from the roll of nations.

In addition to general encyclopedia articles, archæological and Biblical reviews, see especially *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statements* (1891–1907); *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des Deutschen Palästinavereins* (1902–1907); and the separate works: PETRIE, *Tell el-Hesy (Lachish)*, (London, 1891); BLISS, *A Mound of Many Cities* (London, 1894); *Excavations in Palestine during the Years* 1898–1900 (London, 1902); SELLIN, *Tell Ta'annek: Bericht über eine Ausgrabung in Palästina* (Vienna, 1904); *Eine Nachlese auf dem Tell Ta'annek* (Vienna, 1905); and the masterly critical compilation of the results obtained, by VINCENT, *Canaan d'après l'exploration récente* (Paris, 1907).

JOHN P. VAN KASTEREN.

Chanca, DIEGO ALVAREZ, physician-in-ordinary to Ferdinand and Isabella of Castile and Aragon; dates of birth and death uncertain. Owing to his professional skill and learning, he was appointed by the Crown to accompany the second expedition of Christopher Columbus to America in 1493. Shortly after landing on the shores of the Island of Haiti, Dr. Chanca proved his skill as a physician by successfully treating Columbus for an attack of pernicious malarial fever, and saving the lives of other prominent members of the expedition who were attacked by disease. On a site selected by Chanca, whose professional advice had been sought, was established the first Christian settlement in the New World, to which Columbus gave the name of Isabella in honour of his illustrious patroness. In this locality Chanca wrote his letter to the municipal council of his native city, which was the first document describing the flora, the fauna, the ethnology, and the ethnography of America. A remarkable circumstance in connexion with this letter is the fact that everything therein contained was the result of only three months of observation and study. Upon his return to Spain, Chanca published in 1506 a medical treatise entitled "Para curar el mal de Costado" (The Treatment of Pleurisy), and in 1514, he published a work in Latin criticizing a book entitled "De conservandâ juventute et retardandâ senectute", the work of Arnaldo de Villanova, a brother-physician. Chanca's work was published under the title "Commentum novum in Parabolas divi Arnaldi de Villanova".

Dr. Diego Alvarez Chanca in the Miscellaneous Publications of the Smithsonian Institution (Washington); DE YBARRA in *U. S. Cath. Hist. Soc. Records and Studies*, V, pt. I (New York, November, 1907).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Chancel, part of the choir near the altar of a church, where the deacons or sub-deacons stand to assist the officiating priest. It was originally railed off by *cancelli* or lattice work, from which the name is derived. The term is now generally confined to parish churches, and such as have no aisles or chapels round the choir. In some churches, in addition to the principal chancel, there are others at the ends of the side-aisles. The Latin word *cancellus* was commonly used for the low screen which marked the separation of the *presbyterium* and choir from the rest of the church. In a later time the name *chancel* came to be applied to the *presbyterium* itself. Very few chancels, however, of the early period have been preserved in place. A clear idea of the normal arrangement can be had in St. Clement's at Rome, where the sixth-century screens of the choir and *presbyterium* were simply removed from the lower church and set up in the twelfth-century church above. In St. Clement's the chancel screen of the *presbyterium* coincided with the chord of the apse, and the altar also stood upon this line; the approaches had therefore to be constructed on either side of the altar. The chancels of the *presbyterium* are surmounted by a light colonnade for the support of curtains. The term was used in England before the Reformation, and the Anglicans still retain it. Among English Catholics it is now little used, that portion of the church near the altar, separated by rails from the nave, being designated the sanctuary. In cathedrals and conventual churches, where space is required to accomodate the canons or the religious, a portion of the church between the sanctuary and the nave is taken for the purpose; it is not, however, called the chancel, but the choir.

BOND, *Gothic Architecture in England* (London, 1906); FLETCHER, *A History of Architecture* (London, 1905); ATKINSON, *Glossary of English Architecture* (London, 1906).

THOMAS H. POOLE.

Chancellor. See DIOCESAN CHANCERY.

Chancery, APOSTOLIC. See CURIA ROMANA.

Chancery, DIOCESAN. See DIOCESAN CHANCERY.

Chanel, PIERRE-LOUIS-MARIE, Blessed, Protomartyr of Oceanica, b. at Cuet, dep. of Ain, France, 1803, d. at Futuna, Friendly Islands, Oceanica, 28 April, 1841. Being of humble parentage, a zealous priest, M. Trompier, assisted his education. Ordained priest in 1827, he went as curate to Ambérieux and later as pastor to Crozet. His desire to serve in the foreign missions drew him, in 1831, into the newly-founded Society of Mary which, having been formally approved, 29 April, 1836, was entrusted with the evangelization of Occidental Oceanica. Chanel, after taking the three religious vows at the hands of Father Colin, founder and first superior of the Marists, embarked that same year for his distant mission under the leadership of Bishop Bataillon, and was sent to the island called Horn, or Allofatu, by geographers, and Futuna by the natives. War between rival tribes and the practice of cannibalism had reduced its population to a few thousands when Chanel landed on its shores. The religion he found there was a worship of terror offered to evil deities. Chanel laboured faithfully amid the greatest hardships, learning the native language, attending the sick, baptizing the dying, and winning from all the name of "the man with the kind heart". Niuliki, the then ruler, showed first an amicable disposition towards the missionary and even declared him "taboo", or sacred and inviolable; but when he saw that his subjects were being drawn away from the idols into the white man's religion, he issued an edict against him to avert the movement towards Christianity. At that very time his son Meitala joined the missionary.

Musumusu, Niuliki's prime minister and an implacable enemy of Christianity, then concocted a plot with the petty chiefs against the Christians, which was carried out with great cruelty At daybreak, on 28 April, 1841, the conspirators assembled together and, after wounding many neophytes whom they had surprised sleeping, proceeded to Chanel's hut. One shattered his arm and wounded his left temple with a war-club. Another struck him to the ground with a bayonet. A third beat him severely with a club. The missionary was uttering the while words of gentle resignation: "Malie fuai" (it is well for me). Musumusu himself, enraged at the tardiness of death, split open the martyr's skull with an adze. The remains of the martyred mis-

sionary, hurriedly buried, were later claimed by M. Lavaux, commander of the French naval station of Tahiti, and taken to France on a government transport, 1842. The cause of the beatification of Father Chanel, introduced 1857, terminated by the Brief "Quemadmodum" of 16 Nov., 1889. The solemnities took place the following day in the basilica of St. Peter, Rome. "Oceanicæ protomartyr" is the official title given Blessed Chanel by the Congregation of Rites in the decree declaring: "tuto procedi posse ad solemnem Ven. servi Dei P. M. Chanel beatificationem".

Acta authentica beatificationis (Rome, 1889); BOURDIN, *Vie du P. Chanel* (Lyons, 1867); NICOLET, *Vie du Bienheureux P. M. Chanel* (Lyons, 1890), two abridgments in English of the foregoing were printed at Dublin and Abbeville (1890); MANGERET, *Mgr. Bataillon et les Missions de l'Océanie* (Paris, Lyons, 1884), I, 225; HERVIER, *Les missions Maristes en Océanie* (Paris, 1902); *Annales de la propagation de la foi* (Lyons, 1842, 1843); *Our First Beatified Martyrs* (pamphlet issued by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, New York, 1907).

J. F. SOLLIER.

Changanacherry, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF (CHANGANACHERENSIS), in Travancore, British India, created 28 July, 1896. Its first actual vicar Apostolic, Mathew Makil, titular Bishop of Tralles, was consecrated 25 Oct., 1896. This vicariate was established to meet the needs of native Indian Christians of the Syro-Malabar Rite. It includes five deaneries of Nordist Syrians (descendants of native Malabar castes) and two of Sudists (descendants of fourth century immigrant Syrians), a social distinction originating long ago in their residence at Cranganore. Its territory extends south as far as Purakad, and is bounded on the north by the Vicariate of Ernakulam, on the east by the Ghats, and on the west by the Gulf of Arabia. The Catholic population numbers 140,172 in a total of 900,000. There are 95 churches and 57 chapels; the native clergy number 283 (253 secular, 30 regular); besides these there are 20 brothers. There are four Carmelite monasteries. The convents of religious women have 70 members (35 Carmelites, 20 Visitation nuns, and 15 Clarisses). The annual conversions reach about 1000. There are 75 theological seminarists with 20 pupils in preparatory work. In 3 English (boarding) high schools there are 650 boys, and in 4 middle schools 360 girls. In 418 native parish schools there are 14,328 pupils. The Catholic press is represented by one native Malayalam weekly paper and 2 monthly periodicals. The Jacobite Syrians and the Protestants number 13,000; the pagan population about 600,000.

Missiones Catholicæ (Rome, 1907), 824–25; *Illustrated Catholic Missions* (London, March, June, 1903); *La Vera Roma* (30 May, 1903); *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (April, 1897); *Census of India* (1901), XXVII, *Travancore*, part I, 109–110, and *Cochin*, part I, 44–45, 60.

MATHEW VATTAKALAN.

Channel Islands. See PORTSMOUTH, DIOCESE OF.

Chant. See AMBROSIAN, GREGORIAN, LITURGICAL, PLAIN CHANT.

Chantal, JANE FRANCES DE, SAINT. See JANE FRANCES DE CHANTAL, SAINT.

Chantelou, CLAUDE, patristic scholar, b. in 1617, at Vion, in the present Diocese of Le Mans, France; d. 28 November, 1664, at the Monastery of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris. Having spent some time in the Order of Fontevrault, he left it to become a Benedictine in the Congregation of Saint-Maur, in which he made his profession, 7 February, 1640, at Toulouse. When the General Chapter of 1651 ordained that two religious be entrusted with the preparation of a history of the congregation, Chantelou was one of the appointees, and from that time until his death resided at Saint-Germain-des-Prés. He is the author of the following works: "Bibliotheca Patrum ascetica" (Paris, 1661–64), a collection of extracts from the writings of the Fathers regarding the spiritual life; "S. Benedicti abbatis Clarevallensis Parænetico" (Paris, 1662), an edition of sermons of St. Bernard preceded by a life of the saint written by Alain, Bishop of Auxerre (a life of St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, concludes the work); "S. Basilii Cæsareæ Cappadociæ archiepiscopi regularum fusius disputatarum liber" (Paris, 1664), answers of St. Basil to questions proposed by his monks respecting the monastic life; "Carte géographique de la France bénédictine", published by Le Chevalier in 1726. Marin de Carraurais edited and completed Chantelou's manuscript, "History of the Abbey of Montmajour", near Arles (Marseilles, 1878). Nobilleau published his "Analyses du cartulaire tourangeau de Marmoutier" (Tours, 1879). Chantelou was also a collaborator in the publication of important Benedictine historical collections, e. g. the "Spicilegium" of D'Achéry.

LE CERF, *Bibliothèque hist. et crit. des auteurs de la congrégation de St-Maur* (The Hague, 1726), 58–60; LAMA, *Biblioth. des écrivains de la congrégation de St-Maur* (Munich and Paris, 1882), 43; HEURTEBIZE in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1905), II, 2215.

N. A. WEBER.

Chantry (M. E. *chaunterie;* O. Fr. *chanterie;* Fr. *chanter*, to sing; M. Lat. *cantaria, cantuaria*, whence *cantarie, cantuarie*), the endowment of one or more priests to say or sing Mass for the soul of the endower, or for the souls of persons named by him, and also, in the greater number of cases, to perform certain other offices, such as those of choir member in a collegiate church or cathedral, or of curate in outlying districts, or of chaplain in hospitals and jails, or of schoolmaster or librarian. It was thus essentially, though not solely, a liturgical institution requiring as a *sine qua non* of its existence a place where the incumbent might say Mass. As a rule this was provided for by screening off a space between the great pillars of the nave or transept of some parish church or cathedral, and erecting an altar there. But frequently an addition was made to and opening into the choir, or a detached building was erected for the purpose. These detached chantry chapels, built in a churchyard, or in an outlying district, or at the entrance to bridges, often consisted of two stories, the lower one being devoted to the strictly religious uses of the foundation, while the incumbent used the upper one as his home or as a schoolroom. To erect a chantry the consent of the ordinary, which was given only when it was found that a fund sufficiently large for its building and maintenance had been set aside, had to be obtained; then the permission of the Crown to alienate lands in mortmain had to be secured; and then, to provide against the violation of the rights of the mother-church, the priest in whose parish the chantry was to be erected had to be consulted; finally, to give it a legal character, it had to be instituted by the civil authorities of the locality. In the erection of some chantries, beyond giving his permission, the bishop played no part. The donor, or his trustees, retained the funds as well as the right of appointing and removing the incumbent. Chantries of this kind were called "mercenary", and were erected usually only for a definite period of time. Two other forms, called "collative" and "in private patronage", were erected, as a rule in perpetuity. Both of these were ecclesiastical; the only difference between them being that in the latter the donor or his trustees named the incumbent, whereas in the former the bishop alone had the right.

Traces of the chantry system are to be found in England as far back as the Conquest, but these foundations were not numerous until the middle of the fourteenth century. After that time, however, owing largely, no doubt, to the tremendous revolution effected by the great pestilences, and the subsequent growth in wealth and influence of the middle classes, their number constantly increased until, at the time of their suppression, there were, according

to Heylin, 2374 of them. The work of suppressing and despoiling the chantries, begun by Henry VIII, was taken up and completed by his successor, Edward VI, in 1547. They yielded to the harpies that swarmed about his court 180,000 pounds. But the spirit which gave them birth could not be destroyed, and we see it manifesting itself in our own time in the erection of the Vaughan Chantry in the new cathedral of Westminster. Among the many evils attendant upon the suppression of the chantry the most grievous, perhaps, was the effect upon education. For the chantries were the grammar schools of the period—the incumbent "teaching gratis the poor who asked it humbly for the love of God". Just how many of them had taken on this character of grammar school it is difficult to say. But that it was very large is seen from the fact that in 1562, nine years after Edward, the long-heralded "Father" of grammar schools, was dead, we find Williams, the Speaker of the House of Commons, in an address to the queen, referring to "the want of schools: that at least a hundred were wanting in England which before that time had been"—an allusion which we may safely assume had reference to the chantry schools. And Leach, who does not hesitate to call Edward "the Spoiler", instead of "the Father" of schools, says that between 1547 and 1645 no grammar school was founded in England which had not already existed as a chantry. (See SCHOOLS.)

SHARPE, *Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London, 1258–1688*, ed. PAGE (2 vols., London, 1889–1890); *Yorkshire Chantry Surveys, Being the Certificates of the Commissioners Appointed to Survey the Chantries, Guilds, Hospitals, etc., in the County of York*, ed. RAINES (2 vols. Surtees Society, London, 1898); *A History of the Chantries within the County Palatine of Lancaster, Being the Reports of the Royal Commissioners of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary;* LEACH ed., *Early Yorkshire Schools, York, Beverly, Ripon* (Yorkshire Archæological Society), I, in *Record Series* (London, 1899), XXVII; STOW, *A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster and of the Borough of Southwark* (2 vols., London, 1754–5); MOYES in *Academy*, XXXVII, 223; LEACH in *Contemporary Review* (1892); MILBURN in *Dublin Review* (April, 1899); JESSOP in *Nineteenth Century* (March, 1898); MOYES in *Dublin Review* (January and April, 1899); *Saturday Review*, LIX, 344; HOLLAND in *Catholic University Bulletin* (Jan., 1903).

CORNELIUS HOLLAND.

Chapeauville, JEAN, a Belgian theologian and historian, b. at Liège, 5 January, 1551; d. there 11 May, 1617. He made his philosophical studies at the Universities of Cologne and Louvain, and at the latter received the degree of Licentiate of Theology. He then entered the priesthood, and in 1578 was appointed one of the synodal examiners for the Diocese of Liège, and in 1579 parish priest of St. Michael's in the same city. He performed the functions of the latter office for about ten years. Having been a canon of the collegiate church of St. Peter's in Liège since 1582, he was elevated in 1599 to the dignity of a provost of the same church. In 1587, Pope Sixtus V appointed him the first penitentiary canon of St. Lambert's Cathedral. On 12 June, 1600, he was promoted to the archdeaconship of Famenne. Meanwhile, in 1582, he had been nominated Inquisitor of the Faith, and in 1598, Ernest of Bavaria, Bishop of Liège, appointed him vicar-general, in which office he was retained, despite his protests, by Bishop Ernest's successor, Ferdinand of Bavaria. Chapeauville was distinguished for his great charity in attending the sick, especially during the pestilence that visited Liège in 1581, and for his exemplary piety and his zeal for the progress of sacred studies. He taught theology with great success in several monasteries of Liège and published works on theological subjects. He endeavoured to enforce in the diocese the reforms decided upon by the Council of Trent, particularly the establishment of a clerical seminary and the *concursus* for the nomination of parish priests. He also published a valuable collection of the chief works on the history of the bishops of Liège, and even wrote an account of the episcopate of Liège, commencing with Erard de la Marck (1506) and ending with the year 1613. His principal works are: "Tractatus de necessitate et modo administrandi sacramenta tempore pestis" (Liège, 1586); "Petit traité des vices et des vertus" (Liège, 1594); "Abbrégé de la somme des péchez M. J. Benedicti" (Liège, 1595); "De casibus reservatis tractatus" (Liège, 1596); "Catechismi Romani elucidatio scholastica" (Liège, 1600); "Historia admirandarum curationum quæ divinitus ope deprecationeque divi Perpetui Leodiensis episcopi contigerunt. Adjecta est vita B. Perpetui" (Liège, 1601; Fr. tr., 1601); "Summa catechismi Romani" (Liège, 1605); "Epistola ad catechistas de tædio quod catechistis obrepere solet" (Liège, 1605); "Catechista, sive brevis tractatus de necessitate et modo administrandi doctrinam christianam" (Liège, 1608); "Qui gesta pontificum tungrensium, trajectensium et leodiensium scripserunt auctores præcipui" (3 vols., Liège, 1612, 1613, 1616).

A number of copies of the first volume of CHAPEAUVILLE'S *Qui gesta pontificum* contain a short biography of the author: *Periocha vitæ auctoris fideliter post ipsius obitum contracta.* FOPPENS, *Bibliotheca Belgica* (Brussels, 1739), II, 608–10; BECDELIÈVRE, *Biographie liégeoise* (Liège, 1839), I, 407–12; DE THEUX DE MONTJARDIN, *Le chapître de Saint-Lambert à Liège* (Liège, 1871–72), III, 186; HELBIG in *Biographie nationale de Belgique* (Brussels, 1872), III, 428–32; PONCELET, *Inventaire analytique des chartes de la collégiale de Saint-Pierre à Liège* (Brussels, 1906), XXVIII; DE THEUX, *Bibliographie liégeoise* (Brussels, 1867).

A. VAN HOVE.

Chapel (Lat. *capella;* Fr. *chapelle*).—When St. Martin divided his military cloak (*cappa*) and gave half to the beggar at the gate of Amiens, he wrapped the other half round his shoulders, thus making of it a cape (*capella*). This cape, or its representative, was afterwards preserved as a relic and accompanied the Frankish kings in their wars, and the tent which sheltered it became known also as *cappella* or *capella*. In this tent Mass was celebrated by the military chaplains (*capellani*). When at rest in the palace the relic likewise gave its name to the oratory where it was kept, and subsequently any oratory where Mass and Divine service were celebrated was called *capella, chapelle,* chapel. The word is first found used in this sense by Marculfus (seventh century), who gives the above etymology, an explanation which has been generally accepted ever since, though Durandus ventures upon an alternative derivation, to wit, *capra,* because the tent above mentioned was made of goat-skins. Another, but improbable, derivation is *cupella,* a domical or cup-shaped monument (see CUPOLA). The canopy over an altar was also at one time called a *capella*. In ecclesiastical documents the main sanctuary of a church is often termed the *capella major,* to distinguish it from the side-altars (cf. St. Charles Borromeo's "Instructions"). In Spain the sanctuary containing the high altar is to this day called the *capilla mayor*. The thing is, however, much more ancient than the name, and Thomassin quotes numerous early references to *oratoria, sacella,* and *εὐκτήρια.* In dealing with the subject a large number of different kinds of chapels are to be considered, which vary according to their connexion with, or dependence upon, other buildings, or to the specific uses to which they were put. Thus we have chapels which structurally form part of a larger church, those which are included within other buildings not churches, and those which are entirely separate and detached. We have also papal, royal, episcopal, votive, wayside and mortuary chapels. It seems best for the purposes of this article, first to trace the origin and development of chapels in general, and then to deal with the different kinds, according to their special uses, and under their respective titles, in alphabetical order.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT.—The earliest places of

Christian worship may be called chapels, inasmuch as they were informal churches, i. e. a chamber in a house, or the *atrium* and *tablinum* of the house adapted for the purpose; but the earliest oratories or chapels, as distinct from the buildings where the bishop and presbytery presided over the regular assemblies of Christians, were probably martyrs' memorials. Thus, the Council of Gangra (350) censures desecrators of the *sepulchra martyrum* and of the synaxes, sacrifices, and memorials celebrated therein. The Fifth Council of Carthage (400) orders the bishops to raze all unauthorized altars and martyrs' monuments erected in the open fields or at the roadside unless authenticated. The first instance on record of a private chapel is that of Constantine (the prototype of the chapel royal, and of the *saintes chapelles* of France, viz.: at Paris, Vincennes, and St-Germain-en-Laye); the emperor had a chapel in his palace at Constantinople, and carried with him in his wars and progresses a facsimile of it in the shape of a portable tent (Socrates, Hist. eccl., I, xiv). Another early example of a chapel within another building is the small one now known as the *Sancta Sanctorum*, in the still remaining fragment of the ancient Lateran palace. It was the private chapel of the popes and existed as early as 583, when Pelagius II placed certain relics in it (MSS. Bibl. Vat., in Baronius). The private chapel also of the archbishops of Ravenna, in their palace there, is still to be seen; it was built, or at least decorated, by Archbishop Peter Chrysologus about 430. Instances are extant of the original meeting-places of Christians being preserved under the level of the subsequent church, the soil having risen in the course of ages. Thus, under the lower church of San Clemente at Rome is a chamber, at present inaccessible, that may have have been part of the house of Clemens. Under the existing church of St-Gervais at Rouen is a third or early fourth-century chamber which is now a crypt. Under the high altar of Chartres cathedral is the chapel of St-Lubin, bounded on the west by a piece of the Gallo-Roman wall of the fortress of the Carnutenses, and here, it is believed, the first Christians of Chartres, who were allowed to erect a chapel against the wall itself, worshipped. Other examples occur at Sens (St-Savinien), Créteil, Etampes (Notre-Dame), Hexham and Ripon.

The spread of Christianity from the cities into the country must have early occasioned the erection of oratories and chapels for the use of believers living at a distance from the bishop's church. St. Chrysostom (Hom. xviii in Act.) exhorts nobles and rich men to build chapels in their country homes and to employ priests, deacons, and other clerks to offer there, on Sundays, the Unbloody Sacrifice, on weekdays, to celebrate the morning and evening Offices, and to bless the table, and teach the children and servants on the estate. The prohibition by the Council of Laodicea (c. 350) of the celebration of the liturgy in private houses is considered by Thomassin to refer only to the cities where regular churches already existed. This freedom in the erection of chapels had soon to be restricted. There being as yet no parochial system, as now understood, it became necessary to safeguard the jurisdiction of the city-bishop throughout the circumscription of influence and activity recognized as belonging to the cathedral or mother-church. Justinian (Novel. lviii) made private oratories illegal, save for simple prayer ; if such chapels were separate from the dwelling, the bishop might permit service to be held there, but clerks were not to be ordained to these as "titles". Apparently this edict was ignored, for the Quinisext Council of Constantinople (692) decrees that clerks who in oratories within houses celebrate Mass or baptize must submit to the judgment of the bishop in each case (can. xxxi). The fifty-ninth canon of the same council positively forbids baptism in such chapels. Ordination, since the close of the age of persecutions, has never been given without a "title" or definite sphere of work and corresponding maintenance having been first secured to the ordained. In the Council of Chalcedon were read Acts of the Constantinopolitan Council under Flavian, mentioning priests attached to *martyria* or suburban churches at Constantinople, and the sixth canon forbade the ordination of any save to some title, these *martyria* being in the list of those recognized. In the West the same enactment was repeated by the seventh canon of the Fourth Council of Arles (524).

The royal example was soon followed by the nobles, over whose chapels the bishops were constantly asserting and enforcing their jurisdiction and safeguarding the interests of the *parochia* or mother-church. The Council of Agde (506) conceded to the nobles that the Mysteries might be celebrated in their oratories, except on the principal feasts, on which days they and their households must attend the parish church (cf. below, the present legislation); otherwise the offerings of the faithful on those days would have been made in the chapel, to the detriment of the mother-church and parochial clergy. Charlemagne, as head of the revived Empire of the West, followed his imperial predecessors in legislating for the Church, or rather in giving imperial sanction to needful reforms in the Church. "It hath pleased us", he says in his Capitularies (V, clxxxii), "that neither in our palace nor elsewhere shall a chapel be set up without permission of the bishop in whose diocese (*parochia*) it is"; and (V, ccxxx), "Those who have oratories in their houses may pray there, but may not have Masses celebrated without permission of the bishop". And Thomassin quotes, as proceeding from a Gallican council of this time, a canon to the effect that on Sundays and feasts all shall come to the church and none shall invite priests to celebrate Mass in their houses. In course of time many chapels, both those set up by nobles, and those furnished by the ecclesiastical authority, became regular parish churches. In England particularly many foundations, now parochial, were originally manorial chapels, and on the other hand the parish church was often founded independently of the manor-house, as at Deerhurst, on the Severn, where exist side by side and of the same date, both the manorial chapel and the Saxon parish church. Some of these manorial chapels, while still remaining private property, with chaplains appointed and maintained by the lay proprietor, were given semi-parochial privileges and came to be looked upon as chapels-of-ease to the parish church. A notable example of a nobleman's chapel becoming a cathedral is found at Moulins-sur-Allier, where the ancient chapel of the Dukes of Bourbon now forms the choir of the cathedral, the nave having been added by Viollet-le-Duc. Other buildings such as court-houses, hospitals, and of course all religious houses and their granges, had chapels attached to them in medieval times; but, from the very first, except in the case of exempt monasteries and their dependencies, the appointment of priests to serve such chapels was always subject to the control of the bishop, which remains the law of the Church to this day.

KINDS OF CHAPELS.—*Chapels within a larger Church.* —Under this head must be included Lady chapels, side-chapels, ante-chapels, etc., attached to, or under the roof of a larger church. Chantry chapels will be treated in a separate section. The earliest form, perhaps, of the subsidiary chapel within a larger church, is to be seen in the parallel apses which in some ancient churches flank the great apse or main sanctuary. These originated in the East, where, however, they served as sacristies or the like. The Oriental Rites, unlike the Roman, have always had a preliminary offertory or *prothesis* at which the oblations are handled before Mass. This ceremony, at first performed at the altar itself, was in some rites (notably the

Byzantine) elaborated into a preliminary offering at a subsidiary altar or "table of prothesis", the prepared oblations being solemnly conveyed to the main altar in the course of the actual liturgy. The northern apse or chapel became the place of *prothesis*, and the other remained a sacristy or *diaconicon*. Although the architectural feature of parallel apses was early introduced into the West, they had no effect upon the rite in places where the Roman Liturgy was in use, but remained at first mere sacristies. In France and Spain, where the Gallican Rite prevailed, they would doubtless be used in the Oriental way. Paulinus of Nola, in the fifth century (Ep., xxxii), speaks of two chambers, possibly apses, flanking the altar of his church whereof the right-hand one was a sacristy and the other a library or place of retirement for prayer. In the ninth century the Roman church of Santa Maria in Cosmedin was altered for the use of the Orientals by the addition of side apses, and the well-known basilica of Torcello was similarly furnished at about the same time. If the word chapel includes places set apart for prayer as well as those for the celebration of the liturgy, these examples must be considered as rightly coming under this division of the subject. The same must be said also of the apartments opening out from the naves of the churches of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme and Santa Balbina, both at Rome and dating probably from the fifth century. Similar chapels existed in the ninth-century churches of Santa Christina at Pola de Lena and Santa Maria de Naranco, both near Oviedo in Spain. All these examples and many others that might be enumerated differed only from the side-chapels of later ages in having no altars. The ancient discipline of "one altar in one church" has always been preserved in the East, at least in theory, though an exception to its corollary "one Mass at one altar" must be made in the case of Jerusalem, where in the fourth century Mass was offered twice on the Calvary altar on Maundy Thursday, and twice in the Anastasis on Easter Day. The Gallican Rite required this latter restriction; thus, in a synod of Auxerre, it is decreed that two Masses must not be said at one altar on the same day, and, moreover, that no presbyter may celebrate at an altar which had that day been used by the bishop. Also, for many centuries, the Ambrosian Rite preserved the same theory and it was for one altar only that Milan cathedral was designed. But when the members of the priesthood, instead of concelebrating with the bishop in the basilica, began each to say his own Mass, a plurality of altars became a necessity if the ancient rule of "one Mass at one altar" was to be kept. In the East, where the matter was not of great urgency, as individual Masses remained the exception, the subsidiary altar, if required, was enclosed in a chapel forming a complete though miniature church. The Blanskenoy church in Moscow, which contains eight complete and enclosed chapels grouped round a central one, is probably an extreme example. In churches subject to Celtic rule a group of separate chapels was sometimes formed, e. g. the Seven Churches at Glendalough, Ireland, the Ten Churches of Twineham, in England (remaining as late as the eleventh century), and the marvellous group of sanctuaries at Rocamadour, in France, a famous place of pilgrimage in the Middle Ages and probably an isolated survival of the Celtic plan. In churches of the Roman Rite altars were simply set up in any convenient part of the church, although, in the Middle Ages, they were partly screened off. An extreme example of this may be seen in the well-known plan, never carried out, for the abbey church of St. Gall (ninth century), which is so filled up with enclosed altars that congregational worship would have been impossible. In existing churches the parallel apses at once suggested a pair of chapels, and those which lacked this feature were sometimes altered accordingly. In others, smaller apses were often built out from the main apse; the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem seems to have been thus treated in the tenth century, if not earlier, and other chapels were added to the original plan. The sanctuary or "station" on the site of the Crucifixion, which stood between the Holy Sepulchre and the basilica of the Holy Cross, may be taken as an early example of a chapel within a church, for although it was originally in the open air and not included under the roof of the church, as at present, it was used daily in the fourth century after the morning and evening Offices in the Sepulchre church (Anastasis) and had an altar on which the Holy Oblation was offered on Maundy Thursday and the True Cross exhibited on Good Friday (Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta, ed. Gamurrini, Rome, 1888).

As access to the chapels radiating from the main apse was inconvenient, later builders devised the ambulatory, or passage behind the apse proper and connecting all the apsidal chapels with the "procession path". This was an important innovation destined to revolutionize the plan of most large churches; it issued at length in the *chevet*, or crown of chapels, a design which found favour in most European countries, but was nowhere carried to the height of beauty and elaboration that it realized in France. The basilica of St-Martin at Tours is considered to have been the common source from which most examples of this idea were copied, none of them being older than about 900. They were comparatively rare in England, owing to the prevalent square east-end, but there are beautiful examples, as at Westminster, Norwich, and Peterborough. The transept, eastern or western, also invited the formation of chapels, and this position is almost universal in the great Norman cross-churches. It was used in preference to the *chevet* plan in England, where the transept was a more frequent and more developed feature than elsewhere; for while in continental churches the need for increased chapel space was supplied by utilizing the intervals between buttresses (first at Notre-Dame, Paris, in 1290), the English preferred to form extra chapels along the east wall of the transept, and even to lengthen or rebuild the transept for that purpose, their buttresses being as a rule too shallow to afford the space required. At Gloucester there are three stories of chapels, one above the other, the crypt and the triforium containing altars exactly corresponding with those of the ground level. Where the buttresses were interior, as at Albi, the church was from the outset provided with a series of chapels, sometimes in two stories, along its whole perimeter.

The dedication of the *chevet* chapels to important saints led naturally to the easternmost being assigned to Our Lady. In France this chapel is frequently somewhat larger than the rest, as at Bayeux, Reims, Séez, and Troyes; much larger at Amiens and Le Mans; and very much larger at Rouen (both in the cathedral and in the abbey church of St. Ouen) and Coutances. The number of the *chevet* chapels varies from three at St-Etienne of Nevers to the magnificent sweep of thirteen which are the glory of Le Mans. Langres is singular, for so large a church, in having but one such chapel, and Sens seems to have had originally one circular chapel at the east end, like "Becket's Crown" at Canterbury. It was in the Lady chapel towards the close of the Middle Ages, that innovations in church music were allowed, only the strict chant being heard in the choir. At Gloucester the Lady chapel is furnished with two galleries (with chantry chapels below) for the singing of "prick-song"; each is provided with a broad stone desk for the necessary books, thus differing from the choir where such accommodation was unusual and unnecessary, but few books being used there except on the lectern.

Reference may here be made to Galilees and ante-

chapels, which sometimes contained altars and were used for liturgical purposes. They usually take the form of an enlarged western entrance or narthex. Those of St-Front (Périgueux), Romain-Moutier, and Jumièges are early examples, while those at Vézelay and Cluny are conspicuous for their size. The finest example in England is that at Durham (really the Lady chapel), and there is a smaller one at Ely. At Lincoln there is a Galilee on the western side of the south transept. Two parochial Galilees exist in Norwich, at St. Peter Mancroft and St. John Maddermarket, both being the ground story of the western tower. In most of the medieval college chapels of Oxford and Cambridge, what is usually called the ante-chapel is really only the space outside the entrance to the choir, occupied nowadays at service time by those who are not members of the college. Baptisteries were often built in the form of chapels, and either contained altars or had chapels with altars opening out of them, as in the Lateran basilica (fourth century).

Ambassadors' Chapels.—The use of a private chapel for the ambassadors of a Catholic country at a Protestant Court, and vice versa, has frequently been allowed as a matter of courtesy, though not of strict right according to international law. In England, even at a time when the exercise of the Catholic religion was proscribed by the penal laws, Catholic ambassadors were permitted to have such chapels attached to their embassies. The Sardinian, Neapolitan, Venetian, Bavarian, Portuguese, and Spanish ambassadors were thus favoured, all having their private chapels in London. The Sardinian (erected 1648), Bavarian (1747), and Spanish (1742) chapels were even opened to the public and became eventually ordinary parochial churches. The two former still exist, while the latter was replaced (1890) by a handsome church.

Bishops' Chapels.—The bishop's chapel was, at first, nothing less than the basilica or cathedral where he was accustomed to preside with his presbytery, but the feudalization of the bishop and the installation in cathedrals of choirs of monks or canons, under an ordinary superior of their own, made it necessary that the bishop should possess a separate private chapel. Of these episcopal chapels there remain many beautiful examples, of which that at Reims is one of the finest. Another deserving of mention is that which was formerly attached to the London residence of the bishops of Ely, dedicated to St. Etheldreda. It was built in 1290; though dismantled at the Reformation, it was for a short period during the Stuart times refitted and lent for the use of the Spanish ambassador. Afterwards it passed into the hands of a Welsh Protestant congregation, from whom it was bought by the Fathers of Charity in 1876, and reopened by them for Catholic worship. In the Middle Ages the chapel, whether of the bishop or of the noble, often signified his whole *maison ecclésiastique* (see section, *Papal Chapel*), i. e. his chaplains, clerks, choristers and the ecclesiastical furniture, which accompanied him from place to place. All bishops have the right to a private chapel in their houses, and they retain this right even when travelling.

Cemetery or Mortuary Chapels.—These are of very early origin, whether special, as at the burial-place of a martyr, or general, as in the common resting-places of the faithful. The Roman catacombs furnish many examples of both kinds. After the days of persecution, Christians were able to worship at the resting-places of the dead without secrecy or fear of profanation, and thus the cemetery and mortuary chapels of the Middle Ages arose. Two of the most curious are: that at Sarlat, in the Dordogne, which is a conical structure some forty feet high, containing a circular mortuary chapel on the ground-floor and towards the top a *pharos* or lantern, and that at Avioth (Meuse), containing an open sanctuary supported by columns and a glazed lantern above. The former is of the twelfth and the latter of the fifteenth century. Magnificent chapels were often built to serve as the burial-places of kings and other great men. Becket's Crown, at Canterbury, and Henry the Seventh's chapel at Westminster, are examples, as also is the circular chapel containing the tomb of King Emmanuel of Portugal, in the Abbey of Batalha. The most famous of all, perhaps, is the Cathedral of Aachen, which enshrines the tomb of Charlemagne.

Chantry Chapels.—These differ from other interior chapels only in being erected and endowed for the celebration of Masses of requiem, in perpetuity, for some individual soul, generally that of the founder himself. Special priests were usually appointed to serve them, and were called "chantry priests". It was not until the thirteenth century that such chapels became common, and by that time, most of the available space in the churches had been already occupied, hence we find chantry chapels stowed away in corners and odd places. Being intended for private, not public, Masses, they were frequently smaller than other chapels. Vacant spaces in aisles and transepts, or, as in many larger churches, between the pillars of the nave, lent themselves to their accommodation, though sometimes they were distinct buildings annexed to the church. Whenever possible they were placed near the tomb of their founder, and very often such tombs were either enclosed within the chapel itself or actually adjoined it. Like other chapels they were invariably screened off from the rest of the church; wooden screen-work was perhaps the more common, but some notable examples still exist in England of chantry chapels, like miniature sanctuaries, screened and vaulted in stone and of surpassing beauty. Such are Prince Arthur's chantry at Worcester, the Founder's chapel at Tewkesbury, the chantries of William of Wykeham and Cardinal Beaufort at Winchester, and those of Bishop Bubwith and Dean Sugar at Wells. Sometimes the chapel was placed above the tomb and reached by a winding staircase, as at Christ Church, Oxford, in what is commonly but wrongly called "St. Frideswide's Shrine". Chantries were also sometimes built and maintained by a local guild, such as the Guild of the Holy Ghost at Beccles, and the Palmers' Guild at Ludlow. Strictly speaking, the chantry is the endowment, and in some cases it was attached to an existing chapel in which other Masses were commonly celebrated. (See CHANTRY.)

Charnel Chapels and Charnel-houses.—These were in the same class as cemetery chapels and consisted generally of a vault or chamber in which were deposited the bones displaced in the digging of graves, with a chapel adjoining or, more usually, above. Brittany abounds in such chapels, of which Viollet-le-Duc gives two curious examples, at Fleurance and Faouët. In England there were specimens at Worcester, Norwich, Old St. Paul's (London), Bury St. Edmunds, Grantham, Stratford-on-Avon, and many other places. That at Norwich, a detached building to the west of the cathedral, now used as a grammar-school, is perhaps the most perfect example still standing.

Chapels of Ease.—These were separate buildings, churches in everything but name, built in remote portions of large parishes and so called because they were intended to ease the parish church and the parishioners living at a distance from it. Clergy appointed for the purpose served them as vicars of the parish priest. These chapels were not formerly allowed to contain a font or have a cemetery adjoining them, but in later times both these privileges were often conceded, and many such chapels have since become independent of the mother-church.

Gate-house Chapels.—The enclosure wall of most medieval monasteries was entered through a gate-house, many of which contained chapels. In England

such chapels existed at Furness, Evesham, Llanthony, Malling, Merivale, and Bury St. Edmunds. Similar chapels were to be found also in the gate-houses of many walled towns. The "Hanging Chapel" of Langport, Somerset, is a fine example.

Papal Chapels.—Technically the *Capella Papale* signifies the entire staff of dignitaries and officials privileged to assist at one of the greater papal functions, and includes the College of Cardinals, the patriarchs, assistants at the pontifical throne, Apostolic prothonotaries, domestic prelates, private chamberlains, chaplains, heads and procurators of religious orders, papal choristers, and a host of other officials such as the vice-chamberlain of the Roman Church, the majordomo, the prelates of the Rota, etc., who rank as members of the pope's household. Regarded in this sense, the papal chapel originated on the removal of the papal court from Rome in 1305, when the traditional feasts and ceremonies celebrated formerly in the different basilicas of Rome were transferred to the Palatine chapel of Avignon. On the return to Rome in 1377, the popes continued, for various reasons, to perform these ceremonies in a private chapel instead of in the basilicas. Nicholas V built a chapel in the Vatican for the purpose, which was demolished by Paul III to make room for the Pauline chapel erected by him. The other chapel in the Vatican, now used for most of the important papal functions, is the Sistine, built by Sixtus IV in 1473. It is noted no less for its famous choir than for the paintings of Raphael, Michelangelo and others which adorn its walls and ceiling. Since 1870 the number of days on which the full *capella* assists the pope has been greatly curtailed. Formerly there were thirty-two such days in the course of the year; now they are not more than half a dozen. These are the anniversary of the coronation of the reigning pontiff, the requiem for his immediate predecessor, and the public consistories. To them are occasionally added such special ceremonies as jubilee Masses and the canonization of new saints, the latter functions often taking place in St. Peter's instead of the Sistine chapel. With regard to the term "papal chapel", taken in its untechnical meaning, such chapels would seem to correspond more or less with other private chapels, like those of bishops or reigning sovereigns. One of the earliest of these existed in the Lateran palace in the fourth century, and since that time the pope's place of residence has always contained a private chapel for his own use. One is that in the villa of Innocent VIII (now the Belvedere), which that pope built in the Vatican gardens in the fifteenth century; that in the Quirinal during the time that it was a papal residence; that in the Castel Gandolfo, the former summer residence of the popes; and the small chapel in the Vatican, adjoining the pope's private apartments, where the Holy Father says his daily Mass. The last-named is the only one that is now in regular use, and it differs in no way from any other private chapel.

Chapels of Repose.—According to the old English Rite it was the custom in medieval times, on the afternoon of Good Friday, to deposit one of the Hosts consecrated on Maundy Thursday, together with the cross that had been used in the morning office (see Cross), in what was called the Easter sepulchre or chapel of repose, and to bring them forth again on Easter morning with solemn chant and ceremony, thus symbolizing the burial of Christ's Body in the sepulchre and its resurrection therefrom. The usual position for the Easter sepulchre was in a niche on the north side of the sanctuary, and the sepulchre itself was commonly a movable wooden structure erected year by year for the purpose. Among the entries in the old churchwarden's accounts still extant, none occurs with more frequent regularity than that of the payment made for putting up and taking down the Easter sepulchre. In some instances it was a permanent stone structure, and among the few examples still existing the best known is that in the church of Arnold (Nottinghamshire). In the Roman Rite the term "chapel of repose" is applied to the altar or chapel where the Blessed Sacrament is solemnly reserved between the Mass of Maundy Thursday and the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday. (See Holy Week.)

Royal Chapels.—It has always been the privilege of royal palaces, in Protestant as well as Catholic countries, to possess private chapels for the use of the Court. That of Constantine has already been mentioned. Chapels royal have often been merely apartments in the palace itself, but sometimes separate buildings have been specially erected for the purpose. St. George's, Windsor, and La Sainte-Chapelle, Paris, are noteworthy examples of the latter class. The last-named beautiful building is perhaps the most famous of all royal chapels. It was built in 1248 by St. Louis of France to house the relic of the Crown of Thorns which he had obtained from Constantinople, and it adjoined his palace of La Cité. The architect was Pierre de Montereau, whose wonderful creation is still one of the most admired and most imitated buildings of its kind in the world. In the lower story was a chapel for the palace servants and above was the royal chapel proper, with its sumptuous shrine. It was, of course, desecrated at the Revolution, but became once more a chapel royal for a short time under Louis Philippe. Since then it has, until recently, been used only once a year, for a "Red Mass" said at the opening of the law courts hard by. It is now merely a national monument. Of English chapels royal, besides St. George's, Windsor, already mentioned, those of St. James and the Savoy date from Catholic times. The latter was rebuilt by Henry VII on the site of the old Savoy Palace. From 1564 to 1717 it was used as a parish church and only became a chapel royal in 1773. Besides this and the chapel in St. James's Palace, there is also a Protestant chapel royal in the palace of Hampton Court. In the seventeenth century the presence in England of the Catholic consorts of three of the Stuart kings brought about the existence of Catholic chapels royal in London during a period of about eighty years, One was built at St. James's in 1625 for the use of Henrietta Maria, consort of Charles I, and her retinue, which was used occasionally up to 1642. It was reopened in 1662 for Queen Catherine of Braganza, Charles the Second's consort, but closed again in 1671 when she removed her court to Somerset House. Under James II it once more served for Catholic worship, from 1685 to 1688, since which date it has been assigned to the use of the Lutheran members of the Court and is now known as the "German chapel". At Somerset House a new Catholic chapel was built for Queen Henrietta Maria in 1636, which was in use until 1642, and again from 1662 until her death in 1669. When Queen Catherine removed her court hither from St. James's in 1671, it was reopened for Catholic worship and so continued until her death in 1705, when it passed into the hands of the Protestant Government. There was also a Catholic oratory at Whitehall, used occasionally up to 1642 when Queen Henrietta Maria was resident there, and in 1687 James II opened a new chapel in the same palace, which was closed again the following year. In Scotland the chapel royal was originally located in Stirling Castle, but was transferred to Holyrood by Queen Mary in 1542. At the Reformation it was used for a time as a Protestant parish church, but again became a Catholic chapel royal in 1687 under James II (James VII of Scotland). After his flight to France in 1688, it was plundered and partially destroyed by fire. It was subsequently re-roofed, but since 1768 it has been in a state of ruin.

Ship Chapels.—Thomassin mentions a few examples,

the best known being that of St. Louis, who was allowed to carry the Blessed Sacrament on board ship and to have Mass, without consecration, celebrated before It, the rolling and tossing of the vessel being considered prohibitive of the full ceremonial.

Votive, Wayside, and Bridge Chapels.—The Middle Ages furnish numerous examples of votive chapels, erected by the devotion of private persons, often to commemorate some special event or to enshrine some valued relic. Among these may be classed many of the famous places of pilgrimage, both in England and elsewhere. Akin to these are the wayside and bridge chapels which testify to the piety of the times. Existing examples of the latter are to be seen at Pisa, Avignon, Wakefield, Rotherham, Bradford-on-Avon, and St. Ives, while a century ago the remains of such buildings still stood at Rochester, York, Bath, and London. (See BRIDGE-BUILDING BROTHERHOOD.) Wayside chapels, intended for the use of travellers, were often to be found on the way leading to some pilgrimage shrine. The "Slipper Chapel", in Norfolk, is a well-preserved example, formerly used by the pilgrims going to the celebrated shrine of Our Lady of Walsingham. It has in recent years been restored and once more placed in Catholic hands.

ECCLESIASTICAL LAW AS TO CHAPELS.—The present-day law of the Church, while placing no restriction on the erection of chapels that form part of a larger church, lays down very definite regulations respecting any that belong to the category of private chapels. This applies, however, only to those intended for the celebration of Mass; there is no restriction whatever as regards the setting apart of a particular chamber in a private house merely for purposes of private prayer and devotion. But for a chapel in which Mass is to be said, canon law legislates very strictly. Cardinals, bishops (even titular), and regular prelates, are allowed the use of a private chapel by right; for all others a special indult is required. The ordinary of the diocese can give the necessary permission for the chapel or oratory of an institution such as a religious house, an orphanage, hospital, workhouse, or prison, such chapels being usually public or semi-public. But for a strictly private chapel in a private house, intended only for the convenience of the inmates of the house, a papal indult must be obtained, and such indults are only granted for sufficient reasons, e. g. distance from a church, permanent ill-health of a member of the household, etc. With regard to the fulfilment of the obligation of hearing Mass in such private oratories, the ancient law of the Church was that the obligation could only be satisfied by attendance at the parish church. The Council of Trent somewhat modified this rule and since then theologians have differed as to what was the exact law. To settle the matter, Leo XIII, in 1899 (S. R. C. no. 4007), decided that (1) the obligation can be satisfied by any one in all public or semi-public chapels to which the faithful have access; but (2) it cannot ordinarily be satisfied in a strictly private chapel by any persons other than those for whose convenience the chapel exists. This rule, in practice, is capable of a somewhat wide interpretation, and the indult by which the permission for the chapel is granted usually extends the privilege to various other persons, e. g. relations, guests, servants, etc. All places of worship in England belonging to Catholics, like those of other religious bodies outside the Established Church, were formerly termed "chapels."

ROCK, *Church of Our Fathers* (London, 1852); NORTHCOTE AND BROWNLOW, *Roma Sotteranea* (London, 1869); WALCOTT, *Church and Conventual Arrangement* (London, 1861); BLOXAM, *Principles of Gothic Ecclesiastical Architecture* (London, 1882); GASQUET, *Parish Life in Medieval England* (London, 1896); BOND, *Gothic Architecture in England* (London, 1905); BARNES, *Catholic Chapels Royal* in *Downside Review* (1900–02); SMITH AND CHEETHAM, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, s. v. *Chapel* (London, 1875); *Transactions of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society* (London, 1881–84), I; THOMASSIN, *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina* (Venice, 1766); PELLICCIA, *The Polity of the Christian Church*, tr. BELLETT (London, 1883); LENOIR, *Architecture monastique* (Paris, 1852); MARTIGNY, in *Dict. des antiq. chrét.* (Paris, 1865); VIOLLET-LE-DUC, *Dict. raisonné de l'architecture* (Paris, 1874); BUSS-KREUTZWALD, in *Kirchenlexikon;* LECLERCQ, *Manuel d'archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1907).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Chapelle, PLACIDE-LOUIS, Archbishop of New Orleans, U. S. A., b. at Runes, Lozère, France, 28 August, 1842; d. at New Orleans, 9 August, 1905. He began his classical studies at Mende, France, and concluded them at Enghien, Belgium. After a brilliant course of philosophy and theology at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, he received the degree of S.T.D. Ordained priest, 28 June, 1865, he was sent as pastor to St. John's Church, Rockville, Maryland, and four years later was named pastor of St. Joseph's, Baltimore. In 1882 he was appointed to St. Matthew's, Washington, where he soon became the leading Catholic clergyman. Dr. Chapelle was consecrated November, 1891, at Baltimore, titular Bishop of Arabissus and coadjutor to Archbishop Salpointe of Santa Fé, New Mexico, with the right of succession; he succeeded to that see, 7 January, 1894. He was transferred to the Archbishopric of New Orleans, 7 December, 1897. The Holy See appointed him, 11 October, 1898, Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Porto Rico and Envoy Extraordinary to the Philippine Islands. He proved himself equal to this important and delicate mission. He spoke with facility French, Spanish, and English, was thoroughly acquainted with the laws of the Church and the spirit of the American Constitution, and rendered valuable services to the Holy See and to the United States. Being in Paris during the negotiations for the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain, he obtained the insertion therein of the clause which confirmed to the Catholic Church the possession of all properties to which she had a right under the Spanish Government. He was appointed by Leo XIII Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines, 9 August, 1899, and arrived at Manila, 24 January, 1900. His first act was to persuade General Otis to liberate the priests and religious held prisoners by Aguinaldo. After reorganizing the affairs of the Church, he helped greatly in the general pacification of the country. Pope Leo XIII acknowledged and highly praised in a pontifical Brief the work of Archbishop Chapelle. His mission in the Philippines being at an end, Leo XIII retained him as Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Porto Rico and named him Assistant to the Pontifical Throne and Count of the Holy Roman Empire. Pius X, in an autograph letter of 8 October, 1904, said to Archbishop Chapelle: "You have rendered most signal services to the Church in Cuba and Porto Rico." Though having an auxiliary bishop, he wished to visit personally all the parishes of Louisiana, and he returned from Havana, 30 May, 1905, to fulfil this pastoral duty. Yellow fever had just broken out in New Orleans, and he started without delay for the city, to be with his stricken people. He took the fever himself, and died, 9 August, 1905, after having in a pastoral, written four days before his death, offered to God his life for his people.

A. ORBAN.

Chaplain (Lat. *capellanus*, from *capella*, chapel).—The origin of *capella* has been a fruitful source of controversy. The opinion most favoured is that which Du Cange (Gloss. Med. et Inf. Lat.) has drawn from earlier writers, viz. that the word is derived from the *capa* or *capella* of St. Martin of Tours. This was a short cloak preserved as a relic by the Kings of France. They carried it with them when they went to war and on the field enshrined it under a tent. This tent gradually received the name *capella*, and the custodians of the relic were thence called *capellani*. Others think that the word *capella* simply signifies a covering, and

that the name arose from the tent-like structure erected by the kings of France to canopy the altar for soldiers in the field, and that the word has no relation to the relic of St. Martin.

Court Chaplains.—If the derivation of *capella* from the *capa Sancti Martini* be the correct one, we must look for the origin of court chaplains in the clerics who were guardians of the sacred relics in royal palaces. Gradually these clerics were empowered to say Mass in the oratories committed to their care, and thence there was but a step to endowing them with spiritual jurisdiction for the benefit of those living in the palaces. They became the confessors and instructors of all who frequented the court chapel. When such chaplains had increased to a large number, in France, an arch-chaplain was appointed as their superior. From the time of Charlemagne onwards, this latter office was committed to abbots and bishops, and its holder became an important personage in the realm. Not only had he spiritual jurisdiction over the chaplains and members of the royal court, but he was also entrusted with the expedition of such ecclesiastical concerns as were brought to the cognizance of the sovereign from various parts of his kingdom. Both in the Holy Roman Empire and in France, the arch-chaplain or palatine chaplain long held the office of high chancellor of the realm. In France, the arch-chaplain was also grand almoner. The revolution of 1789 swept away the office, but it was restored by Pope Pius IX in 1857 and lasted to the fall of the Second Empire.

Beneficed Chaplains.—There are a large number of clerics whose duty it is to say certain prescribed Masses or to procure their celebration, or to take part in various church services, such as choir service. Such persons receive their support from a pious foundation erected for the purpose. Such chaplaincies are called either ecclesiastical or lay. They are ecclesiastical if the property donated by a founder has been formally erected into a benefice by the proper spiritual authority. If, however, the property designed for the purpose of procuring certain acts of Divine service has not received ecclesiastical erection it is called a lay chaplaincy. The latter is, strictly speaking, not a benefice in the canonical sense of the term. When a founder erects a chaplaincy, he is at liberty to define the duties of the person who is to enjoy the benefit of his foundation. Thus he may prescribe that a certain number of Masses be said by the chaplain; he may designate the intention for which they are to be offered, the altar at which they are to be said, and other like prescriptions. He can also determine whether the chaplain is to say the Masses personally or only be responsible for their due celebration. The Church has always been most liberal in confirming the conditions prescribed by such founders and insisting on their due observance. If the testator has left his goods to a layman, with the obligation of procuring the celebration of certain Masses by any priest whom he shall choose, such chaplaincy is called mercenary, and it does not partake of the nature of an ecclesiastical benefice, as the latter requires generally that the holder should be appointed for life. The controllers of such mercenary chaplaincies can of course be laymen, or even women or children. At times the name of lay chaplains is given to such persons. A chaplaincy is called collative if the founder bestows his goods for spiritual purposes in such a way that the bishop is to erect the foundation into a benefice, for no layman can erect a sacred edifice or institute a spiritual office without the episcopal authorization. Such benefices are called collative because the bishop collates or confers the right to hold them upon the acceptable candidate, even if such candidate has been presented or nominated by lay authority. To exclude the episcopal confirmation would be to make it impossible for the chaplaincy to be held as an ecclesiastical benefice. Hereditary or family chaplaincies are those to which, by the will of the founder, the holder of the benefice is to be nominated by the testator's heirs or assigns. In such cases also the confirmation of the bishop is of absolute necessity. If the chaplaincy be attached to a definite edifice or to an altar in that edifice, it may not by common law be removed to another place. Instances, however, are on record where the Holy See has sanctioned the removal of such chaplaincies from one castle of a noble family to another, where the request has been made by the heirs of the founders.

Regulations Concerning Beneficed Chaplains.—When the founder of a chaplaincy has not expressly stipulated that the beneficiary is to celebrate personally the prescribed Masses, it is not requisite that the chaplain be in Sacred orders, as he can procure otherwise the celebration of the Masses. If it be an ecclesiastical benefice, however, the incumbent must at least be a cleric. When the founder explicitly stipulates that the chaplain is to be a priest, this condition must be adhered to. If, however, he says merely that the chaplain is personally to celebrate the stipulated Masses, then the benefice can be given to a simple cleric, provided he is of such age that he can receive the priesthood within a year. If the foundation requires that the chaplain take part in the Divine Office in a cathedral or collegiate church, then personal service is obligatory on the beneficiary, nor can he employ a substitute, if by obtaining the benefice he becomes a mansionary of that church. In cases where a daily Mass is one of the conditions of the foundation, it is generally held that the chaplain can occasionally intermit this duty for a proper cause. He can also, if hindered by sickness, omit the application of the daily Mass for a fortnight, without being obliged to secure the fulfilment of the foundation requirement by another priest. If the chaplain is obliged to offer his Mass for a definite intention specified by the founder, he may not receive an alms for another intention and satisfy both by the same Mass. As to residence, the chaplain is only bound to observe it when local ecclesiastical regulations, or customs, or the will of the founder has imposed it as a duty. The bishop cannot impose on a chaplain any care of souls that will interfere with his peculiar obligations. The duration of the chaplain's office depends on whether his chaplaincy be lay or clerical; if lay, he may be arbitrarily removed by the one who has the right of appointment, unless the will of the founder be expressly to the contrary; if clerical, the chaplain, like all other holders of benefices, is presumably appointed for life, unless the laws of foundation provide otherwise.

Parochial or Auxiliary Chaplains.—This name is given in Europe to those priests who render assistance to a parish priest, who cannot care for his whole parish owing to the large number of the faithful within its confines. The position and duties of such parochial chaplains are in many ways analogous to those of vicars and curates (see Curate; Vicar). The Council of Trent allows parish priests to appoint the chaplains necessary for their parish, but in most dioceses custom has reserved their appointment to the ordinary. In case the appointment be made by the parish priest himself, he may delegate the chaplain to perform the necessary offices, with the exception of the hearing of confessions. The latter authorization must come from the bishop. Chaplains have no fixed powers. The bishop or the parish priest can make the limitations they judge proper. Whenever they exercise the care of souls, it must always be with dependence on the parish priest as to time and method. They need a special delegation of the pastor to assist validly at a marriage. The support of parochial chap-

lains is to be derived from the parish funds, unless they possess a benefice in the church having the annexed obligation of assisting the parish priest. In the latter case, they are irremovable. When their faculties have been conferred by the bishop, they do not lose them by the death of the parish priest.

Domestic Chaplains.—Benefices possessed by chaplains are often attached to the residence of distinguished families. In many countries of Europe, noblemen or their ancestors have provided for the sustenance of such private chaplains. Often such a priest takes on himself the duty of instructing the children of the house. If the position of the domestic chaplain be really of the nature of a benefice, it follows the rules already given for beneficed chaplains; otherwise the incumbent is considered as an auxiliary chaplain of the parish or diocese where he resides.

Chaplains of Convents.—According to various decrees of Roman congregations, the chaplains of nunneries must be men of mature age, if they can be procured. This rule is so strict that if the bishop without necessity has appointed a junior to the position, the superior may refuse to receive him. (S. C. Ep., In Messan., 1602.) Chaplains unworthy of their charge are to be immediately removed. As a rule, regulars are not to be appointed chaplains in convents unless there be a dearth of secular priests. The chaplain receives his faculties from the bishop, except in the case of nuns who are subject to some order of regulars. Only in the case of exempt nuns can the chaplain administer all the sacraments to them, to the exclusion of the parish priest. As a rule, convent chaplains should not be appointed for life. If a convent claims to have the right of presenting an irremovable chaplain to the bishop, the latter should forward the claim to Rome to obtain judgment upon it. If this is favourable, a perpetual chaplain is to be approved.

Chaplains of public institutions, such as colleges, hospitals, prisons, etc. receive their power from the intention of the bishop when apppointing them or from the laws of the foundation if there be one. As a rule they are allowed to say Mass and preach in the community chapel, and to exercise various quasi-parochial functions for the community.

Pontifical Chaplains.—Attached to the pope's chapel are various grades of chaplains. The private chaplains are those who assist the pontiff at the altar when he celebrates Mass, and are assisted by the honorary private chaplains, who minister directly to the pope only occasionally. There are also the private clerics of the chapel, the common chaplains and the supernumerary chaplains. Honorary chaplains "outside the city" are those who assist the pope only when he is outside Rome. The honorary private chaplains were instituted by Pope Clement XII; the common chaplains by Pope Alexander VII. In 1907, Pope Pius X confirmed to the common chaplains the title of *Monsignore* and their distinctive dress.

Military Chaplains.—Priests appointed to minister to the needs of the army and the navy are commonly called military chaplains. In Catholic countries where the numbers of such chaplains have been large, the governments have usually appointed a chaplain-major. Unless this appointment has been sanctioned by the Holy See, such chaplains-major possess no spiritual jurisdiction over the other chaplains. The common law of the church is that military chaplains should be approved by the ordinary of the place, not by the chaplain-major, otherwise confessions and marriages performed by them are invalid. When there are exceptions to this rule, it can only be in virtue of a special papal indult. Such indults have been granted for various countries. In Spain the vicar-general of the army has jurisdiction independent of the ordinary. In France military chaplains have been abolished since the separation of Church and State. Chaplains were formerly granted to the French soldiers only when their barracks were far from the parish churches. In 1887, Pope Leo XIII concluded a convention with the United States of Colombia in which various privileges for military chaplains were confirmed. In some countries, as Austria and Prussia, the chaplains are distinguished into parish priests, curates, and assistants. They are subject to an army vicar Apostolic, who generally receives episcopal consecration. The exemption of military chaplains in Austria from the jurisdiction of the ordinary dates from 1720. For the British Army and Navy, a decree was issued by the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, 15 May, 1906. It declares that the *pro tempore* Archbishop of Westminster is the ecclesiastical superior of all commissioned army and navy chaplains. As regards the former, he is to treat with the Government concerning their nomination, and take such measures as he shall deem expedient for their spiritual well-being. They are to report to him semi-annually, or at least annually, whatever concerns their state and occupation. Commissioned chaplains (except in Ireland and India) are to receive exclusively from the archbishop the faculties which he may grant them in virtue of his ordinary or delegated jurisdiction. These faculties they may exercise in the place determined by the archbishop, in favour only of the soldiers, their wives, and families. When a chaplain is transferred, his faculties endure until he has taken charge of his new station; but as soon as he receives notice of his transfer, he must inform the archbishop of it. As to their conduct as clerics these chaplains are subject to the local ordinary, to whom their special faculties must be shown, though his consent is not needed for their exercise so long as it is not extended to civilians.

On retirement from a chaplaincy in the army, the priest must return to his former diocese. In South Africa the local clergy are to supply the place of chaplains as far as possible. The Archbishop of Westminster alone is to treat with the Government for the appointment of navy chaplains, and is to grant them faculties which may be used in any part of the world, but only on shipboard. If, however, by the arrangement of the commander of a ship, it be necessary for the chaplain to exercise his faculties on land, he must if possible notify the ordinary of the place, not to obtain authorization, but simply to show proper deference, except in the case that he exercises his functions for others than the members of the navy, for then he is obliged to have recourse to the ordinary of the place where he is (Acta S. Sedis, Vol. XL, fasc. 5). In Ireland the military chaplains are subject to the local bishops. The Provincial Council of Dublin in 1853 requires that army chaplains report to the bishop at stated times the religious condition of those under their charge. In the United States Army probably the first chaplains commissioned by the Government were those appointed during the Mexican War. At present the Government appoints a limited number of chaplains for the army and navy. To administer the sacraments to soldiers in garrison, army chaplains need the approbation of the ordinary; when the soldiers are mobilized, chaplains may exercise their functions anywhere without such authorization. Navy chaplains (cf. Smith, op. cit. infra.) seem to fall under the general law that faculties must be obtained from the bishop of the port whence the vessel sails. However, by the general decree of 4 April, 1900, they would have faculties on shipboard from the mere fact that they were approved by their own proper ordinaries.

Ferraris, *Prompta bibl.* (Rome, 1886), III; Bouix, *De Parocho* (Paris, 1880); Smith, *Elements of Eccles. Law* (New York, 1895), I; Laurentius, *Instit. jur. eccl.* (Freiburg, 1903); Humphrey, *Urbs et Orbis* (London, 1899).

William H. W. Fanning.

Chaplet. See Rosary.

Chaptal, Jean-Antoine, Comte de Chanteloup, technical chemist and statesman; b. at Nogaret, Lozère, France, 4 June, 1756; d. Paris, 30 July, 1832. He graduated as doctor of medicine from the Montpellier University in 1777. In 1781, he filled the newly established chair of chemistry at the same university, and established chemical works there, which acquired a European celebrity. Refusing to yield to the solicitations of the King of Spain or of President Washington, he prosecuted his work in France through the stormy times of the Revolution, up to the days of the Restoration. In 1793, he assumed charge of the Grenelle saltpetre works, where he greatly improved the manufacture of gunpowder. In the Polytechnic School of Paris he was given the chair of organic (vegetable) chemistry. After the fall of Robespierre, he was placed in charge of the reorganization of the Montpellier University, again taking his old chair of chemistry. Upon the foundation of the French Institute, he was admitted as member. He returned to Paris, and established other chemical works near the city. Under the Consulship of Napoleon, he was called to the Council of State, and later became Minister of the Interior. His work in this department was very extensive, including the establishment of commercial exchanges, of chambers of commerce, the reorganization of loan offices (*monts-de-piété*), the introduction of productive labour in prisons, and many other advances in local Government. He introduced the Sisters of Charity into the hospital service; regulated the mineral water industry, of which the present French Government takes very full cognizance, and arranged for the exposition of industrial products for five years. He established the study of viniculture at the Luxembourg. Roads and canals received his attention; the roads over the Simplon and Mont-Cenis Passes are largely his work. He was in the Ministry from 1800 to 1804. When Napoleon became emperor he made Chaptal senator, Grand Officer of the Legion of Honour in 1806, and, soon after, treasurer of the Senate and Count of the Empire. During the Hundred Days, the general control of manufacture and commerce was entrusted to him. During the Restoration, he was member of the Academy of Sciences in the chemical section. In 1819, he entered the Chamber of Peers.

His technical activity covered a wide field, such as improvements in the manufacture of sulphuric acid, saltpetre for gunpowder, beet-root sugar, wine, dyeing, bleaching and other things. His principal printed works, some eleven volumes, were published from 1790 to 1823. Chaptal occupies a peculiarly interesting position in the long list of Catholic scientists. His career covered the stormy period of the French Revolution, and, more fortunate than the brilliant Lavoisier, he was spared to prosecute his useful work. The seeking of his services by Washington in the new republic, although he did not yield to the solicitation, brings him the nearer to Americans. He was a worker on the technical side of chemistry, supplementing the theoretical investigations of Lavoisier, and developing the field of chemical manufacture, which to-day is its all-important division.

T. O'Conor Sloane.

Chapter.—The name *Chapter* (Lat. *capitulum*), designating certain corporate ecclesiastical bodies, is said to be derived from the chapter of the rule book, which it was the custom to read in the assemblies of monks. By degrees the meeting itself was called the chapter and the place of meeting the chapter house. From these conventual chapters or meetings of monks for the transaction of business connected with their monasteries or orders, the designation passed over to somewhat analogous assemblies of other ecclesiastics. Hence we speak of collegiate chapters and cathedral chapters. In general a chapter may be defined as an association of clerics of a certain church forming a moral body and instituted by ecclesiastical authority for the purpose of promoting the divine worship by means of choir service. If it be a cathedral chapter, however, its principal object is to assist the bishop in the government of his diocese, and the choir service is only secondary. Members of chapters are called canons.

Origin and Development.—From the earliest times the priests and deacons of the cathedral city aided the bishop in conducting ecclesiastical affairs. Considered as a body, these clerics were called the *Presbyterium*. The custom often obtained of bishop and clergy occupying a common dwelling, and this fact, joined with the example of the monks, led to a uniform method of life. About the end of the fourth century St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, reduced this common life to a more perfect form, and when, later, many of his clerics themselves became bishops, they introduced similar rules in their churches. In Spain, Italy, and England (Bede, Hist. Eccl., I, xxvii) early traces are found of this common life of the bishop and his priests. Among the Franks, especially, St. Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz (d. 766), formed his clergy into a community bound by a rule, which was, however, distinct from that of regulars. From this rule or canon, the members of the body derived their name of canons. Later on other larger churches, in imitation of the cathedral, adopted a similar mode of life, and hence arose the distinction between canons of cathedral and collegiate churches, some of whom were secular and some regular. The main object of the last-named capitular bodies is to promote the splendour of God's worship by choir service. This article will treat particularly of cathedral chapters.

Constitution of Cathedral Chapters.—A cathedral chapter constitutes a moral body or corporation. Inasmuch as it is an ecclesiastical corporation it can be erected only by the pope, according to the prevailing discipline. The chapter can be considered as forming one body with the bishop, in as far as it constitutes his senate and aids him in the government of his diocese; or as forming a body distinct from the bishop, having its own regulations and interests. Viewed under the first aspect the cathedral chapter has the bishop for its head; under the last, it has its own proper superior. Taking the chapter in its strict sense, however, canonists generally declare that the bishop must always be distinguished from it; nor can he be called a member of the chapter. Anciently, the principal dignitary of the chapter was the archdeacon, but from the eleventh century the dean, who was also archpriest, had the internal government of the chapter. In some countries this dignitary is called the provost. The collation to canonries, by common law, pertains to the bishop and the chapter conjointly, unless in the case of such canonships as are papal reservations. The nomination of the head of the chapter belongs to the pope. In some countries, as Austria, Bavaria, Spain and until recently France, the Government, in virtue of concordats or ancient privileges, has the right of nomination to some or all of the vacant canonries.

Officials of the Chapter.—At the head of the chapter as a corporate body, is a president who, as before said, is called in different countries by various names, though the prevailing one is that of dean. The duty of this official is to convoke the chapter and preside over it. He is also to see that the canonical statutes are observed in all that relates to capitular meetings and the choir service. The chapter appoints a treasurer, a secretary, and a sacristan. The Council of Trent decreed (Sess. V, Cap. i) that a canon theologian should be constituted in cathedral churches. His office is to explain the Holy Scriptures

and the dogmas of the Faith, and also to treat questions pertaining to moral theology. A canon penitentiary is likewise to be appointed (Sess. XXIV, cap. viii) with power to hear confessions in the whole diocese. As to other dignitaries or officials of the chapter, there is no uniformity among the various capitular bodies. The Council of Trent approved of this variety (Sess. XXV, cap. vi), and hence the peculiar statutes or customs of each chapter or diocese or country must be examined to know what dignitaries, in addition to those mentioned, form part of the capitular body. Among such other officials may be named the custos, primicerius, portarius, precentor, hospitalarius, eleemosynarius or almoner, and camerarius or chamberlain. Punctator and hebdomadarius are not distinct offices but special functions committed to certain canons.

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE CHAPTER.—These are called by the general name of capitulars or canons. The division of such canons into seniors and juniors, residential and forensic, prebendal and semi-prebendal, etc., belongs rather to archæology. The number of simple canons is not fixed by a general law of the Church, and the bishop can, with the consent of his chapter, increase their number, except in cases where the pope has absolutely determined how many canons shall compose a particular chapter. In the latter case no new capitulars can be added except by Apostolic authority. Honorary canons have neither a canonry nor a vote in the chapter, but they are entitled to a stall in the choir. The number of such honorary canons must not exceed that of the titular ones. Leo XIII prescribed in 1894 that a bishop is not to nominate to an honorary canonship a subject of another diocese, without the consent of the chapter and the goodwill of the candidate's own ordinary. The honorary canons who do not belong to the diocese must never be equal to the third part of all the capitulars. In England and Scotland the number of canons is usually ten, and the president is called provost. In Ireland the chapter is presided over by a dean, and besides the canons penitentiary and theologian, there are usually also a number of other dignitaries.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF CAPITULARS.—Cathedral canons (capitulars) have precedence, after the bishop or vicar-general, over all the diocesan clergy when they go in procession as a chapter. They have also a certain pre-eminence, so that they may be made judges delegate of the Holy See in preference to the other clergy and to canons of collegiate churches. They also wear certain honorary insignia, as a ring, a cross, a violet soutane, etc., and sometimes even the mitre. Leo XIII decreed in 1894 that canons of minor basilicas in Rome can use such insignia only within their churches, and that canons "outside the city" can employ them only within their dioceses. A capitular has a right to receive his prebend or income from the day of installation. He likewise has a place and vote in the chapter and a stall in the choir. He is obliged to make a profession of faith before the bishop or his vicar at a meeting of the chapter, within two months of his installation. Residence near the cathedral church is required, as his duties are to be performed personally and not by substitutes, except in very rare cases. The conventual Mass is to be assisted at daily by the canons according to their rotation. If the Mass be offered for benefactors, all must be present. Choir service is also of obligation, and the canons must not merely assist but also chant the psalms. Absence is allowed only for a legitimate cause or through dispensation of the proper ecclesiastical authority. They must assist at the deliberations of the chapter and fulfil whatever duties may be imposed upon them by it unless legitimately excused. When the bishop celebrates Mass or takes part in other pontifical functions, the capitulars must assist him according to the form prescribed in the "Ceremonial of Bishops" and the "Roman Pontifical". They are also to accompany the bishop when he goes in procession to the cathedral, and after the service they must go with him to the church door in a body.

CAPITULAR MEETINGS.—Chapters, being true ecclesiastical colleges in the strict sense of the word, have all the rights such bodies possess by their nature or by the positive sanction of law. Consequently, they can hold sessions, ordinary or extraordinary, to expedite matters concerning the chapter. By common law, they need no previous approbation of the bishop for such meetings, but the bishop can require that they give him notice of a capitular congregation and of the resolutions approved by it. The convocation of the chapter to consider its own affairs belongs to the dean or provost, except where a particular statute intervenes. The bishop convokes it when it is to treat of diocesan matters. All the canons present in the city are to be called to meetings of the chapter. At times even those absent are to be summoned, as for the election of a prelate, the reception of new canons, etc. The meeting is to be held at the prescribed time and place. Two-thirds of the capitulars form a quorum, according to the regulations of some chapters; canon law requires only a majority. Business is to be transacted by a general and public deliberation, followed by a vote. This vote need not be unanimous, unless the subject matter refers to the canons as individuals. The chapter has authority to make laws for itself, provided they be not contrary to the general canon law. These statutes, according to the prevailing discipline, must be approved by the bishop. In particular cases, where there is a tie vote, the dean or bishop has the casting vote or a double suffrage. Like every other ecclesiastical corporation, the chapter has the right of possessing and administering the property over which it has the dominion. Consequently the chapter can appoint its own officials to administer its possessions, even without the ordinary's approbation. The supreme administrator of capitular property, as the dean or other dignitary, is to be determined by local statutes or customs.

Chapters Sede Plenâ.—As the chapter constitutes the diocesan senate, the bishop is obliged to ask its counsel or consent for various administrative acts. Where consent is required, the bishop cannot validly proceed against the will of the capitulars. Where only counsel is prescribed, the ordinary fulfils his obligation by asking their advice, but he is not constrained to follow it. In some cases defined by law, the acts of the bishop are null, if the counsel of the chapter be not asked. The consent of the chapter is requisite in general for all matters of grave importance, especially such as place a perpetual obligation on the diocese or on property, unless the bishop is allowed greater liberty either by custom or Apostolic delegation. In particular, the consent of the capitulars is necessary for buying, selling, or alienating ecclesiastical property; for mortgaging church property, for uniting, dividing, or suppressing spiritual benefices or parishes; for erecting new canonries, even honorary ones; for collating to benefices, if the right be held by the chapter conjointly with the bishop; for nominating prosynodal examiners; for assuming a temporary coadjutor for the bishop; for committing parish churches to regulars; for imposing new taxes or contributions on the diocese; for measures that would be prejudicial to the chapter or diocese, because the chapter is the lawful defendant of diocesan rights. The counsel of the chapter is to be asked for the making and promulgating of new diocesan laws, whether composed in the synod or out of it; for correcting and punishing the faults of clerics; for the building of new monasteries; for administrative acts of some moment, as in appointments to parishes and other diocesan

business. For the matters cited, the consent or counsel of the chapter is required by the bishop when he is exercising his ordinary jurisdiction. In cases, however, where he acts as delegate of the Holy See, no such counsel or consent need be asked. The chapter on its side is obliged to show due obedience to the bishop in the observance and execution of his lawful commands, in submitting to his canonical visitation, and in obeying his just judgment in judicial causes.

Chapters Sede Impeditâ.—When on account of some physical or canonical impediment, the bishop cannot govern his diocese, the episcopal administration does not pass to the chapter, but it becomes its duty to notify the pope, who alone appoints the administrator of a diocese, except in certain cases determined by law, when the chapter can conduct diocesan affairs; as when the bishop has been imprisoned by heretics or pagans; when he is excommunicated or suspended; when the vicar-general dies and the bishop is far away. In the above exceptional cases the chapter may administer the diocese until the Holy See provides otherwise.

Chapters Sede Vacante.—On the death of the bishop, the chapter succeeds to his ordinary and customary jurisdiction in spirituals and temporals, except to those which he had by virtue of Sacred orders, or by special privilege, or by special delegation of the Holy See. The faculties delegated to bishops as delegates of the Apostolic See by the Council of Trent also pass to the chapter. Within eight days of the bishop's death, the chapter must elect a vicar capitular to whom the whole administration of the diocese must be committed (see VICAR CAPITULAR), and the chapter can reserve no jurisdiction to itself. Lastly, it nominates the new bishop.

CATHEDRAL CHAPTERS IN MISSIONARY COUNTRIES. —In England, Ireland, Scotland, Holland, and some other countries, cathedral chapters have been erected. As the circumstances of these countries are different from those in lands where the Church is canonically established, the Holy See has made some changes in the common law governing cathedral chapters. The canons are dispensed from residence near the cathedral church, and may be parish priests or missionaries dispersed through the diocese. They are likewise dispensed from the daily chanting of the Divine Office in choir. It is generally prescribed, however, that when the capitulars come to the cathedral for their monthly meetings, they must recite Terce together and assist at a conventual Mass. As a general rule the rights and offices of canons in missionary countries are the same as those already enumerated for places where canonical law is in full force. The Bishop is therefore to ask their counsel or consent, as the case may be, in matters referring to diocesan administration and when the episcopal see is vacant, the chapter succeeds to the deceased bishop and elects a vicar capitular. In the United States, cathedral chapters have not as yet been constituted. In 1883 Propaganda consulted the American bishops on the advisability of erecting them, but the prelates judged that the time was not yet opportune.

WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium* (Rome, 1899), II; SMITH, *Compendium Jur. Can.* (New York, 1890); BOUIX, *De Capitulis* (Paris, 1882); FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibl.* (Roman ed., 1886), II.

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Chapter House, a building attached to a monastery or cathedral in which the meetings of the chapter are held. In monasteries the chapter house was used daily after Prime (and sometimes after Terce), for the reading of the "Martyrology" and the "Necrology", for the correction of faults, the assigning of the tasks for the day, and for the exhortation of the superior, and again for the evening Collation or reading before Complin. Secular canons used the chapter house for similar purposes, and for the formal transaction of public business of common interest to the body corporate. The chapter house is not mentioned by St. Benedict (d. 543), nor is it indicated in the ancient plan of the Abbey of St. Gall, drawn up in 820; the monks then probably assembled for chapter in a part of the cloister near the church. The need of a separate building made itself felt, and the chapter house is mentioned in the statutes approved by the Council of Aachen in 816. The shape of the chapter houses varied: some were rectangular, others rectangular with an apsidal termination, others again were circular or polygonal. The rectangular room, with a wooden roof, and little architectural distinction, is characteristic of the continent of Europe. In England the chapter house was the object of very careful designing and elaborate ornamentation; the polygonal-shaped chapter house is a triumph of English thirteenth-century architecture, and no single instance of it is found either in France or Germany. The earliest example is probably that of Lincoln, decagonal in shape, which was built from 1240–1260. Other instances are those of York, Lichfield, Southwell, Salisbury, and Wells. English examples of the elongated form will be found at Bristol, Canterbury, Chester, Durham, Gloucester, and Oxford. The ingenious theory which seeks to identify the polygonal shape with secular foundations, and the rectangular shape with monastic foundations, breaks down in presence of the circular chapter house of Worcester, and the octagonal chapter house of Westminster Abbey, both Benedictine in origin.

MARTÈNE, *De Antiquis Monachorum Ritibus* (Rouen, 1700); ROCK, *Church of our Fathers* (London, 1849), III, 79; DU CANGE, *Glossarium* (Paris, 1883), s. v. Capitulum; GASQUET, *English Monastic Life* (London, 1904); CABROL, *Dictionnaire d'archéol. chrét.* (Paris, 1903), s. v. *Abbaye;* BUMPUS, *The Cathedrals of England and Wales* (London, 1905–6); BOND, *Gothic Architecture* (London, 1905).

EDWARD MYERS.

Chapter Schools. See SCHOOLS.

Chapters, STRIFE OF THREE. See THREE CHAPTERS.

Character.—Quite distinct from the technical meaning which the term *character* possesses in theological controversy is that attached to it in the language of common life, as well as in the literature devoted to psychology, ethics, and education. The interest surrounding the conception of character in these latter branches of speculation has been constantly increasing during the past hundred years.

PSYCHOLOGY AND CHARACTER.—Different shades of meaning pertain to the term in different contexts. In general we may say that character is the expression of the personality of a human being, and that it reveals itself in his conduct. In this sense every man has a character. At the same time only human beings, not animals, have character: it implies rationality. But in addition to this usage, the term is also employed in a narrower sense, as when we speak of a man "of character". In this connotation character implies a certain unity of qualities with a recognizable degree of constancy or fixity in mode of action. It is the business of psychology to analyze the constituent elements of character, to trace the laws of its growth, to distinguish the chief agencies which contribute to the formation of different types of character, and to classify such types. If anything approaching a science of character is ever to be built up, it must be a special psychology. French psychologists during the last thirty years have given us a large quantity of acute observations on the topic of character. Chief amongst them have been: MM. Azam, Pérez, Ribot, Paulhan, Fouillée, and Malapert. Still these contributions do not constitute a science.

The behaviour of each human being at any stage of his existence is the outcome of a complex collection of elements. The manner in which he apperceives or takes in certain present impressions, the sort of

thoughts which they awaken, the particular feelings with which they are associated in his mind, and the special volitions to which they give rise are, in spite of the common nature in which he participates with other men, in a certain measure peculiar to himself. Taken collectively they are said to constitute or, more accurately perhaps, to reveal his character. At any epoch in mature life a man's character is the resultant of two distinct classes of factors: the original or inherited elements of his being, and those which he has himself acquired. On the one hand, every human being starts with a certain nature or disposition—a native endowment of capacities for knowledge, and feelings, and tendencies towards volitions and action —which varies with each individual. This disposition is dependent in part on the structure of the bodily organism and especially of the nervous system which he has inherited; in part, perhaps, also on his soul which has been created. It forms his individuality at the beginning of life; and it includes susceptibilities for responding to external influences, and potentialities for developing in various ways which differ with each human being. A fundamental error in English psychology from Locke to John Stuart Mill was the ignoring or under-estimating of this diversity of native aptitude in different individuals. Much of the Associationist treatment of the development of the human mind proceeded on the assumption of an original equality or similarity of mental faculty, and consequently tended to ascribe all subsequent differences to a diversity of circumstances. It vastly exaggerated what has been called the part played by nurture as compared with that of nature. It overlooked the fact that the original capacity and disposition of the individual mind largely determines how it shall appropriate the experience presented to it by its environment. This error was peculiarly unfavourable to the affording of an adequate account of character. Since Darwin there has been a return to the older and truer doctrine which recognized fully the importance of the original endowment of each individual. For, although the author of the "Origin of Species" himself exaggerated the influence of the environment in his biological theory, he and his followers were driven to lay great stress upon heredity and the transmisson from parent to offspring of individual variations and acquired habits.

The Four Temperaments.—The original endowment or native element in character with which the individual starts life is practically identical with what the Ancients and the Schoolmen recognized under the term *temperament*. From the times of Hippocrates and Galen they distinguished four main types of temperament: the sanguine, the choleric, the phlegmatic, and the melancholic. Curiously enough modern speculation from Kant to Wundt and Fouillée tends to accept the same general classification, though sometimes under other names. These different types of temperament the Ancients held to be due to the predominance in the organism of different *humours*. Modern writers variously account for them by differences of texture and varying solidity of the tissues of the body, by varying development of different parts, by diverse rates of activity in the processes of nutrition and waste, in the changes of nerve-energy, or in circulation, and by differences of tonicity in the nerves. Whatever be the true physiological explanation, the fourfold classification seems fairly to represent certain markedly contrasted types of disposition, though they leave room for subdivision and intermediate forms. Moreover, though scientists are still far from being agreed as to the precise elements in the organism on which temperament depends, the fact that different forms of temperament have an organic basis seems certain. The transmission from parent to offspring of hereditary dispositions, therefore, involves no conflict with the doctrine of the creation of each human soul.

Although our original temperament is thus given to us independently of our will, we ourselves play an important part in the moulding of our character, and we thus become responsible for certain ethical qualities in it. Character has been defined as "a completely fashioned will". It would be more accurate to say that character is "natural temperament completely fashioned by the will". It is, in fact, a resultant of the combination of our acquired habits with our original disposition. As the quality, shape, and structure of the organism and of its different parts may be variously modified in the process of growth—especially during the plasticity of early life—by variations in nutrition, exercise, and environment, so may the faculties of the soul be variously developed by the manner in which it is exercised, and by the nature of the objects on which its faculties are employed. Among the acquired elements which go to the building up of character may be distinguished those pertaining to cognition, whether sensuous or intellectual, and those belonging to the emotional and volitional activities of the soul. Exercise strengthens the power and widens the range of each faculty, creating, not uncommonly, a craving for further exercise in the same direction. The regular use of the intellect, the controlled activity of the imagination, the practice of judgment and reflexion, all contribute to the formation of habits of mind more or less thoughtful and refined. The frequent indulgence in particular forms of emotion, such as anger, envy, sympathy, melancholy, fear, and the like, foster tendencies towards these sentiments which give a subconscious bent to a large part of man's behaviour. But finally the exercise of the will plays the predominant part in moulding the type of character which is being formed. The manner and degree in which currents of thought and waves of emotion are initiated, guided, and controlled by the will, or allowed to follow the course of spontaneous impulse, has not less effect in determining the resultant type of character than the quality of the thoughts or emotions themselves. The life of the lower animal is entirely ruled by instinct from within, and by accidental circumstances from without. It is therefore incapable of acquiring a character. Man, through the awakening of reason and the growth of reflexion, by the exercise of deliberate choice against the movements of impulse, gradually develops self-control; and it is by the exercise of this power that moral character is especially formed. Character is in fact the outcome of a series of volitions, and it is for this reason we are responsible for our characters, as we are for the individual habits which go to constitute them.

Types of Character.—Starting from the basis of the four fundamental temperaments, various classifications of types of character have been adopted by different writers. The intellectual, the emotional, and the volitional or energetic stand for the chief types with A. Bain. M. Pérez, taking for his principle of division the phenomenon of movement, distinguishes characters as lively, slow, ardent, and *équilibrés* or well-balanced. M. Ribot, proceeding from a more subjective ground of division and excluding indefinite and unstable types as strictly speaking characterless, recognizes as the most general forms: the sensitive, subdivided into the humble, contemplative and emotional; the active, subdivided into the great and the mediocre; and the apathetic, subdivided into the purely apathetic or dull; and the *calculateurs* or intelligent. By combination these again afford new types. M. Fouillée takes sensitive, intellectual, and volitional for his scheme and by cross-combinations and subdivisions works out an equally complex plan. MM. Paulhan, Queyrat, and Fouillée and Malapert have each different divisions of their own, thus establishing, at all events, the impossibility of attaining agreement on the subject.

ETHOLOGY.—These efforts naturally suggest the question: Is a science of character possible? Mill devoted an important section in Book VI of his "Logic" to answering this query. He argues that there may be a true science of human nature, though not, as in the case of the physical sciences, an exact science. The laws which it can formulate are only approximate generalizations expressive of tendencies. It may not attempt exact predictions, owing to the complexity and uncertainty of the causes at work. Though mankind have not one universal character, there exist universal laws of the formation of character. The ascertainment of these laws constitutes the object of the science of ethology. The phenomena being so complex the method of investigation must be deductive. We have to draw inferences from general psychological principles, and then to verify them by study of concrete individual cases.

It is very unwise to lay down limits to the progress of knowledge; but it may be affirmed that, at all events, we have at present nothing approximating to a science of character. As we have said, there is already in existence a considerable literature devoted to the psychological analysis of the constituents of the different forms of character, to the study of the general conditions of its growth, and to the classification of types of character. But the results, as yet reached, have little claim to the title of a science. There are moreover two obstacles, which though not, perhaps, absolutely fatal to the possibility of such a science are graver difficulties than Mill realized. Firstly, there is the element of individuality lying at the root of each character and variously determining its growth, even in like circumstances, as we see in two children of the same family. The mistaken view as to the original equality and similarity of different minds naturally involved an erroneous under-estimate of this difficulty. Secondly, there is the fact of free-will, denied by Mill. We do not maintain that free-will is irreconcilable with a science whose laws are approximate generalizations as Mill conceived those of ethology to be. All anti-determinists allow enough of uniformity in the influence of motive upon action to satisfy this condition. Still the admission of free-will in the building up of character does indisputably increase the unpredictableness of future conduct and consequently of a science of character.

ETHICS AND CHARACTER.—Whilst psychology investigates the growth of different types of character, ethics considers the relative value of such types and the virtues which constitute them. The problem of the true moral ideal is, in some ethical systems mainly, and in all systems partially, a question of the relative value of different types of character. The effect on the agent's character of a particular form of conduct is a universally accepted test of its moral quality. Different systems of ethics emphasize the importance of different virtues in the constitution of the ideal moral character. With the Utilitarian, who places the ethical end in the maximum of temporal happiness for the whole community, benevolence will form the primary element in the ideal character. For the Stoic, fortitude and self-control are the chief excellences. The egoistic Hedonist would seem bound to praise enlightened prudence as the highest virtue. For the Christian, Christ is, of course, the true example of ideal character. The vast multitude of varied types of moral perfection presented to us in the lives of the saints who have striven to copy Him show the infinite many-sidedness and rich fruitfulness of that ideal. In all conceptions of ideal character strength forms an essential feature. Firmness of will, fortitude, constancy in adhering to principle or in pursuit of a noble aim hold so important a place that in common language to be a man of character is frequently equivalent to being capable of adhering to a fixed purpose. But strength of this kind may easily degenerate into irrational obstinacy or narrow fanaticism. Another essential is the virtue of justice, the constant, practical recognition of the rights and claims of others—involving, of course, all our duties towards Almighty God. In addition to these, habits of charity and magnanimity, with temperance and self-restraint in the control of our lower appetencies, will be included. Finally, the richer the culture of the mind, the larger the intellectual horizon, the broader the sympathies, and the more balanced the springs of action in the soul, the more will the character approximate to the ideal of human perfection.

EDUCATION AND CHARACTER.—The true aim of education is not merely the cultivation of the intellect but also the formation of moral character. Increased intelligence or physical skill may as easily be employed to the detriment as to the benefit of the community, if not accompanied by improved will. Both do not necessarily go together. As it is the function of ethics to determine the ideal of human character, so it is the business of the theory or science of education to study the processes by which that end may be attained and to estimate the relative efficiency of different educational systems and methods in the prosecution of that end. Finally it is the duty of the art of education to apply the conclusions thus reached to practice and to adapt the available machinery to the realization of the true purpose of education in the formation of the highest type of ideal human character.

CARPENTER, *Principles of Mental Physiology* (London, 1876); 245–257, 336–370; BAIN, *Study of Character* (London, 1861); HERBART, *The Science of Education*, tr. FELKIN (London and New York, 1897); MALAPERT, *Les éléments du caractère et leurs lois de combinaison* (Paris, 1906); PAULHAN, *Les caractères* (Paris, 1902); FOUILLÉE, *Tempérament et caractère selon les individus, les sexes, et les races* (Paris, 1901); QUEYRAT, *Les caractères et l'éducation morale* (Paris, 1896); PÉREZ, *Le caractère de l'enfant à l'homme* (Paris, 1892); EYMIEU, *Le gouvernement de soi-même* (Paris, 1907); ELLIS, *The Education of Character* (London, 1856).

MICHAEL MAHER.

Character (IN CATHOLIC THEOLOGY) indicates a special effect produced by three of the sacraments, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy orders. This special effect is called the sacramental character. The term implies a relation (as will be explained below) to a term used in the Epistle to the Hebrews (i, 3) concerning the Son of God, who is there described as the Χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, or "figure [*figura*] of the Father's substance". In Protestant theology, the term character is used in another sense in treatises concerning the Blessed Trinity; the phrase "hypostatic character" being employed to signify the distinctive characteristic (or what Catholic theologians call the *proprietas personalis*) of each of the Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Here we are concerned only with the sense of the word in Catholic theology, that is, with sacramental character.

Sacramental character means a special supernatural and ineffaceable mark, or seal, or distinction, impressed upon the soul by each of the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy orders; and it is by reason of this ineffaceable mark that none of these three sacraments may be administered more than once to the same person. This is express Catholic doctrine declared both in the Council of Florence (Sess. ult., Decret. Eugenii IV, § 5) and in the Council of Trent (Sess. VII, can. ix, and Sess. XXIII, cap. iv and can. iv). "If any one shall say that in three sacraments, viz. Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy orders, there is not a character impressed upon the soul, that is a certain spiritual and ineffaceable mark [*signum*], whence these sacraments cannot be iterated, let him be anathema" (Concil. Trid. Sess. ult., can. vii). If, indeed, there be grave doubt whether any one of these sacraments has really been administered, or whether the manner of its adminis-

tration has been valid, then it may be administered in a conditional form. But if they really have been validly administered, they cannot again, without sacrilege, be conferred upon the same person. The character imparted by these sacraments is something distinct from the grace imparted by them. In common with the other sacraments, they are channels of sanctifying grace. But these three have the special prerogative of conferring both grace and a character. In consequence of the distinction between the sacramental grace and the sacramental character, it may even happen, in the reception of these sacraments, that the character is imparted and the grace withheld; the lack of proper dispositions which is sufficient to prevent the reception of the grace may not prevent the reception of the character. Thus, an adult who receives baptism without right faith and repentance but with a real intention of receiving the sacrament, obtains the character without the grace. The sacramental character, then, is not in itself a sanctifying gift; it is of a legal and official, rather than of a moral, nature. Nevertheless, normally, the character has a connexion with grace. It is only accidentally, by reason of some faulty disposition in the recipient of the sacrament, that the association between the character and the grace is broken. In the Divine intention, and in the efficacy of the sacraments, the grace and the character go together; and the grace is proportioned to the special function which the character indicates. So that the character is sometimes called a sign, or mark, of grace.

The sacramental character, as we have said, is ineffaceable from the soul. This means, not that the effacement of this spiritual mark is an absolute metaphysical impossibility, but that in the established order of Divine Providence there is no cause which can destroy it in this life—neither sin, nor degradation from the ecclesiastical state, nor apostasy. This is of faith; and it is a theological opinion of great probability that the character is not effaced from the souls of the blessed in Heaven; while it is an opinion of some probability, that it is not effaced from the souls of the lost. Theology further tells us that character is a mark, sign, or badge by which the recipient is devoted to the work of worshipping God according to the ordinances of the Christian religion and Christian life; and that this is the reason why a character should be impressed by the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy orders rather than by the others. Not all of the sacraments are directly and immediately ordained for the work of Divine worship; e. g. the Sacrament of Penance only absolves from sin, restoring the sinner to his former state, but not conferring on him any special privilege or faculty. Again, among the sacraments immediately connected with the worship of God, we may distinguish between the sacrament which constitutes the very act of worship (that is the Eucharist), and those sacraments which qualify a person to take part, as an agent or recipient, in the worship. Now these last are Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy orders. The Sacrament of Orders consecrates a man to the work of Divine worship as an agent, i. e. for the conferring of the sacraments upon other persons; baptism dedicates a person to Divine worship by qualifying him to receive the other sacraments; and confirmation, which confers spiritual manhood (as distinguished from the new birth of baptism), qualifies the recipient for the duty of honouring God by professing the Christian Faith before its enemies. The sacramental character is compared by theologians to a military badge, or the insignia of an order of knighthood. Scotus illustrates it by an argument drawn from the analogy of civil society, in which he names three official ranks: (1) the royal household, or that of the chief magistrate, by whatever name he may be called; (2) the public service, e. g. the army; (3) the officers of the army. By baptism, he says, we are enrolled in the household of Christ; by confirmation, we are made soldiers of Christ; by Holy orders, we are made officers. And as these ranks have their distinctive badges in civil society, so in the spiritual society, or Church, the ranks are distinguished in the sight of God and His angels by spiritual badges, marks, or sacramental characters.

All theologians affirm that the sacramental character is not a mere external denomination; and practically all are agreed that it is a sort of quality or state made inherent in the soul. Those, such as Scotus, who say that it is a relation (to Christ) mean that it is a relation with a real *fundamentum*, or ground, and whether we say that it is a relation having a ground in the soul, or a state or quality involving a relation, seems to signify quite the same thing, the difference being only in the expression. The category of quality being divided by Aristotelean and Scholastic philosophers into four kinds, theologians for the most part classify the sacramental character as something akin to the genus of quality called power. Theologians also tell us that the character inheres not in the very substance of the soul but in one of the rational faculties; but it is a question in dispute whether the faculty in which the character inheres as its subject be the will or the practical reason (the Scotists holding that it is the will; the Thomists, that it is the practical reason). The sacramental character or mark is the character or mark of Christ, not of the Holy Spirit, and as the Redeemer has three prerogatives, as Prophet, Priest, and King, this mark is the mark of Christ as Priest. It is a participation in His priesthood and an assimilation to it. Now, every created perfection is a shadow of some perfection of the Deity, and therefore assimilation to Christ even in His human nature is assimilation to God. And as the Son is described in the Epistle to the Hebrews as "the Character of the Father's substance", hence the sacramental character has been defined as "a distinction impressed by the Eternal Character [the Son] upon the created trinity [i. e. the soul with the intellect and the will] sealing it into a likeness (*secundum imaginem consignans*) unto the Trinity which creates and anew-creates (*Trinitati creanti et recreanti*)." For theology distinguishes in the soul (1) the natural image and likeness of God; (2) the likeness produced by sanctifying grace and faith, hope, and charity; (3) the likeness not moral, but, so to say, legal and official, produced by the sacramental character.

The doctrine of the sacramental character is one of those which have been developed, and its history is traceable with sufficient clearness. It is to be observed, however, that the doctrine rests upon the authority of the Council of Trent, and that the history is given as history, not for the purpose of invoking the authority of the primitive Church. Though first solemnly defined by the Council of Trent, it had already been officially declared in the Council of Florence; and it was the unanimous opinion of all theologians, long before the time of Wyclif, who questioned it. It was set forth with the utmost explicitness by St. Augustine in the controversies of the fifth century. He points out that all who favoured rebaptism did so because they failed to distinguish between two effects of the sacrament, that is between the sanctifying gift of grace and the Holy Spirit, on the one hand, and the gift, on the other hand, which was not in itself sanctifying but which was a mark dedicating the recipient (cf. Contra Ep. Parm., II, n. 28, with Ep. xcviii ad. Bonifac.). In this controversy the doctrine of the sacramental character was but asserting itself with greater emphasis because it was (constructively) attacked. The Church was but bringing out into distinctness

a doctrine held all along. For the Fathers of the fourth century habitually speak of baptism as a permanent, an everlasting, or an ineffaceable, seal; and what they say of baptism may be applied to confirmation, since the two sacraments were usually associated. They compare the seal, or mark, of baptism with the insignia of soldiers, with the mark placed by shepherds upon sheep, with circumcision, with the marking of the doorposts of the Israelites in Egypt. Such evidence as we have from the earlier ages all tends to prove that the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries were only thinking out more explicitly what they had received from their predecessors. Thus Hippolytus contrasts the seal (or mark) of baptism, the mark given by Christ to his believers, with the mark of the Beast (Hippolyt., De Christo et Antichristo, n. 6); the writer of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (see CLEMENT I, ST., POPE; CLEMENTINES) calls it (c. 7, 8) the "seal impressed"; the "Pastor" of Hermas (lib. III, Simil., IX, cc. 6, 16, 17, 31) speaks of baptism as a seal. At the end of the second century we find in the work known as "Excerpta Theodoti" (n. lxxvi), generally attributed to Clement of Alexandria, historical evidence of the existence of the doctrine. As the coin circulating in Judea in Christ's time bore the image and superscription of Cæsar, so, the writer says, does the believer obtain through Christ the name of God as an inscription, and the Holy Spirit as an image, upon his soul; as even brute animals by a mark show their owner and by a mark are distinguished, so the believing soul, which has received the seal of truth, bears the marks (*σπίγματα*) of Christ.

In the light of this traditional teaching it is possible to see some reference to this truth in the Apostolic writings. Thus St. Paul says: "Now he that confirmeth us with you in Christ, and that hath anointed us, is God: Who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts" (II Cor., i, 21, 22). Here there is a distinction made between the "unction", i. e. grace, and the "sealing", or impressing of a mark (character), and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Again he says: "In whom [Christ] also believing you were signed with the holy Spirit of promise" (Ephes., i, 13), and "grieve not the holy Spirit of God: whereby you are sealed unto the day of redemption" (iv, 30). It is obvious, therefore, that this doctrine has been taught from the beginning, at first, indeed, without emphasis or clearness, in an obscure and only half-conscious manner, but with growing clearness; and though some theologians in the Middle Ages may have doubted whether it could be proved to be contained in the deposit of revealed truth, they did not at all doubt that it was true, or that it was a part of Catholic teaching.

FRANZELIN, *De Sacramentis in genere* (Rome, 1888); DE AUGUSTINIS, *De re sacramentariâ* (Rome, 1889); ST. THOMAS, *Summa theol.*, III, Q. lxiii; SUAREZ, disp. xi; SCOTUS, *Lib. Sentent.*, IV, dist. vi; ST. BONAVENTURE, *Lib. Sentent.*, IV, dist. vi; WILHELM AND SCANNELL, *A Manual of Catholic Theology* (London, 1898), II, 375; GIHR, *Die hl. Sakramente d. kathol. Kirche*, 2d ed. (Freiburg, 1902), I; LAAKE, *Ueber den sakram. Charakter* (Munich, 1903); FARINE, *Der sakram. Charakter* (Freiburg, 1904); POHLE, *Lehrbuch d. Dogmatik*, 2d ed. (Paderborn, 1906), III, 41 sqq.

M. J. RYAN.

Charadrus, a titular see of Asia Minor. According to Strabo (XIV, 669) and Skylax, 102, it was a harbour and fortress in Cilicia Tracheia, between Anemurium and Antioch. The Greek name is Χάραδρος, or Χαραδροῦς, still retained in the actual name Kalandran, a little village in the vilayet of Adana, with 280 inhabitants. Nounechios, Bishop of Charadrus, was present at Chalcedon in 451 (Lequien, II, 1017). The same prelate subscribed, in 458, the letter of the bishops of Isauria to Emperor Leo, with the double title Lamos and Charadrus (Mansi, Conc., VII, 563; see Lequien, loc. cit.). This means that Charadrus was at an early date united with Lamos, a see in Isauria, suffragan to Seleuceia.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Charcas. See PLATA.

Chardon, JEAN-BAPTISTE, Indian missionary in Canada, and in the Louisiana territory, b. at Bordeaux, France, 27 April, 1672; d. at Quebec, 11 April, 1743. He entered the Society of Jesus at Bordeaux, 7 Sept., 1687, and arrived in Canada in 1699. He was on the Ottawa mission in 1700. In the following year he went to Green Bay, Wisconsin, to aid the venerable Henri Nouvel, who had been nearly forty years on the mission there. In 1711 he was evangelizing the Illinois on the St. Joseph River. According to Marest, he was a missionary full of zeal, with a rare talent for learning languages. He remained at Green Bay until about 1728, and was the only priest on the old mission ground west of Lake Michigan for several years. No further information regarding Chardon, except the date of his death, is available.

THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896–1901), LXVI, 347; LXXII, 148; SHEA, *History of the Catholic Missions* (New York, 1855), 376, 423; IDEM, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886), 622.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Chardon, MATHIAS (his name in religion was Charles), a learned French Benedictine of the Congregation of Saint-Vannes, b. at Yvoi-Varignan in the present department of Ardennes, France, 22 September, 1695; d. at the monastery of St-Arnold in Metz, 21 October, 1771. He took vows in the monastery of St-Vannes (St-Viton) in Verdun in 1712, and soon became famous for his learning. At the general chapter of the Congregation of St-Vannes, held at Toul, in 1730, Chardon was forced to resign his office as a professor because he opposed the Bull "Unigenitus". He is the author of "Histoire des Sacrements" (Paris, 1745, 6 vols.), an historical treatise refuting the errors of the Sacramentarians by showing how the sacraments were administered in the Church, and how they were used from the time of the Apostles to the present. There is also an Italian translation (Verona, 1754; Brescia, 1758; Capolago, 1835), and it is reprinted in Migne, "Cursus Theologiæ" (Paris, 1840), XX, 1–1152.

FRANÇOIS, *Bibl. générale des écriv. de l'ordre de S. Benoît* (Bouillon, 1777), I, 194; QUÉRARD, *La France littéraire* (Paris, 1827–64), II, 134; BOUILLOT, *Biographie ardennaise* (Paris, 1830), I, 220; HEURTEBIZE, in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1905), II, 2216; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, III, 55.

MICHAEL OTT.

Chariopolis, a titular see of Thrace. Nothing is known about this city during antiquity. In 1087 it was plundered by Tselgou and Solomon, Kings of the Patzinaces and of the Hungarians. In 1205 Villehardouin passed there, after the unsuccessful siege of Adrianople. It figures only in later "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of the twelfth or thirteenth century as a suffragan of Heracleia in Thrace. An act of Isidorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, dated 13 August, 1347, places it again under the jurisdiction of Heracleia. Lequien (II, 1133) mentions but four bishops, the first present at Nicæa in 787, the last in 1351. It is not known when the see ceased to be a residential one for the Greeks; they frequently use the name for titular bishops. Chariopolis is now a little town with about 3000 inhabitants in the vilayet of Adrianople, northwest of Rodosto; the Turks call it Khaïrebolou, Aireboli, or Irebol.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Charismata.—The Greek term *χάρισμα* denotes any good gift that flows from God's benevolent love (*χάρις*) unto man; any Divine grace or favour, ranging from redemption and life eternal to comfort in communing with brethren in the Faith (Rom., v, 15,

16; vi, 23; xi, 29). The term has, however, a narrower meaning: the spiritual graces and qualifications granted to every Christian to perform his task in the Church: "Every one hath his proper gift [*charisma*] from God; one after this manner, and another after that" (I Cor., vii, 7 etc.). Lastly, in its narrowest sense, *charisma* is the theological term for denoting extraordinary graces given to individual Christians for the good of others. These, or most of these, are enumerated by St. Paul (I Cor., xii, 4, 9, 28, 30, 31), and form the subject-matter of the present article. They are: "The word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, faith, the grace of healing, the working of miracles, prophecy, the discerning of spirits, diverse kinds of tongues, interpretation of speeches" (I Cor., xii, 8–10). To these are added the charismata of apostles, prophets, doctors, helps, governments (ibid., 28).

These extraordinary gifts were foretold by the Prophet Joel (ii, 28) and promised to believers by Christ: "And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name they shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues," etc. (Mark, xvi, 17, 18). The Lord's promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost (Acts, ii, 4) at Jerusalem, and, as the Church spread, in Samaria (Acts, viii, 18), in Cæsarea (x, 46), in Ephesus (xix, 6), in Rome (Rom., xii, 6), in Galatia (Gal., iii, 5), and more markedly in Corinth (I Cor., xii, 14). The abuses of the charismata, which had crept in at this latter place, induced St. Paul to discuss them at length in his First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Apostle teaches that these "spiritual things" emanate from the Spirit who quickens the body of the Church; that their functions are as diversified as the functions of the natural body; and that, though given to individuals, they are intended for the edification of the whole community (I Cor., xii).

Theologians distinguish the charismata from other graces which operate personal sanctification: they call the former *gratiæ gratis datæ* in opposition to the *gratiæ gratum facientes*. The "gifts and fruits of the Holy Ghost", being given for personal sanctification, are not to be numbered among the charismata. St. Thomas (Summa Theol., I–II, Q. cxi, a. 4) argues that the Apostle (I Cor., xii, 8–10) "rightly divides charismata; for some belong to the perfection of knowledge, as faith, the word of wisdom, and the word of science; some belong to the confirmation of doctrine, or the grace of healing, the working of miracles, prophecy, the discerning of spirits; some belong to the faculty of expression, as kinds of tongues and interpretation of speeches." It must, however, be conceded that St. Paul did not intend to give in these two verses a complete enumeration of charismata, for at the end of the chapter he mentions several more; besides he makes no attempt at a scientific division. Englmann (Die Charismen, Ratisbon, 1848) distinguishes two categories of charismata: (*a*) charismata tending to further the inner growth of the Church; (*b*) charismata tending to promote her outer development. To the former belong the gifts which help the dignitaries of the Church in performing their offices; to the latter the gift of performing miracles. This division seems indicated in I Peter, iv, 10, 11: "As every man hath received grace [charisma], ministering the same to one another . . . . . If any man speak, let him speak, as the words of God. If any man minister, let him do it, as of the power, which God administereth." Seven of the charismata enumerated by St. Paul fall into the first category: (1) the Apostolate; (2) the cognate office of prophecy; (3) the discerning of spirits; (4) the office of teacher; (5) the word of wisdom and science; (6) helps; (7) the gift of governing. Five belong to the second category: (8) increased faith; (9) the power of miracles; (10) *in specie* the healing of the sick; (11) the gift of tongues; (12) the interpretation of tongues.

(1) *The Apostolate* deservedly heads the list of God's extraordinary gifts to man for the building up of the Church. The Apostolic office contains in itself a claim to all charismata, for the object of its ordinary working is identical with the object of these special gifts: the sanctification of souls by uniting them in Christ with God. The Apostles received the first great effusion of charismata when the Holy Ghost descended on them in the shape of fiery tongues, and they began to speak in diverse tongues. Throughout their whole missionary activity they are credited with supernatural powers by Scripture, history, and legend alike. The legend, however fanciful in its facts, is built upon the general sense of the Church. Through the Apostles the fullness of Christ's gifts flowed on to their helpers in various measure, according to the circumstances of persons and places.

(2) *Prophecy*, the gift of knowing and being able to manifest things hidden from the ordinary knowledge of man. "There were in the church which was at Antioch prophets and doctors, among whom was Barnabas, and Simon who was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manahen, . . . and Saul" (Acts, xiii, 1). Agabus "signified by the Spirit, that there would be a great famine over the whole world, which came to pass under Claudius" (Acts, xi, 28). Philip the evangelist "had four daughters, virgins, who did prophesy" (Acts, xxi, 8, 9). These prophets were at times allowed to know and reveal the secrets of hearts (I Cor., xiv, 24, 25); they spoke "that all may learn, and all may be exhorted" (I Cor., xiv, 31), which implies that they were enlightened in the Faith above their fellows. Their gift was not a permanent one: for while one prophet was speaking a sudden revelation might come "to another sitting" and then the speaker must "hold his peace" (I Cor., xiv, 30). The object of prophecy was to speak "to men unto edification, and exhortation, and comfort" (ibid., 3, 4). Paul ranks this charisma above all others: "be zealous for spiritual gifts; but rather that you may prophesy" (I Cor., xiv, 1). "For greater is he that prophesieth, than he that speaketh with tongues: . . . " (ibid., 5). It appears to have been so frequent in the early Church as to be considered a special, although extraordinary, office. At Antioch "prophets and doctors" are linked together (Acts, xiii, 1), and "God indeed hath set some in the church; first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors . . . " (I Cor., xii, 28; cf. Eph., iv, 11). In the course of time prophecy became less common, without, however, ever disappearing altogether.

(3) *The discerning of spirits* should be distinguished from natural or acquired insight, or shrewdness of judgment; it is the supernatural gift enabling its possessor to judge whether certain extraordinary manifestations are caused by a good or an evil spirit, or by natural agents. St. Paul associates it with prophecy: "Let the prophets speak, two or three; and let the rest judge" (I Cor., xiv, 29). This judging or discretion was necessary to prevent and correct abuses which might easily come in the train of prophecy. The discerning of spirits was possessed in a marked degree by many saints, and it is not uncommon now among confessors and spiritual directors.

(4) *The Doctors' office* was to preach and teach the Faith permanently in some community assigned to their care. The Apostles themselves and the evangelists mentioned with apostles, prophets, doctors, and pastors (Eph., iv, 11) went from place to place founding new Churches; the Faith could only be maintained by permanent teachers fitted for their work by special gifts. Thus St. Paul writes to Timothy: "The things which thou hast heard of me by many witnesses, the same commend to faithful

men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (II Tim., ii, 2). Such faithful men are the catechists in missionary countries.

(5) *The word of wisdom and the word of knowledge* (λόγος σοφίας, λόγος γνώσεως). Wisdom (*sapientia*) is in St. Paul the knowledge of the great Christian mysteries: the Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection of Christ, and the indwelling in the believer of the Spirit of God (I Cor., ii, passim; cf. Eph., i, 17). Knowledge (γνῶσις, *scientia*) likewise implies acquaintance with the religion of Christ, though in a lesser degree (I Cor., i, 5). In I Cor., viii, 1–7, "knowledge" denotes the special knowledge that all heathen religion is vain, that "there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him". The word of wisdom and the word of knowledge seem to be degrees of the same charisma, viz., the grace of propounding the Faith effectively, of bringing home to the minds and hearts of the listener with Divine persuasiveness, the hidden mysteries and the moral precepts of Christianity. The charisma in question was manifested in the speech of St. Peter to the multitude on the day of Pentecost (Acts, ii) and on many occasions when the heralds of the Faith being delivered up, took "no thought how or what to speak", for it was given them "in that hour what to speak" (Matt., x, 19).

(6) *Helps* (ἀντιλήψεις, *opitulationes*).—A charisma connected with the service of the poor and the sick performed by the deacons and deaconesses (Acts, vi, 1). The plural is used to mark the many forms assumed by this ministry.

(7) *Government* (κυβερνήσεις, *gubernationes*).—The special gifts bestowed on the rulers of the Church for the faithful exercise of their authority. This charisma is connected with all the grades of the hierarchy, with the Apostles and their successors, the bishops and priests, with doctors and deacons and administrators. St. Gregory calls the government of souls the art of arts; if it is so at all times, we must expect to find it endued with more special Divine assistance when the nascent Church was struggling against all the powers of Jew and Gentile.

The second series of charismata (those tending to promote the outer development of the Church) is not connected with any special office. These graces show the power of God at work in the members of the new Church; they were intended to strengthen the faith of believers and to dispel the incredulity of outsiders.

(8) *Faith*, as a charisma, is that strong faith which removes mountains, casts out devils (Matt., xvii, 19, 20), and faces the most cruel martyrdom without flinching. Such faith, common at the beginning, has been granted by God in all ages to saints and martyrs, and to many holy men and women whose hidden lives offered no occasion for miracles or martyrdom.

(9) *The working of miracles* (ἐνέργημα δυνάμεων, *operatio virtutum*) is the God-given power to perform deeds beyond the ordinary power of man. Under this charisma are comprised the many signs mentioned by Mark (xvi, 17, 18): "In my name they shall cast out devils: they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents; and if they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them: they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover". St. Peter heals the infirm and sick and such as were troubled with unclean spirits (Acts, v, 15, 16); Philip works miracles in Samaria (Acts, viii, 6); St. Paul suffers no harm from the viper that hung on his hand (Acts, xxviii, 3–5); St. Peter raises Tabitha from the dead (Acts, ix, 40).

(10) *Healing* (χάρισμα ἰαμάτων, *gratia sanitatum*) is singled out by St. Paul among other miracles because it was probably the most frequent and the most striking. The plural is used to indicate the great number of infirmities that were healed and the variety of means used in the healing, e. g. by pronouncing the name of Jesus (Acts, iii, 6), by the imposition of hands, by anointing with oil, by the sign of the cross.

(11) *The gift of tongues* and (12) the *interpretation of tongues* are described at length in I Cor., xiv. In what did *glossolalia* exactly consist?—(a) It was speaking, opposed to being silent (I Cor., xiv, 28), yet (b) not always in a foreign tongue. On the day of Pentecost the Apostles did indeed speak the various languages of their hearers, but the still unbaptized Gentiles in the house of Cornelius "speaking with tongues, and magnifying God" (Acts, x, 46) and the twelve newly baptized Ephesians speaking with tongues and prophesying (Acts, xix, 6) had no reason for using any strange tongue. Again, instead of the expression "speaking with tongues" Paul uses the alternative phrases, "speaking in a tongue", "by a tongue", "with a tongue" (I Cor., xiv, 2, 4, 13, 14, 27). The object of the gift was not to convey ideas to listeners, but to speak to God in prayer (ibid., 2, 4), an object for which a foreign language is unnecessary. Lastly—and this argument seems conclusive—Paul compares glossolalia, as regards its effect, with talking in an unknown language; it is, therefore, not itself an unknown language (ibid., 11). (c) It was an articulate language, for the speaker prays, sings, gives thanks (ibid., 14–17). (d) The speaker was in a kind of trance—"If I pray in a tongue, my spirit [πνεῦμα] prayeth, but my understanding [νοῦς, *mens*] is without fruit" (ibid., 14). (e) On unbelievers glossolalia made the impression of the marvellous; perhaps it recalled to their mind the religious ravings of hierophants: "Wherefore (i. e. because unintelligible) tongues are for a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers. If . . . . . all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned persons or infidels, will they not say that you are mad?" (I Cor., xiv, 22, 23). (f) The gift of tongues is inferior to that of prophecy: "Greater is he that prophesieth, than he that speaketh with tongues: unless perhaps he interpret, that the church may receive edification" (ibid., 5). (g) The charisma of interpretation is, then, the necessary complement of glossolalia; when interpretation is not forthcoming, the speaker with tongues shall hold his peace (ibid., 13, 27, 28). Interpretation is the work either of the speaker himself or of another (ibid., 27). It takes the form of an intelligible address; the explanation was to follow the speech with tongues as regularly as the discerning of spirits succeeded prophecy (I Cor., xiv, 28, 29).

Among the Fathers it is *sententia communissima* that the speaking with tongues was a speaking in foreign languages. Their interpretation is based upon the promise in Mark, xvi, 17, "They shall speak with new tongues", and on its final fulfilment in the gift of tongues to the Apostles (Acts, ii, 4). A new tongue, however, is not necessarily a foreign language, and a gift which had a special use on the day of Pentecost appears purposeless in meetings of people of one language. There are, besides, textual objections to the common opinion, although, it must be owned, not quite convincing [cf. (b) above]. Many explanations of this obscure charisma are proposed, but not one of them is free from objection. It may indeed be that there is some truth in all of them. St. Paul speaks of "kinds of tongues", which may imply that glossolalia manifested itself in many forms: e. g. in the form of foreign languages when required by circumstances, as with the Apostles; as a new language—"a kind of speech distinctive of the spiritual life and distinguished from common speech, which to the exuberant feeling of the new faith appeared unsuitable for intercourse with God" (Weizsäcker); or as the manifestation of the unspeakable

groanings of the Spirit, asking for us, and causing us to cry, "*Abba*, Father" (Rom., viii, 15, 26). (See TONGUES, GIFT OF.)

I Cor., xii–xiv, with commentaries; ST. THOMAS, II–II, QQ. clxxvi–clxxviii; ENGLMANN, *Die Charismen* (Ratisbon, 1848—best book on the subject); SCHRAM, *Theol. mystica*, 435; SEISENBERGER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; ID. in BUCHBERGER, *Kirchl. Handlexikon;* WEIZSÄCKER, *Apost. Age*, II, 254–75.

J. WILHELM.

Charitable Bequests, CIVIL LAW CONCERNING.—The word *charity*, as employed by the courts and used as descriptive of uses and trusts which will be upheld as charitable, has been the subject of a number of definitions. In the famous Girard will case (Vidal v. Girard, 2 How. U. S. 127), Horace Binney defines a charitable gift: "Whatever is given for the love of God or for the love of your neighbor, in the catholic and universal sense—given from these motives, and to these ends—free from the stain or taint of every consideration that is personal, private, or selfish." And he further says: "Uncertainty of individual object would seem to be a characteristic of charity, for personal or individual certainty has often been held fatal to it."

The following comprehensive definition is given by a leading authority: "A charity, in the legal sense of the term, may be defined as a gift to be applied consistently with existing laws, for the benefit of an indefinite number of persons, either by bringing their minds or hearts under the influence of education or religion, by relieving their bodies from disease, suffering, or constraint, by assisting them to establish themselves in life, or by erecting and maintaining public buildings or works or otherwise lessening the burdens of the government" (Amer. & Engl. Ency. of Law, V, 894).

By a statute passed in the reign of Elizabeth (43 Eliz., c. 4) certain uses were defined as charitable which would be upheld by the court in contradistinction to those which were held to be superstitious after the Reformation in England. The objects enumerated in the statute were: "Relief of aged, impotent and poor people; maintenance of sick and maimed soldiers and mariners, schools of learning, free schools and scholars in universities; repairs of bridges, ports, havens, causeways, churches, seabanks and highways; education and preferment of orphans; relief, stock or maintenance for houses of correction; marriage of poor maids; supportation, aid and help of young tradesmen, handicraftsmen and persons decayed; relief or redemption of prisoners or captives; aid or ease of any poor inhabitants concerning payments of fifteens, setting out of soldiers, and other taxes".

Under this statute the Court of Chancery was authorized to appoint commissioners to superintend the application and enforcement of charities, and if from any cause the charity could not be applied precisely as the testator had declared, the court had the power in some cases to appropriate it according to the principles indicated in the devise as nearly as possible to the purposes expressed therein. This was called an application of *cy pres*, from the French words meaning "as near as", the words of a will being interpreted so as to give effect to the testator's general intention. The application of this doctrine depends chiefly upon judicial expression in each particular case. In many of the United States it has been repudiated, in others sustained. The statute of Elizabeth did not create a new law upon the subject of charitable uses, though it did create a new jurisdiction, and as it has not been enacted in many of the American States, the better opinion seems to be that the enumeration of charities in the statute had for its aim to show by familiar examples what class or kind of uses were considered charitable, rather than to enumerate all of the purposes which would fall within the scope and intent of the statute.

The Supreme Court of the United States has held, following ancient authority, that there is an inherent jurisdiction in equity in cases of charity, and that they were valid in such courts independent of and previous to the statute of Elizabeth. "The character of the object sought to be attained—the purpose to which the gift is to be applied—not the motive of the donor, is the best test of a legal, public charity" (Pepper and Lewis, Dig. Pa., p. 2753). The following have been held to be charities: the erection and repair of churches, the support of ecclesiastical denominations; of missions; the education of theological students, and kindred objects. In England, bequests for Masses for the dead are void in law, as being for superstitious uses; on the other hand, bequests for Masses have been sustained as charitable bequests in Ireland and in Canada (cf. Lilly and Wallis, "A Manual of the Law Specially Affecting Catholics", London, 1893, p. 144, and Desmond, "The Church and the Law", Chicago, 1898, p. 49). In the United States, some jurisdictions have sustained such trusts, while others have held them void (cf. Dillon, Bequests for Masses, Chicago, 1897). The support of education in its various forms is sustained, also the relief of the poor, the maintenance of hospitals and institutions, works of public utility, the abolition of slavery, and the benefit of freedmen. Trusts subversive of morality and religion will not be sustained. Trusts for the encouragement of sport and trusts for the care of private tombs or graveyards have not been sustained. Technically speaking, a bequest is a gift of personal property by will; a devise, a gift of real property by will; but these terms are frequently used interchangeably in popular language, and wills are always interpreted in accordance with the intention of the testator so far as the same can be gathered from the language of the instrument; therefore any language which will serve to express a desire to vest either personal or real property in a charity will be effective.

According to Sir William Blackstone, the power of bequeathing "is coeval with the first rudiments of the law", but this power was not originally extended to all a man's personal estate. By the common law, he tells us, one-third of the goods went to the heirs, one-third to the wife, and the remaining one-third was at the testator's own disposal. By imperceptible degrees the law was changed in different parts of England, until, in order to favour the power of bequeathing and to reduce the whole kingdom to the same standard, statutes were passed in the reign of William and Mary, of William III, of Anne, and of George II, giving the right to testators within certain parts of the Kingdom of England to dispose of their entire personal estates, notwithstanding existing customs restricting this power to one-third only, and the claims of widows and children were utterly barred. By an act passed in the first year of the reign of Victoria (1 Vict., c. 26), it was enacted that all real and personal estate may be disposed of by will executed as required by that act. The right of testamentary disposition either of real or of personal estate exists, with certain limitations in some of them, in all of the United States.

Lands were originally devisable, it would seem, to a qualified extent with the Anglo-Saxons. The development of the feudal system, after the Norman Conquest of England, laid upon the holders of land certain obligations to their paramount lords, which made it necessary that these lands should not pass into the hands of charitable corporations and be thus withdrawn from the feudal obligation, because such corporations were of necessity unable to render the services usually due to the overlord, e. g. military duties, which are not compatible with religious life. This was the moving cause of the passage of certain statutes called Statutes of Mortmain, which it is necessary to consider further in order to understand the law governing gifts to charitable corporations.

"Upon the development of the feudal system at the Norman Conquest", says Chancellor Kent (4 Kent, 504), "lands held in tenure ceased to be divisible in consequence of the feudal doctrine of non-alienation without the consent of the lord. . . . The restraint upon the power of devising did not give way to the demands of the family and public convenience, so early as the restraint upon alienation in the lifetime of the owner. The power was covertly conferred by means of the application of uses; for a devise of the use was not considered a devise of the land. The mode of doing this was by a feoffment to the use of the feoffor's last will, and the feoffee being considered as seized of the use, not of the land, could devise it. The devise of the use was supported by the courts of equity, as a disposition binding in conscience; and that equitable jurisdiction continued until the use became by statute the legal estate. The Statute of Uses of 27 Henry VIII, like the introduction of feuds, again destroyed the privilege of devising, but the disability was removed within five years thereafter by the Statute of Wills of 32 Henry VIII."

In the beginning of the reign of Charles II, military tenures were abolished so as to render the disposition of real property by will absolute. While the power of disposition of real property, as well as personal property either by the common law or by virtue of the statute above referred to, has been made thus free, there still remain certain restrictions upon individuals which must be considered.

All persons of sound mind are competent to bequeath and devise real and personal estate, excepting infants and married women. In England a married woman may now by statute make her will as freely as if unmarried. In some of the United States, if not in most of them, the power of married women over their separate estates, saving to the husband certain proportions in case he should elect to take against the will, is as great as that of unmarried women; that is, married women are for the most part put on the same plane as men; they have certain rights in a proportion of the real and personal estate of their husbands, which he cannot void by will. There are, however, certain restraints upon alienation either by deed or by will, the first of which has already been mentioned, viz: alienation in "mortmain", a word coined to represent the condition where land has come into the possession of a dead hand, or in Latin *mortua manus*. An alienation of lands and tenements to any corporation, sole or aggregate, ecclesiastical or temporal, is such an alienation.

After the introduction of the feudal system it was always, and is still, necessary in England to have a licence in mortmain from the Crown to enable a corporation to purchase lands, because the king is the ultimate lord of every fee, and save by his own consent he cannot lose his privilege of escheats and other feudal profits by the vesting of lands in tenants that can never be attainted or die. "In strictness, however, the license to hold in mortmain was only a waiver of the right of the Crown to enter on the lands alienated; for as no royal charter can *per se* take away the property or prejudice the interest of the subject, such license did not abrogate the right of the mesne lords to enter, and therefore with respect to them, the corporation was not secure until the lapse of the periods respectively limited for the assertion of their rights" (Grant on Corp., 101, quoted in Farrington v. Putnam, 90 M. 418).

Originally the prohibition extended only to religious houses, bishops, and other sole corporations, excluding the parsons of parishes, who were in effect sole corporations and not included therein, but by the Statute "de Religiosis" (7 Edward I, c. 2) it was provided that no person, whether religious or otherwise, should sell, buy, or receive under pretence of a gift, or term of years or any other title whatsoever, any lands or tenements in mortmain under penalty of a forfeiture. Various attempts to evade this statute were met by subsequent statutes. In the reign of George II (9 George II, c. 36) a statute was passed that no lands or tenements or money to be laid out thereon should be given or charged with any charitable uses whatsoever, excepting by deed indented, executed in the presence of two witnesses, twelve calendar months before the death of the donor and enrolled in the Court of Chancery within six months after its execution. This act and its amendments were repealed in 1888, but new legislation codified the law on the subject, practically re-enacting the provisions of the existing law.

As the object of the statutes of mortmain was solely political, they were held not to apply to the alienation of land in the West India colonies or in Scotland. These statutes were not re-enacted in the United States, and therefore we must look to the special restrictions contained in the statutes of the several States, whether general or special, whence corporations derive their existence, for the limitations upon their power to purchase and hold real estate, and also to the force to be given to the exception of corporations out of the English Statute of Wills, which declares that all persons other than bodies politic and corporations may be devisees of real estate.

At common law every corporation has the capacity to purchase and alienate lands and chattels, but in England corporations, both ecclesiastical and lay, under the statutes above referred to have lost this capacity. In the United States, as has been said, the statutes of mortmain are for the most part not recognized, but conveyances by deed or will of lands and tenements made to bodies corporate are void unless sanctioned by charter or act of legislature, and the inference from the statutes creating corporations and allowing them to hold real estate to a limited extent is that statutory corporations cannot hold real estate for purposes foreign to their institution.

The object of the exception of corporations from the English Wills Act was to prevent the locking up of property in perpetuity and also to prevent the imposition upon dying persons, who might thus be persuaded to give their estates from their families to charitable objects. The English statute of charitable uses has not been re-enacted probably in any of the United States, and it would seem that a devise not directly to a charitable corporation but in trust for such corporation would be good, on the principle that a court of equity has jurisdiction over bequests and devises to charitable uses independent of the statute. It is no valid objection to a grant or devise to a charitable use that it creates a perpetuity or renders the estate granted or devised for the purposes inalienable. (See TRUSTS AND BEQUESTS.)

LILLY AND WALLIS, *A Manual of the Law Specially Affecting Catholics* (London, 1893), under *Trusts and Bequests*, 135-67; DESMOND, *The Church and the Law* (Chicago, 1898), under *Bequests to Charity*, 44 to 56.

WALTER GEORGE SMITH.

Charity and Charities.—In its widest and highest sense, charity includes love of God as well as love of man. The latter kind of love is so closely connected with, and dependent upon, the former, that neither it nor its fruits, under the Christian dispensation, can be adequately set forth without a brief preliminary glance at the relations existing between the two kinds.

INTRODUCTORY.—As a virtue, charity is that habit or power which disposes us to love God above all creatures for Himself, and to love ourselves and our neighbours for the sake of God. When this power or habit is directly infused into the soul by God, the virtue is supernatural; when it is acquired through

repeated personal acts, it is natural. If, in the last sentence but one, for the words, "power or habit which disposes us to" we substitute the words, "act by which we", the definition will fit the *act* of charity. Such an act will be supernatural if it proceeds from the infused virtue of charity, and if its motive (God lovable because of His infinite perfections) is apprehended through revelation; if either of these conditions is wanting the act is only natural. Thus, when a person with the virtue of charity in his soul assists a needy neighbour on account of the words of Christ, "as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me", or simply because his Christian training tells him that the one in need is a child of God, the act is one of supernatural charity. It is likewise meritorious of eternal life. The same act performed by one who had never heard of the Christian revelation, and from the same motive of love of God, would be one of natural charity. When charity towards the neighbour is based upon love of God, it belongs to the same virtue (natural or supernatural, according to circumstances) as charity towards God. However, it is not necessary that acts of brotherly love should rest upon this high motive in order to deserve a place under the head of charity. It is enough that they be prompted by consideration of the individual's dignity, qualities, or needs. Even when motived by some purely extrinsic end, as popular approval or the ultimate injury of the recipient, they are in essence acts of charity. The definition given above is at present scarcely ever used outside of Catholic religious and ethical treatises. In current speech and literature the term is restricted to love of neighbour. Accordingly, charity may be popularly defined as the habit, desire, or act of relieving the physical, mental, moral, or spiritual needs of one's fellows. (See ALMS' AND ALMSGIVING.)

The obligation to perform acts of charity is taught both by revelation and by reason. Under the former head may be cited the words of Christ: "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"; "as you would that men should do to you, do you also to them in like manner"; and particularly the description in St. Matthew (xxv) of the separation of the good from the bad at the Final Judgment. Reason tells us that we ought to love our neighbours, since they are children of God; since they are our brothers, members of the same human family; and since they have the same nature, dignity, destiny, and needs as ourselves. This love, or charity, should be both internal and external. The former wishes the neighbour well, and rejoices in his good fortune; the latter comprises all those actions by which any of his needs are supplied. Charity differs from justice, inasmuch as it conceives its object, i. e. the neighbour, as a brother, and is based on the union existing between man and man; whereas justice regards him as a separate individual, and is based on his independent personal dignity and rights. The spirit of the Gospel as regards charity is far superior to that of any of the other great religions. Its excellence appears in the following points: love of the neighbour is akin to love of God; the neighbour is to be loved even as the self; men are brothers, members of the same family; the law of charity extends to the whole human race, thus making all persons equal; men are obliged to love even their enemies; the neighbour is not merely a rational creature made in the image and likeness of God, but also the supernaturally adopted son of the Father, and the brother of the Father's Only-Begotten Son; finally, the Gospel presents the supreme exemplification of brotherly love in the death of Christ on the Cross. In no other religion are all these characteristics found; in most they are totally wanting. The charity inculcated by Judaism is of a very high order, but it falls considerably below that of the New Testament. Although both love of the neighbour as one's self (Lev., xix, 18) and care of the poor (Deut., xv, 4, 11) are strictly commanded in the Pentateuch as duties to God, the neighbour meant only the Jews and the strangers dwelling within their gates. It did not embrace all mankind. The writers of the "imprecatory" Psalms, for example xvi and liii, rejoice in their enemies' misfortune. Indeed, hatred of enemies was so generally regarded as lawful that Christ proclaimed His injunction of love of enemies as something new and unfamiliar. While the Jewish religion taught and still teaches the Fatherhood of God, this doctrine is much less attractive than the Christian conception of the same truth. Besides, it embraces only the children of Israel. The Hebrew idea of the brotherhood of man is correspondingly restricted. Among the other religions, Buddhism probably has the highest form of caritative doctrine, but the motives of its charity are cold, utilitarian, and selfish. It does not command its followers to love their enemies, but merely to refrain from hating them.

The charitable achievements of the non-Christian religions have exhibited all the limitations of their defective first principles. Among the Greeks and the Romans the human person had no inherent worth. He was of importance only as a citizen. The majority of the subjects of these two great powers, being slaves, were without any legal rights. The poor, whether slaves or freemen, were treated by even the noblest and wisest of the Greeks and Romans with contempt, or at most with that pity which is akin to contempt. Owing to its doctrine that the emotions should be suppressed and that pain should be borne with indifference, Stoicism had the practical effect of discouraging sympathy with, or charity towards, the unfortunate and the indigent. Human wretchedness was regarded as a minor evil or as no evil at all. Gifts to beggars were few, and usually from motives entirely selfish. Although the assertion is sometimes made that Athens and Rome possessed hospitals, the weight of evidence seems to show conclusively that no public institution for the regular treatment of diseases existed anywhere before the coming of Christ. The rich citizens of Rome annually distributed large sums of money among their clients and dependents, and the Government regularly provided for the needs of thousands upon thousands, but neither of these practices was intended to benefit any of the poor who were not citizens. The dominant motive of both was political—to secure the goodwill and civic influence of the crowd. In Athens the subventions of public money to the poorer artisans were similarly restricted and directed to the same ends.

Hebrew charity was of a much higher order, being motived by obedience to God and genuine pity for the unfortunate. One of its ideals was thus expressed in the words of Jehovah: "there shall be no poor or beggar among you". Owners were warned that their possessions were from God, and that they were but stewards. The widow, the orphan, the blind, and the lame, were objects of special compassion and assistance. The poor were permitted to gather up for themselves the gleanings left in the field by the reapers, and to take possession of everything that grew spontaneously in the year of the Sabbath. Those who lent money were forbidden to take interest from their fellow-Hebrews or from the strangers within their land. The fact that labour was held in honour went far towards making the condition of the lowly much less hard than among the heathen peoples. Nevertheless, Jewish charity was essentially national, for it took no account of the alien dwelling without. Interest, and frequently exorbitant interest, was exacted from the latter. In the later centuries of their existence as a nation, the Chosen People departed to a great extent from both the letter and the spirit of their excellent legislation on behalf of the poor.

Hence Christ's frequent condemnation of their leaders as hypocrites, self-seekers, oppressors of the poor, and givers of alms in order to be seen of men. While the Koran strongly enjoins the duty of almsgiving, and while the Mohammedans seem to be fairly charitable toward their coreligionists, their treatment of non-believers has been uniformly devoid of either charity or justice. The acts of oppression, cruelty, and murder which they have perpetrated against other peoples, show that Mohammedans have no conception of charity in the Christian sense. It is true that Christian nations have frequently been cruel towards one another and towards unbelieving races, but not in the consistent, unmitigated, and unlimited fashion of the followers of Islam.

Since the body of this article is to be occupied with a somewhat detailed account of the charitable activity of the Church, only a word need now be said concerning its general superiority over that of Paganism, Judaism, and Mohammedanism. This word cannot be more effectively uttered than in the following sentences of Lecky: "Christianity for the first time made charity a rudimentary virtue, giving it a leading place in the moral type, and in the exhortation of its teachers. Besides its general influence, in stimulating the affections, it effected a complete revolution in this sphere, by regarding the poor as the special representatives of the Christian Founder, and thus making the love of Christ, rather than the love of man the principle of charity. . . . A vast organization of charity, presided over by bishops, and actively directed by the deacons, soon ramified over Christendom, till the bond of charity became the bond of unity, and the most distant sections of the Christian Church corresponded by the interchange of mercy" (History of European Morals, II, 3rd ed., 79, 80).

HISTORY OF CHARITY IN THE CHURCH.—(1) *The Apostolic Age.*—The conception of love and of brotherhood which Christ brought into the world obtained ample expression and development in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles, particularly those written by St. Paul. There is no longer any distinction of Jew and Gentile, Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free; but "Christ is all, and in all" (Col., iii, 11). Even those who are not of the household of the Faith are to be loved and assisted (Rom., xii, 14–20; Gal., vi, 10). In the sight of God the slave is the equal and the brother of his master (Phil., 16). Labour is no longer dishonourable, but the normal condition of livelihood (II Thess., iii, 10). "Religion clean and undefiled before God . . . is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation" (James, i, 27). While the Church has especial solicitude for widows and orphans, she is not to be burdened with those who can be supported by their own relatives (I Tim., v, 8, 16). Persons who seek to become rich are exposed to many snares and temptations, "for the desire of money is the root of all evils" (I Tim., vi, 9, 10). Fraternal charity done in the spirit of Christ effects an equality among all the members of the Christian family, for the material gift of the giver is balanced by the love and prayers of the receiver (II Cor., viii, 13, 14; ix, 11, 12). Even the poor can and should contribute their mite (II Cor., viii, 11, 12). The rich should give to the poor in the spirit of Christ who became poor for our sake (II Cor., viii, 9). Hence charity is not to be performed as under the compulsion of law, but freely and spontaneously. The gift should be from the heart, for "God loveth a cheerful giver" (II Cor., ix, 7).

These doctrines were carried into the everyday life of the new believers. In Jerusalem, "the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul: neither did any one say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own; but all things were common unto them. . . . For neither was there any one needy among them" (Acts, iv, 32, 34). As soon as the Apostles realized that their spiritual mission was impeded by personal attention to the material works of charity, they appointed as their representatives the seven deacons to serve the tables and provide for the widows (Acts, vi, 1–6). Thus the caritative function of the Church became specialized. Both the spirit and the deeds of charity were exemplified in the agapæ, or love-feasts, where rich and poor partook of a common meal to which all had contributed according to their means. (See AGAPE.) When some rich Corinthians introduced the practice of consuming their own contributions before the poor had arrived at the place of the meal, they were reprimanded by St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 21, 31). Each congregation had a treasury for the relief of its own poor, and many of them shared their stores with other congregations in times of unusual distress. During a famine in Jerusalem assistance came from the Church at Antioch, and from the Gentile Churches (Acts, xi, 29; Gal., ii, 10).

(2) *The Age of the Persecutions.*—As compared with their numbers and resources, the charity of the Christians of this period seems to have surpassed anything that the world has witnessed since. The explanation is to be found in four principal causes: (a) the principles that were kept constantly before the minds of the faithful; (b) the social and political conditions surrounding them; (c) their excellent administration of charity; and (d) the manifold sources from which it was provided.

(a) At the basis of all their giving was a thorough grasp of the truth that the human possessor of goods is only a distributor and steward for the supreme owner, who is God. The rich believer recognized his obligation to give to the needy all of his resources that were left after his own wants had been supplied. And he was taught that his own wants were to be interpreted rather strictly, that he was to forego luxuries, and even unnecessary comforts and conveniences. Like other believers, he was to be distinguished from his pagan neighbours by his life of contentment, simplicity, and moderation. Clement, Cyprian, and Tertullian describe minutely the complex and luxurious life of the heathens, and denounce it as wholly unworthy of imitation by Christians who really love their poor neighbours (Ratzinger, "Armenpflege", p. 85 sq.; Uhlhorn, "Christian Charity in the Ancient Church", p. 129 sq.). And their interpretation of simple and proper Christian life seems to have been adopted by substantially all the believers. In this respect the latter were far in advance of the Christians of modern times. This duty of distribution was discharged by placing the gifts on the altar, whence they were received and dispensed by the bishop. Through this practice the rich were impressed with the truth that they were merely making a return to God, while the poor were taught to look upon what they received as the gift of God. Moreover, they were enabled to accept it without injury to self-respect, and in a spirit of gratitude both to God and to the human giver who was only God's instrument. By praying for the latter they made an equitable return, were in truth dispensers of charity themselves. Two important consequences of this method and this view of charity were: first, the faithful gave so freely and spontaneously that no specific definitions of the duty or penalties for the neglect of almsgiving were formulated by the Church during this period; and second, no contributions were accepted from unbelievers, public sinners, extortioners, unjust possessors, or persons engaged in sinful occupations.

(b) The second cause to which the superabundant charity of the early Christians has been attributed was their social and political environment. Refusing to accept the authority of the Roman State in mat-

ters of morality, worship, and religion, they were brought under the displeasure of the civil power. Refusing to offer sacrifice or to take oaths in the name of false gods, they were shut out from the everyday life of the field, the market-place, the social gatherings, the theatre, and the forum, as well as from most of the gainful occupations. Forced to live a life apart, they easily became objects of misunderstanding, suspicion, and calumny. Then came that long and frightful series of persecutions, which they met with a uniform policy of non-resistance. The important consequence of all these conditions was that the normal life of the Christian became one of sacrifice and suffering, of prayer, fasting, and chastity. A very large proportion of them looked forward complacently to martyrdom for themselves, and to the near approach of the end of the world for all. In these circumstances the possession and enjoyment of earthly goods could have very little attraction and very little meaning. Almsgiving, and almsgiving in abundance, became one of the ordinary activities of the earnest Christian who had anything in excess of his own simple needs.

(c) In the third place, the administration of charity was under the immediate and exclusive direction of the bishop. The details of the work, as investigating and registering those in distress, and distributing the amount of relief which the bishop deemed proper in each case, were attended to by the deacons, and in the case of needy women by the deaconesses. The latter were either unmarried women or widows of mature years. Assistance was given only to persons unable to earn their living and in real need, and to these only in so far as was strictly necessary. Centuries of subsequent experience, combined with the latest theoretical knowledge, have neither produced a better system nor achieved more satisfactory results than this primitive Christian organization of charity. In the words of the Lutheran Uhlhorn, "never has she [the Church] more highly reverenced the poor, more kindly and lovingly treated them; never also has she been farther from fostering beggary, and making life easy to idlers" (op. cit., p. 180).

(d) Among the sources of the material relief dispensed by the Church during the age of the persecutions, the most important seems to have been the oblations of natural products placed upon the altar at the time of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. All the faithful who could do so participated in this offering, since it was regarded as an element of the religious service. The names of the contributors were announced to the congregation. Distinct from the oblations were the *collectæ*, which were likewise natural products, but which were handed in on certain fast days immediately before the reading of the Epistle. Another source consisted of money contributions to the church treasury, to the *corbona* or *arca*. These were usually given secretly. Extraordinary collections were taken up from the richer members, and large sums were obtained from those who on the occasion of their conversion sold all their goods for the benefit of the poor. In their capacity as *collegia*, or corporations, some of the churches may have taken dues from their members, which helped to swell their resources for works of charity. Finally, the needy of all classes received a great deal of assistance directly from individuals. Heads of families were obliged to care not only for their children and other dependent relatives, but for all the members of their household, both bond and free. So cheerfully and so generously did the Christians give, so generally did they part with all their superfluous revenues for the benefit of the distressed, that the Church was not called upon to determine the duty of charitable contributions by any precise ordinance or law. The imposition of tithes did not begin until after the victory of Constantine in 312 (Ratzinger, op. cit., pp. 71, 72).

The results produced by the four factors just described were remarkable not only in the material order but also in the realm of thought. Assistance was afforded to the clergy, to widows and orphans, to the destitute, the aged, the sick, the persecuted, the imprisoned, and the stranger; and decent burial was given to the neglected dead. Although the clergy had the first claim upon the charity of the faithful, only those were assisted who were unable to support themselves from their own resources or by their own labour. Indeed, it was through the latter means that the greater number obtained their livelihood. The claims of the widows and orphans were recognized as second only to those of the clergy. Children abandoned by the pagans received support from the Church. In general all members of the community who were wholly or partially incapable of self-maintenance were given the measure of assistance that they needed. Owing to the frequent pestilences, sickness was one of the very important forms of distress, and it received from the charity of the Christians all the care and comfort that the knowledge and resources of the time made possible. Material and moral aid was extended to the victims of persecution. Prisoners were visited and comforted, especially those condemned to inhuman conditions of life and toil in the mines. Succour was frequently brought to the latter from a distance of hundreds of miles. Christians who were compelled, through economic conditions or on account of the persecutions, to seek shelter or a livelihood far from home, obtained abundant hospitality from their fellow-Christians. Another form of charity practised by the faithful at this time, and a most necessary one in view of the indifference of the pagans, was the burying of the dead. Although their charity was organized on congregational lines, it was not confined to parochial needs. Aid was given to other congregations, even to those at a great distance. Thus Carthage came to the relief of Numidia, and Rome to the assistance of Cæsarea. Even the Pagans and the Jews were not forgotten; witness the touching instances furnished by the Christians of Carthage and Alexandria (Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 84).

Another beneficent work of Christian charity in the material order consisted in transforming the attitude of men towards labour, and the relations between masters and slaves. Freemen who had hitherto been ashamed to work, and who had led a mendicant and parasitic life, became self-supporting and self-respecting. In the Christian workshop master and servant regarded each other as brothers instead of enemies, and the worker performed his task freely instead of under compulsion of the chain and the lash. In the pagan view and in Roman law, the slave had no rights, neither to humane treatment nor to marriage nor to life. He was not a person, but a thing. Christianity taught the master that the slave was his brother in Christ, and his equal both in the Christian assemblies and in the sight of God. It commanded the master to treat his slaves with mildness and humanity, to grant them freedom from toil on Sundays and holidays, to permit them to live a family life in the same conditions of privacy, security, and indissolubility that ought to mark his own marital relations. It enjoined upon the slave the duty of respecting himself as a man and a brother of Christ, and bade him obey his master not out of fear but out of regard for the social authority of Christ. It permitted him to aspire to the highest honours in the Church. While the Church made no effort during this period towards the emancipation of the slaves, her attitude in this respect was dictated by motives of the greatest kindness and the truest charity. Socially and economically the Christian slave was no worse off than his persecuted fellow-Christians, whereas if he obtained his freedom he would be unable to find an occupation compatible with a moral life. The agapæ not only

helped to feed the poor, but promoted the doctrine of equality and brotherhood. Here the poor man and the slave sat down with the rich man and the master to partake of a meal to which all had contributed according to their means; and the wealthy and the powerful were strikingly reminded that possessions and authority were relatively insignificant in the eyes of the common Father of all. Abuses did, indeed, gradually creep in; in many places the love-feast took on the character of a sumptuous banquet, or was wholly provided by some rich man as a meal for the poorer Christians only ; but these changes were largely due to the increase in the size of the congregations, and to the dangers of meeting openly during the time of persecution.

The most notable achievement of Christian charity in the world of ideas sprang from its teaching concerning ownership, and concerning the intrinsic value of the individual. It was in large measure owing to the thoroughness with which the Christians put into practice the truths that God created the earth for all the children of men, and that the human owner is merely the steward and distributor of his possessions, that they were so soon able to triumph over a hostile civilization which was built upon force and selfishness. In reproach of that civilization Tertullian could proudly exclaim: "All things are common among us except women". The Christian preaching and exemplification of the truth that not merely the Roman citizen, but every human being is clothed with the dignity of personality, brought about at length the end of slavery, and exerted a considerable influence upon legislation even before the victory of Constantine. Trajan encouraged the emancipation of slaves; Hadrian deprived the masters of the right to put them to death; Plutarch and Epictetus held far more humane views concerning the claims of slaves than did Cicero and Cato. Nerva and Trajan extended public assistance to the needy children throughout Italy, instead of confining its benefits to the idlers in the city of Rome, after the manner of all their predecessors. Uhlhorn maintains that as soon as the Church had freed herself from the heresy of Montanism, the Christians began to lose their grasp of the higher motives of charity, and to lay stress upon the distinction between the counsels and the Commandments (op. cit., p. 205 sq.). For the majority, who aimed only to comply with the Commandments, the duties of charity became, like all other duties, less rigorous. The motives of their charitable activity also degenerated into the desire to obtain personal merit in the supernatural order, and release from their sins. According to Uhlhorn, these doctrines first found definite statement in the works of Hermas, Cyprian, and Origen; but they soon became the prevailing view of the Church, and so continued until the Reformation, when a return was made to the primitive teaching (pp. 397, 398). These, however, are the facts: whatever diminution of charitable work occurred is explained by the change in the political and social conditions surrounding the Christians; the distinction between counsel and precept was originated by Christ Himself (Matt., xix, 11, 12); the meritorious character of almsgiving was likewise taught by Him (Matt., xxv, 31–46, and frequently elsewhere); and both these doctrines, together with that of almsgiving as expiatory of the temporal punishment due to sin (not of sin itself), are found in all the early writers, as well as in the liturgy of that age (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., pp. 89–92).

(3) *From Constantine to Gregory the Great.*—As a result of the freedom and social importance which the Church obtained through the victory of Constantine, she was called upon to relieve the distress not merely of her own children, but of the whole population. The universal corruption, cruelty, and extravagance of the civil officials, the relentless and grinding usury of the money-lenders and the almost continuous invasions of the barbarians, combined to produce a greater amount of wretchedness than had ever before existed in the empire. Over the three classes just mentioned the Church had very little influence, since none of them became fully Christianized until long after Christianity had become the established religion. Among the means available to meet this distress there remained the oblations at Mass, the collections on fast days, and the extraordinary collections. But none of these was relatively as fruitful as in the age of the persecutions. Hence exhortations to almsgiving become much more frequent, and towards the end of the sixth century the law of tithes makes its appearance A new source of charitable relief was created by the contributions of the emperors, and of the powerful and wealthy generally. Many of the latter were converted on their death-beds, and endeavoured to atone in their wills for previous neglect of the duty of almsgiving. The bishops not only condemned this postponement of a grave Christian obligation, but refused to accept money which was acquired through dishonesty or extortion, even when it came from the hands of kings. As in the preceding period, the relief of the poor was recognized as a primary function of the Church, and all her revenues, even the sacred vessels, as subject to the demands of charity. Hence arose the custom of referring to the possessions of the Church as "the patrimony of the poor". In the interests of security and system, the church revenues were divided into four parts, of which one went to the bishop, another to the clergy, a third to the maintenance of worship, and the fourth to the relief of distress. This practice became quite general in Rome during the fifth century, whence it gradually extended over the whole Christian world (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 116 sq.). The administration of charity remained in the hands of the bishop, assisted by the *œconomus*, who was usually a priest. The latter was in turn assisted by the deacons, subdeacons, and deaconesses. In every episcopal city, and in other places of importance, were houses called *diaconiæ*, at which and from which assistance was given to the poor, the sick, and the aged. A new institution of charity appears in the *xenodochia*, hospitals, which originated during the reign of Constantine. They were primarily intended for the reception of strangers, but soon undertook the care of the sick, the homeless poor, widows, abandoned children, and other helpless classes. In brief, they performed the tasks that are now divided among hospitals, hotels, almshouses, and asylums. Towards the end of the fourth century they increased very rapidly, and by the time of Gregory the Great were to be found in almost every city of the empire. They were all under the control of the bishop, and were maintained by landed endowments, the general revenues of the Church, and special contributions from the faithful. A form of charity which in the latter half of the Middle Ages became the dominant one, came into existence during the period now under consideration. This was the monastic system of poor relief. The precept of labour, which occupied a primary place in the rules both of Basil and Benedict, was the means of providing a most striking and most beneficent example to an age that had not yet learned the dignity and value of work. And a large share of the product of the industry of the monks was distributed among the poor. The monasteries supplied physicians for all the sick of the neighbourhood, maintained hospitals for all classes of the distressed, reared and educated the young, and during the fifth century were about the only places of refuge for persons whose homes lay in the path of the devastating barbarians. On the other hand, the present period witnessed the decay of the once important agapæ. More and more they became repasts for the poor

provided by the rich, until at length they degenerated into displays of the lavish generosity of their providers, and came under the condemnation of the Church. Among the practices of charity by private individuals were: alms given to those of the poor who had permission to solicit aid at the doors of the churches; large donations of property for the endowment of hospitals, such, for example, as those made by Fabiola, Pammachius, Demetrias, Zoticus, Pulcheria, and Olympia; the direct distribution of all their goods to the poor by many of the wealthy; and many other forms and practices which have necessarily been overlooked by the historian.

In the preaching of the Church at this time the fundamental truths of Christian charity were constantly applied to the different social needs and institutions. The bishops protested strongly and frequently against the excessive taxes and the harsh methods employed in collecting them; against the landowner's oppression of his tenants, and the extortion practised by the usurer; against the forcible enslavement of freemen, the tyranny of civil officials, and the injustice of the courts; against the inhuman treatment of slaves, and in favour of emancipation. In opposition to the almost universal selfishness of the age, they incessantly proclaimed the duty of almsgiving, the stewardship of wealth, and the solidarity of mankind. To those possessors who refused to distribute their superfluous goods among the needy, some of the Fathers applied the terms "robber", "thief", "extortioner". And they regarded as superfluous all that remained after the reasonable needs of the owner had been supplied. They exacted a restitution for the benefit of the poor of all the proceeds of extortion and usury. Nevertheless they all defended the principle of private ownership. Finally, they kept constantly before the faithful the doctrine that almsgiving is an offering to God by the rich, and a gift from God to the poor. The results of the Church's preaching and practice of charity during this period were that widows, orphans, abandoned children, friendless young women, prisoners, the sick, the helpless poor, and the victims of the barbarian invasions, received all the care and assistance which their condition and the available resources permitted. In fact, the unrelieved poverty of that day seems to have been less appalling than is the pauperism of our own time. The vigilance of the deacons and deaconesses seems to have been fairly successful in preventing a waste of charity upon beggars and idlers. While the Church was not able to bring about the abolition of the manifold social abuses of the time, she was directly instrumental in modifying them to a considerable degree. Thus, the bishops gave a humane example by their treatment of the tenants on the lands owned by the Church, punished the murder of slaves by excommunication, frequently emancipated their own bondmen, and demanded for the slave as well as for the freeman the privilege of Sunday rest. The civil legislation of the time granted this demand, abolished the gladiatorial sports and the right of life and death which the father had possessed over his children, conceded the right of asylum to the Christian churches, recognized the duty of the State towards all the poor, prohibited indiscriminate begging, and made the bishop president of a court for the trial of cases which concerned the poor, the widow, and the orphan. The bishop's title, "father of the poor and protector of widows and orphans", was recognized by the State as well as by the Church. No doubt the more frequent stress now laid upon the supernatural rewards of charity does indicate a decline from the fervour of the preceding age, but there is no evidence that the change in the generosity of the faithful was as great as many historians assume. And it is sufficiently explained by the more heterogeneous character of the Christian population after the danger of persecution had passed. Failure to preach the meritorious character of almsgiving would not only have been an injury to the poor, but would have shown contempt for the teaching of Christ.

(4) *The Middle Ages.*—The first important event in the world of charity after the reign of Gregory the Great was the deterioration that it suffered in Gaul under the Merovingians. Owing to the anarchic social and political conditions of the time and the resulting demoralization of the clergy, the poor were all but forgotten, and institutions of charity either disappeared or were diverted to other uses. Although the monasteries discharged their duties fairly well during the early part of the Merovingian period, they became involved later on in the general disorder, worldliness, and negligence which reached a climax under Charles Martel. Then came the great lawgiver, Charlemagne, who effected a manifold and far-reaching reform. He recovered the church property that had been misappropriated, and reestablished the law of tithes, the fourfold division of church revenues, the oblations during Divine service, and other offerings to the priest for charity, and the custom of regarding all the goods of the Church as primarily the patrimony of the poor. According to his legislation, the bishop was to remain the supreme director of charity administration, but in the beneficed parishes the immediate control was in the hands of the person who occupied the benefice. Every form of genuine distress was to be relieved, but idlers, beggars, and vagabonds were to be turned away and compelled to work. The feudal lord was charged with the duty of caring for all the needy among his own vassals. This provision was merely an application to feudal conditions of St. Paul's injunction that everyone should maintain the dependents of his own household. It continued in force, theoretically at least, throughout the whole of the Middle Ages. The monasteries, too, were required to resume their former practices of charity and their more important function as centres of industry, religion, morality, and civilization for all the surrounding populations. Thus it came about that the work of civilizing and Christianizing the Germanic peoples was for the most part accomplished by the monks of St. Benedict and the monks from Ireland (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., pp. 216–218).

A great impetus was given to charitable activity by the discipline of penance, according to which fasting, prayer, and other forms of penitential exercises were, to a considerable degree, replaced by almsgiving. The amount to be contributed was proportioned to the offence; for some of the gravest sins the penalty was total renunciation of one's possessions and entrance into a monastery. Especially large donations to charity were required of those who had neglected the corporal works of mercy. The bishops and other Christian teachers of the time of Charlemagne frequently reminded the kings, princes, and lords that all earthly power was from God, and that their subjects were their equals before God and their brothers in Christ. Through this teaching Germanic slavery (which, indeed, had never been so general nor so deep-rooted as among the Greeks and the Romans) was mitigated into serfdom. Through the Christian teaching and example concerning the dignity of labour, there arose a class of artisans who were not ashamed of their calling, and who were therefore able at length to free themselves from subjection to the feudal lord. The doctrine that all superfluous wealth ought to be employed for the benefit of the poor, was as clearly proclaimed, at least by the great Christian teachers, such as Bede and Alcuin, as it ever had been; but it was not preached so generally nor observed so faithfully. After the death of Charlemagne his organization of charity fell rapidly into decay. Feudalism, all-powerful, haughty, belliger-

ent, unscrupulous, acknowledging no claims but those of might, demoralized both ecclesiastical and civil order. The spiritual leaders of the people were to a very great extent incompetent, worldly, and avaricious. Clerics as well as nobles exploited their serfs and neglected the poor. From the middle of the ninth to the beginning of the twelfth century these deplorable conditions were general throughout Europe. In England, however, the demoralization did not reach its lowest depths until the second half of the tenth century; in Ireland it did not come until the eleventh. Nevertheless the doctrine of charity, as expressed in the documents accompanying charitable foundations, and in the writings of the great teachers like St. Bernard, was everywhere identical with that of the Scripture and the Fathers. The old truths about property as a trust, about the duty of distributing superfluous goods among the poor, about the supernatural rewards of almsgiving, and its value as expiatory of the temporal punishment due to sin—are all clearly taught. Owing to the relatively lower average of Christian fervour, the last two features assume a relatively greater prominence than they had in the teaching of the age of the persecutions.

During the three centuries following the death of Charlemagne, the work of relieving the poor was steadily and rapidly transferred from the diocesan clergy to the monasteries. The demoralization of the diocesan clergy, the misappropriation of church property and revenues by the clergy and the lords, the theory that the lords were to care for all the poor within their domains, the deflexion to some of the monasteries of tithes that formerly went to the parish clergy, the practice of giving landed endowments to the monasteries instead of to the parish churches, the humane treatment generally accorded to their tenants by the monks, and the fact that Christian life became more and more centred about the monasteries—combined to effect this transformation. The new and dominant position of the monasteries is thus described by Ratzinger: "The energy of Christian life had gone over from the diocese to the monastery. The latter became the centre for rich and poor, high and low, for innocent youth and repentant age. It provided in some measure a substitute for the primitive episcopal parish. In every district, alike on towering mountain and in lowly valley, arose monasteries which formed the centres of the organized religious life of the neighbourhood, maintained schools, provided models for agriculture, industry, pisciculture, and forestry, sheltered the traveller, relieved the poor, reared the orphans, cared for the sick, and were havens of refuge for all who were weighed down by spiritual or corporal misery. For centuries they were the centres of all religious, charitable, and cultural activity" (op. cit., pp. 287, 288)—that is, until the end of the fifteenth century. The orders that took the most prominent part in the work of poor-relief were the Benedictines, Cistercians, Premonstratensians, Dominicans, and Franciscans. Through the *portarius* alms were daily distributed at the monastery gate. The needy who were unable to come for a portion of this received assistance in their homes. Connected with the monasteries were hospitals for the treatment and relief of all forms of distress. In addition to their material works of charity, the monasteries did much for the improvement of social conditions and ideals. They treated their tenants and servants a great deal better than did the secular lords, and in their schools maintained a genuine equality between the children of the rich and the poor. The teaching and example of St. Francis and his followers concerning the solid worth of holy poverty, recalled millions of souls from selfishness, luxury, and avarice to simpler and saner ideals of life, and as a further result not merely gave an immense impetus to charitable activity among all the people, but contributed not a little towards the abolition of serfdom in Italy (cf. Dubois, Saint Francis of Assisi, pp. 59–61). During the fourteenth and more frequently in the fifteenth century, however, many abuses got a foothold in the richer monasteries. Avarice, luxurious living, lavish entertainment of guests, favouritism towards relatives, and other forms of relaxation rendered these institutions unable and unwilling to attend properly to the relief of distress. Moreover, the mendicant orders withdrew in the later Middle Ages to the towns, where they devoted themselves almost exclusively to the contemplative life and to preaching.

Next in importance to the monasteries came the hospitals. As already noted, these institutions discharged the functions of guest-house, asylum, almshouse, and hospital in the modern sense. Many of them were managed by secular brotherhoods whose members lived a common life and wore a distinctive garb, but did not claim the privileges of a religious order. The first of these hospitals was established at the end of the ninth century, in Siena, by a certain Soror. Similar institutions in charge of similar brotherhoods soon made their appearance in many of the other cities of Italy. About the middle of the twelfth century the Brotherhood of the Holy Spirit was founded by one Guido in connexion with his hospital at Montpellier. This association grew very rapidly. In 1198 Pope Innocent III took it under his special protection, and entrusted to it a large hospital which he had endowed at Rome. This was but one of the many hospitals established under the direction of that remarkable pontiff. By the end of the thirteenth century there was hardly an important town in Germany that did not possess one or more hospitals of the Brotherhood of the Holy Spirit. St. Elizabeth of Hungary founded three hospitals. The military orders, such as the Knights of St. John and the Hospitallers in Germany, whose existence is due to the spirit of service and self-sacrifice created by the Crusades, established and maintained hospitals in nearly every country of Europe. These orders did an immense amount of good while they remained true to their original spirit, but their usefulness had come to an end by the middle of the fifteenth century. In the later Middle Ages numerous hospitals were maintained by the free towns and cities. Every town in Italy and Germany had at least one, while the larger cities possessed several. They were superintended by a layman, but the attendants and nurses were members of religious associations. Akin to the hospitals were the leper houses and leper huts in which were sheltered the victims of that form of leprosy which the Crusaders brought back from the East. In the thirteenth century these institutions numbered, according to Matthew Paris, nineteen thousand (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 341). To meet this plague there arose in the twelfth century the military order of St. Lazarus. It spread rapidly over the whole of Europe, had charge of many hospitals, and obtained extensive landed possessions. Having finished its task and become somewhat demoralized, it was dissolved by Pope Innocent VIII at the end of the fifteenth century.

Several other religious communities and pious associations having for their chief object the relief of distress arose during the period which we are now considering. A group of women belonging to the Third Order of St. Francis, and under the patronage of St. Elizabeth of Hungary (now known as Elisabetherinnen in Germany and Grey Nuns in France), were formed into a community by Pope Martin V in 1428. Their work on behalf of the poor, the sick, and the distressed in Germany, France, Austria, and Italy, has been noteworthy in amount and quality. At the end of the twelfth century a lay sisterhood, called Beguines, was organized to care for the sick in the homes of the latter. Later on they gave instruction to poor girls, and shelter to poor girls and

widows. They became quite numerous in the Netherlands and Germany, but failed to retain their early spirit, especially in the matter of respect for ecclesiastical authority. By the end of the sixteenth century their career had practically ceased. Among the other communities worthy of mention are: that of St. Anthony of Vienne, which arose in the second half of the eleventh century to minister to those afflicted with the disease known as St. Anthony's fire, and whose period of usefulness lasted about two centuries; the Alexian Brothers, originally a lay association whose chief work was to bury the dead, but which soon undertook other charitable functions; they were formed into a religious congregation in 1458, and still exist in charge of hospitals; the Trinitarians, and the congregation founded by Raymund of Pennafort and Peter Nolasco, both of which appeared about the beginning of the thirteenth century, and in the course of the next five hundred years relieved an immense amount of physical and mental wretchedness by ransoming captives, particularly from the Mohammedans; finally, the "Fratres Pontifices" (Bridge Builders), who during the last four centuries of the Middle Ages made bridges and roads, erected inns for poor and sick travellers, and protected merchants and other wayfarers against the thievery and violence of highwaymen. Their diffusion was rapid and general throughout Europe, and their services to the social and commercial life of the period were incalculable. To the modern mind an organization bound by a religious vow to the avocation of bridge-building may seem fantastic, but it was merely a particular illustration of the general fact that in the Ages of Faith the Church was able to create an institution for the relief of every social need. (See BRIDGE-BUILDING BROTHERHOOD.)

A very important agency in the charitable activity of the later Middle Ages was that of pious foundations or endowments. They consisted of lands or other revenue-producing property, the income of which was to be expended for the benefit of the poor. In return for this charity the beneficiaries were expected to pray for the donor, or for the repose of his soul. Here we see the same conception of charity as an instrument of equality between rich and poor, which was enunciated by St. Paul and exemplified in the primitive oblations. Many of the foundations required that requiem Masses should be celebrated for the benefactor. The greater number were connected with monasteries and hospitals, although some were entrusted to the parish churches and, in the cities, to the civil magistrates. Besides their hospitals, the free cities gradually undertook other works of charity, until in the fifteenth century they either directly or indirectly discharged the greater part of the task of relieving the poor, the helpless, and the stranger. The guilds, which played such an important and varied rôle in the life of the cities, were not merely associations having charge of trade and industry; they were often mutual benefit societies which cared for all needy members and for the dependent families of needy and deceased members. As a result of the charitable activity of Church, municipality, guild, and other associations like the *Calenderii* in Germany and the *Humiliati* in Italy, there was practically no unrelieved poverty in the cities during the later Middle Ages. The spectre of the modern proletariat, wretched, debased, with no definite place in the social organism, and no definitely recognized claims upon any social group or institution, had no counterpart in the municipal life of that time.

From the fact that in the cities the care of the poor had for the most part been taken over by municipal agencies in the fifteenth century, and that the parish system of relief had ceased before the end of the eleventh, it is not to be inferred that the charitable activity and influence of the Church were restricted to the religious orders and religious associations. The whole structure of municipal charity was built up under her inspiration, encouragement, and direction. All through the Middle Ages the diocesan clergy continued to collect and distribute the means of charitable relief. In the cities they supplied the needs of those persons who had been overlooked by the monasteries, hospitals, and guilds. In the country the theory of feudal responsibility for all dependents caused the charity of the diocesan clergy to be confined to travellers and strangers. Moreover, Ratzinger maintains that in England the system of parish relief continued in full vigour and efficiency up to the time of the Reformation (op. cit., p. 421 sq.). Professor Ashley contends that it had disappeared before the twelfth century, but his conclusion is based on the presumption of similarity of conditions in England and on the Continent rather than upon positive arguments (English Economic History, II, 309 sq.). Then, there was the beneficent influence of the Church upon social and political institutions. Her prohibition of usury, which was also under the ban of the civil law, was a great boon to the poor and all the economically weak. For in those days money was nearly always borrowed to meet temporary and personal needs, and not as now for use as capital. While the theological proof that interest-taking was unlawful may not have been any better understood by the mass of the medieval population than by many of its modern critics, the doctrine itself, reinforced by the ecclesiastical and civil legislation, effectively taught men that gains ought to be the fruit of labour not of exploitation, and on the whole protected the economically weak against the economically strong (cf. Ashley, op. cit., II, 434 sq.). When the increased need for loans threatened to place large numbers of the people at the mercy of the Jewish usurers, the *Montes Pietatis* were established, mostly by the Franciscans, from which money could be borrowed on payment of a sum sufficient to cover risks and the cost of maintenance. Finally, the Church successfully inculcated what Dr. Cunningham has called, "a keen sense of personal responsibility in the employment of secular power of every kind" (Western Civilization, II, 104). King, prince, and feudal lord held their office from God, and were responsible to Him for the people committed to their charge. The poor, the weak, and the helpless were, in theory, and to a considerable degree in practice, objects of their special care. While the cultivators of the land remained, until the latter part of the Middle Ages, unfree, "bound to the soil", they enjoyed security of tenure, and could claim the protection and support of the lord. The mutual duties and rights of lord and serf were in a high degree personal, and not reducible to any mere cash-nexus. The principles of charity expounded during the last three centuries remained the same as those found in the Scripture and in the Christian teaching of every age from the beginning. Only they were presented more precisely and systematically. Thus St. Thomas, whose treatment of the matter may be taken as typical, declares that charity towards the neighbour should have as its motive the love of God, and that almsgiving may be made meritorious of eternal rewards and expiatory of the temporal punishment due to sin. He insists that fraternal charity ought to be free, spontaneous, from the heart. When he speaks of it as a duty he has in mind moral duty, not the constraint of external law (cf. Summa Theologica, II–II, all of Q. xxxii). While he maintained that the contemplative life is in itself of higher moral and supernatural worth than the active life, inasmuch as it is more directly concerned with love of God, he also pointed out that a life of activity and labour may become strictly obligatory, and hence more meritorious than a life of contemplation—for example, in order to gain a livelihood, escape the moral dangers of idleness, or give alms to the needy (II–II, Q. clxxxii, aa.

I and 2; Q. clxxxvii, a. 3). In spite of some occasional exaggeration of the contemplative, and disparagement of the active, life, the utility and dignity of labour have never been more generally recognized than in the second half of the Middle Ages. As to private property, St. Thomas taught that, while it was useful and lawful, all superfluous goods should be used for social purposes (II–II, Q. lxvi, a. 2). In no age has the conception of ownership as a social trust been put into practice by so large a proportion of the community as during this period. For proof we need only point to its innumerable and magnificent institutions, foundations, and expenditures for the glory of God and the service of mankind (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 392).

There are certain serious and oft-repeated criticisms of Catholic charity in general and of medieval charity in particular which may be conveniently noticed at this point. They are all reducible to the general assertion that the Church's teaching concerning the meritorious character of almsgiving led to so much indiscriminate charity as to raise the question whether Catholic work on behalf of poverty was not productive of more harm than good. With regard to this contention, the first observation to be made is that the Church did teach that charitable actions from the proper motive promoted the spiritual welfare of the giver, but that this was the teaching of Christ Himself, as well as of the Christian authorities in every age (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., pp. 89, 160, 388). If the doctrine seems to have been more frequently and more strongly inculcated in the Middle Ages than in the first centuries of the Christian Era, the explanation is to be sought not merely in a lesser spirit of self-sacrifice, but also in the more developed and systematic presentation of the theory, as well as in the fuller accounts which history has handed down to us concerning the beliefs and deeds of the later time. In the second place, the contention, or assumption, that the Church, or any of her authoritative exponents, ever taught that almsgiving was meritorious regardless of the need of the recipient—in other words, that it is a good work to give the neighbour something which does him harm—is simply false. How could any sane and intelligent Christian defend the proposition that an act of injury to the neighbour would win the favour of God? To Him the welfare of one man is as dear as that of another. If this a priori consideration seem inconclusive, let us cite the admissions of the economic historian, Professor Ashley: "It is not difficult to adduce a long catena of passages from the Fathers and from the canons of Councils, which declare in the most explicit fashion the duty of investigation" (op. cit., II, 315). In this way, he says, "Ehrle is able to make a very effective reply to the exaggerations of Emminghaus" (p. 369). His conclusion is: "It must be allowed that so far as the theory of almsgiving is concerned, the medieval Church was free from the fault that has been imputed to it . . ." (p. 316).

But the important question concerns neither the motives nor the doctrine of medieval charity, but its effectiveness in the relief of poverty. Here are three typical answers to this question: ". . . in the sphere of simple poverty it can hardly be doubted that the Catholic Church has created more misery than it has cured" (Lecky, History of European Morals, II, 95, 3rd ed.). "For eighteen centuries the charitable and legislative efforts of society have been pauperizing instead of elevating men" (H. B. Adams, in Johns Hopkins University Historical Studies, fifth series, p. 319). "This [private charity], like the charity of the Church, was wholly indiscriminating and, therefore, evil in its consequences" (Charles A. Ellwood, in Henderson's Modern Methods of Charity, p. 167). In all probability these statements are a fairly adequate reflection of what is still the prevailing view outside the Catholic Church. As a matter of simple fact, this view has never been justified by evidence; all the available evidence tends to show that it is a gross exaggeration. It seems to be due partly to prejudice, partly to a priori inferences, and partly to hasty generalizations from isolated and inadequate data. That a large part has been played by the element of religious prejudice, becomes clear when we reflect that most of the descriptions of monastic corruption and incompetence which have formed the original basis of the theory under discussion, were written by men who were bitter opponents of the monks, their religion, and their institutions. In a considerable proportion of cases (v. g. the case of Fuller, who is quoted below, and of the King's Commissioners of 1535, quoted by Froude, II, 434) their object was not so much to write history as to discredit the old religion and the old regime. Careful historians of to-day recognize this, but popular writers on the history of charity have not yet given it sufficient attention. The other two causes of the theory, illicit use of the a priori method and hasty generalization, usually appear together, though now one, now the other, predominates. A very common misuse of the a priori method is seen in the contention that the amount of begging, particularly unjustifiable begging, in the Middle Ages was enormous. This charge is based not so much upon statistics—which are almost entirely wanting—nor upon authentic general descriptions, as upon two assumptions: first, that a good Catholic would give indiscriminately to all beggars for the sake of the supernatural merit attached to charitable actions; and second, that the practice of begging was made honourable by the mendicant orders, who employed it as their regular means of obtaining a livelihood. Again and again we meet with this form of argument.

Of course Catholics have never believed that almsgiving which is not beneficial to the receiver could be spiritually helpful to the giver. Consequently belief in the meritorious character of works of charity no more necessarily leads to indiscriminate giving than belief in the virtue of mercy involves indiscriminate condoning of crime. Secondly, the fact that certain religious orders got their living and performed their charitable functions through begging, no more sanctified unworthy begging (which was always under the ban of the Church) to the people of the Middle Ages than the solicitations of clergymen and charity organizations, both of whom live by a species of begging, justifies the general practice of mendicancy to our minds. Concerning generalizations from insufficient data, two instances will suffice. Emminghaus, whose work heads the list of authorities in many non-Catholic works, has, as Professor Ashley admits, misrepresented the position of the Church on meritorious almsgiving, apparently because he did not study sufficiently the sources. If he has been guilty of such a fault concerning the theory of Catholic charity, need we be surprised to find that his generalizations about the practice and results are likewise based upon insufficient acquaintance with the sources? Ratzinger calls attention to several instances of this, and declares that the conclusions of Emminghaus with regard to charity in the early Church are due to unpardonable ignorance (op. cit., p. 93). Professor Ashley writes thus: "There are strong reasons for believing that for a couple of centuries at least before the Reformation, the English monasteries had done but little for the relief of honest poverty; . . . that, in the strong words of Fuller, 'the Abbeys did but maintain the poor which they made'" (op. cit., II, p. 312). In proof of this statement, he quotes two passages from Ratzinger concerning the decline of the monastic system of relief on the Continent, and declares that the same thing must have occurred in connexion with the English monasteries. In the first of the passages in

question, Ratzinger says that grave abuses, such as avarice, luxury, and a diminution of love for the poor, got into the richer monasteries, and he intimates that to some extent in the fourteenth, and to a greater extent in the fifteenth, century, these abuses were no longer mere exceptions; but he adds that no other period can show as many foundations and works of benevolence (op. cit., p. 311). All that he tells us in the second passage quoted is that the multiplicity of charitable agencies—monasteries, hospitals, orders, and associations—without any centralized directions, was less effective than the old parish system, and was unable to overcome begging (p. 397). Obviously these limited and qualified statements are not equivalent to Professor Ashley's sweeping assertion. It would seem that in spite of his usual fairness, he is here unable to emancipate himself from the long prevailing English tradition concerning all pre-Reformation institutions. Similar errors have no doubt been committed more frequently by writers who are less competent and less fair than Professor Ashley.

Assuming that the extreme view under discussion rests upon no sufficient foundation, what conclusion concerning Catholic charity in the later Middle Ages seems to be justified by the evidence? Notwithstanding the well-recognized danger of generalizing from historical facts, it seems safe to say that the amount of culpable waste and of unwise and indiscriminate giving to the poor was considerable; but that the amount of distress that went unrelieved was not, relatively to economic resources and standards of living, greater than the unrelieved want of any age since. The first part of this conclusion seems to be abundantly established by the investigations of Ratzinger (op. cit., pp. 311, 313, 315, 319, 323, 360, 362, 396–399, 437 sqq., and elsewhere). Justice, however, requires that we make some qualifications. The prevalence of begging during the fifteenth century was due not so much to misdirected charity as to the breaking up of feudalism and to the agrarian changes, such as enclosures and sheep-farming (cf. Ashley, op. cit., p. 352), which deprived immense numbers of persons of all means of livelihood. The fact that the duty of discrimination in giving was not so generally preached and practised as to-day, is largely accounted for by a less developed appreciation of the evil of social dependency. This was inevitable in feudal society. In the third place, much of the inefficiency of the medieval agencies must be attributed solely to their lack of co-ordination and centralization. The second part of our generalization calls to mind the words of the Rev. Dr. Gibbins: "But poverty was neither so deep nor so widespread as it is now, nor as it soon became, and the monasteries and guilds (when they did their duty) were possibly quite as efficient as a modern Board of Guardians" (Industry in England, p. 195). Dr. Gibbins is not a Catholic. Dr. Ellwood maintains (Henderson's Modern Methods of Charity, foot-note, p. 167) that the dissolution of the English monasteries "revealed" rather than "caused" a large amount of pauperism and vagrancy. We may pertinently ask whether the Poor Law "covered", i. e. relieved, these conditions as fully and as humanely as the monastic system which it supplanted. Some of its early provisions for the repression of begging constitute a foul blot on the history of English legislation. Cruel as they were, these measures proved ineffective. Speaking of European conditions generally, Ratzinger declares that it was precisely in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the prohibition of begging was most severe, that the practice was most extensive (op. cit., p. 445).

After more than two centuries of variations, during which the defects of the Statute of Elizabeth had been corrected by the Settlement Law of Charles II, which, in the words of Dr. Ellwood (Henderson, op. cit., p. 173) was "disastrous to rich and poor alike", the English Poor Law went to that extreme of indiscriminate liberality provided for by the Allowance System of 1782. So demoralizing was this measure that, to quote General Walker, "the condition of the person who threw himself flat upon public charity was better than that of the labourer who struggled on to preserve his manhood in self-support" (cf. Warner, American Charities, p. 15). Despite the great reform which the law underwent in 1834, and despite the intelligent administration which it ought to receive at the end of the nineteenth century, Mr. Thomas Mackay is constrained to write: "the Poor Law as administered throughout the greater part of the country is simply a disaster to the best interests of the poorer classes, and succeeds in maintaining a head of pauperism which, though it continues to decrease, is still a disgrace to the intelligence of the country" (The State and Charity, p. 137). Now, if the case be so with the English Poor Law, which represents the most systematic, determined, and long-continued endeavour to find an adequate substitute for pre-Reformation agencies; if not only in England but in every other European country, the amount of unrelieved want is still, relatively to national resources and standards of living, greater than it was in the Middle Ages; if, as even Uhlhorn admits, "no period has done so much for the poor as the Middle Ages" (op. cit., p. 397); if the possessors of wealth of those days were imbued with saner ideas as to its worth and a broader and more generous conception of its uses, we can bear with some complacency the knowledge that medieval charity is chargeable with much injudicious distribution and even with considerable misappropriation. Professor Patten, who is one of the leading authorities on economics and economic history in America writes: "The economic aims of the Church were also fairly well realized. It provided food and shelter for the workers, charity for the unfortunate, and relief from disease, plague, and famine, which were but too common in the Middle Ages. When we note the number of the hospitals and infirmaries, the bounties of the monks, and the self-sacrifice of the nuns, we cannot doubt that the unfortunate of that time were at least as well provided for as they are at the present. If the workmen were well fed, warmly clothed, and comfortably housed, surely the economic aims of the age were fairly well realized" (The Development of English Thought, pp. 90, 91).

5. From the End of the Fifteenth Century to the Present Time.—The great increase of distress which followed so soon upon the Reformation was due in some measure to the rapid decay of feudalism and the agrarian changes, but in greater measure to the confiscation of the monastic and other sources of Catholic charity, and to the substitution of an extortionate set of secular landlords for the monasteries and the churches. The last factor was especially harmful in England (cf. Gibbins, op. cit., pp. 203–205), but its evil results were considerable in all the regions where the Reformation triumphed (Ratzinger, op. cit., pp. 456–463). Luxury and selfishness increased among the wealthy, while charitable contributions decreased among all classes. Uhlhorn admits that the purer motives of giving, which were the gift of the Reformation, did not lead to the expected results; "that our Church has in this respect also, and perhaps most of all in this, come short in practice of what has been given her in knowledge" (op. cit., p. 398). How far the practice of giving and the spirit of charity had declined since the advent of the new religion is sufficiently indicated by the bitter complaints of Luther (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., pp. 457, 458). As a necessary consequence the relief of the poor fell more and more to the care of the civil authorities, national, provin-

cial, and municipal. Municipal poor-relief did not, however, originate with the Reformation. As noted above, it had been quite general in the fifteenth century. In the first half of the sixteenth it underwent important developments in the cities of Belgium, beginning with Ypres (1524). The new ordinances of this city were, it seems, chiefly due to the ideas of the Spanish theologian and humanist, Vives. His work, "De Subventione Pauperum", was written while he resided at the court of Henry VIII, and was published at Bruges in 1526 (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., pp. 438 sq.). It was soon translated into Spanish, Italian, and French. In the second part, which deals with public charity, Vives declares that it is the duty of the civic authorities to care for the needy, and lays down provisions by which the work can best be accomplished. His most important recommendations are: that a census be taken of the indigent; that all who are able be compelled to work; that the authorities, if necessary, provide employment; and that begging be prohibited. These proposals aroused considerable opposition on the ground that they savoured of Lutheranism, denied the natural right of man to beg, and were too harsh upon the deserving poor. The faculty of the Sorbonne, to which the controversy was referred for adjudication, decided that the recommendations of Vives were contrary neither to the Gospel nor the Fathers, but made the reservation that begging should not be prohibited unless the public resources were sufficient to relieve all the distressed. In the work of Vives, says Ratzinger, we find all the fundamental principles of every sound system of relief that has ever existed. And we might add that, as they were not due to the Reformation, but to the intellectual revival which preceded it, they would have been much more fruitful had their application not been hindered by the social, political, and religious disturbances for which the Reformation was responsible. In 1531 the proposals of Vives were embodied in a general law of the Emperor Charles V, with the proviso that the local authorities should have discretionary power to license certain persons to beg. The means of caring for distress under the new ordinances were to be provided by the hospitals and other foundations, and by voluntary contributions.

The Council of Trent laid down minute regulations concerning the administration of hospitals and hospital funds, and reaffirmed the duty of the bishops not only to enforce these regulations, but to examine and oversee all measures for the relief of the poor (De Reformatione, Sess. VII, XXII, XXV). In many portions of the Catholic world these ordinances soon bore considerable fruit, especially in connexion with the re-establishment of the system of parish relief. The greatest name identified with this work is that of St. Charles Borromeo, Bishop of Milan. As a result of his boundless zeal and tireless activity, his diocese before long possessed a complete organization of charity which was worthy of comparison with that of the early Church, and surpassed any system of his own time. One of the most important features of the period now under consideration has been the rise of religious communities and other associations to relieve various kinds of distress. The Brothers of Charity, founded by St. John of the Cross in Granada, 1534, to care for the sick, soon spread over Spain, Portugal, Italy, France, and Germany. In North America appeared the hospital orders of the Brothers of St. Hippolytus (Mexico, 1585) and the Bethlehemites (Guatemala, 1660). A congregation whose members are at once priests and physicians arose in Turkey under the name of "Fathers of the Pestilence". The Daughters, or Sisters, of Charity, founded by St. Vincent de Paul about the year 1633 have become celebrated for their manifold works of mercy in every part of the world. St. Vincent's work on behalf of foundlings, galley-slaves, and the wretched of all descriptions, makes him the most remarkable worker in the field of charity that the world has ever known. The Piarists whose object is the instruction and care of poor children were instituted in 1597 by Joseph of Calasanza, and have become very numerous in Austria, Italy, Spain, and Poland. The Institute of the Blessed Virgin, the "English Ladies", founded by Mary Ward in 1611, was intended to be chiefly a teaching order, though it also has orphan asylums, chiefly in Bucharest and Bavaria. The Sisters of the Good Shepherd devote themselves to the reformation of wayward girls. Their founder was a Frenchman, Father Eudes (1642). The Little Sisters of the Poor had their origin in the charitable work of a French servant girl, Jeanne Jugan, and received the approbation of the Holy See in 1854. Their splendid work on behalf of the aged, as also the rescue work of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, is recognized by all classes in all civilized countries. Although the congregations just mentioned are among the most important that have been established for the relief of distress since the Reformation, they are in reality only a small part of the whole number (cf. Ratzinger, op. cit., pp. 508–536). By far the greatest lay association that has arisen during this period is the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. It was originated in 1833 by Frédéric Ozanam and seven other Catholic students in Paris. At present, branches of the society, called conferences, are to be found in almost every country of Europe, North and South America, and in many parts of Asia, Africa, and Australasia. In 1905 the whole number of conferences throughout the world was estimated at six thousand, with a combined membership of one hundred thousand, or two hundred thousand, including the honorary members. The individual conferences of each city are usually combined into a particular council, the particular councils of a large locality, province, or country, are federated into a central or a superior council, while the superior councils of all the countries are represented in the council-general in Paris. The society does not confine its ministrations to direct material assistance, but in many places maintains nurseries, libraries, orphanages, schools, and employment bureaus, and strives everywhere to extend moral and religious aid and encouragement to those in need of these forms of charity. Owing to its religious spirit, its centralized organization, and its method of personal contact with the needy, the St. Vincent de Paul Society is, relatively to its resources, probably the most effective of all existing associations for the relief of distress.

To-day the characteristic agencies of Catholic charity are: institutions in charge of religious communities, as monasteries, hospitals, reformatories, and asylums for homeless infants, for orphans, for the deaf, dumb, blind, aged, crippled, and insane; the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, and other associations of the same general character; and the parish, through the informal and unorganized, yet very important, work of the parochial clergy. In conformity with the regulations of the Council of Trent, all these are under the supreme direction of the bishop. Some statistics pertaining to France and the United States may be taken as fairly representative. In 1901 the number of persons assisted by Catholic societies in the former country was 107,400, or 83,000 children, 700 girls and women in refuges, 17,000 aged, and 6,700 insane persons. The total number of Catholic charitable societies exceeded 4000 (Henderson, Modern Methods of Charity, p. 527). In the preceding year the 1400 French conferences of the St. Vincent de Paul Society expended 440,000 dollars in relief work. According to the Catholic Directory for 1908, there were in the United States 272 orphan asylums with 42,597 in-

mates, and 1054 other charitable institutions. The Report of the Superior Council of New York for the year 1905 informs us that there were in the United States 443 conferences of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, whose combined membership was 7,423. During that year they assisted 19,193 families and expended 233,698 dollars.

If the charitable work of the Church since the Reformation seems to compare unfavourably with her record before the Middle Ages, and during the latter half of the Middle Ages, and if in some places and times it seems to have lacked energy, foresight, vigilance, and progressiveness—these appearances are almost wholly explained by the obstacles that have confronted her during that period. The most serious hindrance was, of course, the confiscation of monastic and other church properties from which the poor had been relieved. This occurred not merely in places where the Reformation triumphed, but in Catholic countries also, as in France and Spain during the eighteenth century, and in Italy during the nineteenth. Civil legislation in general has likewise been frequently obnoxious. A great part of the Church's energies both in Catholic and non-Catholic lands has been absorbed in defending the Faith. The policy of state support of the poor through taxation, which has everywhere been increasing its scope, has not only diminished the field of Catholic charity, but has inflicted serious injury upon the spirit of charity among all classes. The trend of political economy, especially in its popularized forms, during the greater part of the nineteenth century, was strongly against charitable activity, on the ground that compulsory self-reliance would in practically all cases best develop strength of character and capacity for self-support (cf. Warner, American Charities, ch. i). Finally, the materialistic theory of life, according to which the supreme good is abundant and diversified satisfaction of the senses, has produced an immense increase of self-love and selfishness, and a profound diminution of love of God and effective love of the neighbour. While these deplorable conditions have been most general among persons outside the Church, they have seriously affected a large proportion of the Catholic populations everywhere. Surveying the whole historical field of Catholic charity, we are justified in saying that, in proportion to her resources, the Church met the various forms of distress of every age more adequately than any other agency or system; that her shortcomings in charitable activity were due to the nature of the peoples and civilizations, and to the political, social, economic, and religious conditions in which she worked; that the instances of heroic charity which stand to her credit surpass by an immeasurable distance all instances of that class outside her fold; that the individual gifts to charity which she has inspired are likewise supereminent; and that, had she been permitted to reorganize and develop her charities without the interference of the Reformation, the amount of social distress, and of social injustice as well, would be much smaller than it is to-day.

PLACE OF CATHOLIC CHARITY IN PRESENT SOCIETY.—Before the Reformation all charities were administered by the Church; to-day most of them are under the control of the State. Nevertheless the field still open to Catholic charity is neither small nor likely to become smaller. The limitations and defects of public charity are well known: it is almost inevitably more mechanical and less sympathetic than private charity; it is more wasteful, not only because it is less carefully administered, but also on account of the readiness of many persons to claim public relief as a right; and, inasmuch as it supplants appeals to the individual conscience by the imposition of a tax, it inflicts a mortal injury upon the spontaneity of charity and the sense of personal responsibility towards the unfortunate. The inferiority of state-administered charity, so far as outdoor relief is concerned, has received striking illustration in the achievements of Dr. Chalmers in Glasgow more than half a century ago, in the experiment of substituting voluntary for public relief in Whitechapel and Stepney, London, and in the policy of refusing public outdoor relief which prevails in Brooklyn and Philadelphia (cf. Bliss, Encyclopedia, s. v. Chalmers; Mackay, The State and Charity, pp. 164 sq.; and Warner, American Charities, pp. 162–176). The general principles underlying the whole problem of state charity would seem to be these: instead of assuring every person a living, the State ought so to regulate economic conditions that every person able to obtain a livelihood by labour should have that opportunity; that it should have charge of certain extreme forms of distress, such as virulent disease and insanity; and that in general it should co-operate with voluntary charitable agencies, and stand ready to relieve all serious want which is not met by them. At any rate, students and workers in the field of charity seem to be practically unanimous in the belief that the scope of private charity ought to be extended rather than restricted. In this field Catholic charity should occupy the foremost place, and do by far the largest and most effective work. The principles of Catholic charity, concerning the ownership and use of goods, the true equality and brotherhood of men, spontaneity in giving, and the motives for giving, are supremely great. Especially is this true of the motives. The neighbour ought to be assisted out of love of God. As the highest form of this is to love God for His own sake, so the highest form of fraternal charity is that which is motived by the thought that the neighbour is the creature, the image, the child of God, and the brother of Christ. Inasmuch as this motive points to a worth and sacredness in the individual which is higher than anything that he possesses when considered in himself, it is more effective and more comprehensive than the motive which is restricted to love of the neighbour for his own sake. Many needy individuals are in themselves repellent rather than sympathy-compelling. While the second form of fraternal charity for love of God, namely to obtain the spiritual rewards which God has annexed to this form of good works, is lower than the first, it is entirely natural, entirely praiseworthy, and has the approval of Christ Himself. This motive appeals to multitudes who would rarely be able to rise to the higher one, and is occasionally effective in the case of the least selfish. Warner declares that, "of all the churches the one that still induces the largest amount of giving in proportion to the means of those who give is no doubt the Roman Catholic" (op. cit., p. 316). To a large extent this fact is due to the Church's practice of insisting upon both motives, and thus touching all the springs of charity in man's complex nature. At the same time it is a patent fact that large numbers of men and women devote themselves and their means to works of charity solely out of love for the neighbour regarded in himself. This motive is likewise in harmony with the promptings of human nature. It is particularly effective in lofty souls who, lacking any positive religious faith, find in works of charity satisfaction of the desire to serve and worship something outside of themselves. While the number of such persons will in all probability be largely augmented in the near future, neither in numbers nor in achievements will they be worthy of comparison with those who come under the influence of the motives supplied by Christianity.

The second advantage possessed by Catholics in the work of charity lies in their ecclesiastical organization. Relief can be individualized by means of the parish, and centralized by means of the diocese. In many places Catholics are, moreover, co-operating with non-Catholics through the charity organization

societies. This is entirely fitting, for two reasons: First, because the methods and purposes of what has come to be called organized charity—namely, investigation, attention to causes, specific treatment, self-help, record-keeping, and co-operation among the different charitable agencies in order to eliminate duplicated and misdirected effort—are entirely sound. Second, because Catholics have a prior claim upon all these principles and practices. As noted above, the general principles were first formulated by the theologian, Vives, in 1526, and received their first application about the same time in the Catholic cities of the Netherlands and Germany. They were developed and applied along the specific lines of present practice by Frédéric Ozanam in 1833 (cf. O'Meara, Life of Ozanam). The first non-Catholic to exemplify these modern methods was Chalmers in 1850, while the first charity organization society did not come into existence until 1868 (cf. Warner, op. cit., pp. 377–392). True, these methods are liable to abuse: the work may become too formal, too mechanical, too much given to investigation, and the results may be waste of money, lack of sympathy, and unnecessary hardship to the deserving poor. Nevertheless time and experience seem, in most places, to have reduced these evils to the lowest proportions that can reasonably be expected in a human institution. In many localities it is desirable that Catholic charitable agencies should make a fuller use of these methods, and in general become better organized and better systematized. Where the St. Vincent de Paul Society lives up to the standard set by its founder in this matter, it is the most effective relief society in existence. Some of the American conferences of the association have in recent years begun to employ paid agents with gratifying results. This is a wise feature, inasmuch as voluntary workers cannot always be obtained in sufficient numbers who possess the time, ability, and experience essential to the largest achievement. Again, Catholic charity-workers will follow the best traditions of Catholic charity by co-operating with the tendency, which is every day becoming stronger in the circles of organized charity, to attack the social causes of distress (cf. Proceedings of the Thirty-third National Conference of Charities and Correction, pp. 1–10). This is, of course, the wisest, most effective, most difficult, and, therefore, most meritorious form of charitable effort. In the Middle Ages the social causes of poverty were much better controlled than at present, because the Church had infused into all classes the doctrine that social power carries with it social responsibility. To-day the chief social causes of poverty are the worship of money, and the lack of social responsibility in those who possess social power, i. e. economic power. Only within the Catholic Church can be found the principles, resources, organization, and authority through which these causes can be repressed.

Finally, the opportunities of private charity, the direct assistance of individuals by individuals, are still and will continue to be large. This form of charity has always been encouraged by the Church, and when wisely administered it has advantages which are not attainable by the organized form. It makes possible that exchange and that equalization between giver and receiver spoken of by St. Paul, and promotes that mutual understanding and mutual sympathy which are especially necessary in our day, when the gulf separating those who have and those who have not has become so wide and so ominous. Individual charity also increases vastly the total amount that passes from the more to the less fortunate, thereby producing a more equitable distribution of the earth's bounty than would take place if all cases of distress were referred to the already overburdened organizations. Dr. Devine, who is one of the foremost authorities in the field of organized charity, speaks in the highest terms of rightly-administered individual charity, and declares that, "it is a question whether the unmeasured but certainly large amount of neighbourly assistance given in the tenement-houses of the city, precisely as in a New England village or in a frontier settlement, does not rank first of all among the means for the alleviation of distress" ("The Principles of Relief", p. 332, and the entire chapter). See Alms and Almsgiving; Hospitals; Poverty; Orphanages; Deaf and Dumb; Education of the Blind; Homes; Protectories; Philanthropy; Monastery.

Baluffi, *The Charity of the Church a Proof of Her Divinity*, tr. Gargan (Dublin, 1885), general and popular rather than definite and systematic; Broglie, *St. Vincent de Paul*, tr. Partridge (London, 1899); Uhlhorn, *Charity in the Ancient Church*, tr. (New York, 1883), excellent except for some erroneous notions of doctrine; Lecky, *History of European Morals* (New York, 1880), II, iv; Ashley, *English Economic History* (New York and London, 1893), II, v; Döllinger, *Gentile and Jew*, tr. Darnell (London, 1906), II; Janssen, *History of the German People*, tr. Mitchell and Christie (St. Louis, 1896–1900), I, II, III, IV; O'Meara, *Life of Ozanam* (London, 1878); Warner, *American Charities* (New York, 1894); Devine, *The Principles of Relief* (New York, 1905); Mackay, *The State and Charity* (London and New York, 1898); Henderson, *Modern Methods of Charity* (New York, 1904), the best work in English on the subject with which it deals, and comparatively fair to Catholic charity; it contains an excellent bibliography; *International Congress of Charities at Chicago in 1893* (Baltimore and London, 1894); *Proceedings of the National Conferences of Charities and Correction* (Indianapolis, 1874–1907); *Proceedings of the International Convention of the St. Vincent de Paul Society* (St. Louis, 1905); *The St. Vincent de Paul Quarterly* (New York); *Charities and the Commons* (New York); Palgrave and Lalor, *Dictionaries of Political Economy;* Bliss, *Encyclopedia of Social Reform*, s. vv. *Charity, Poverty, Pauperism, Poor Laws, Philanthropy;* Ratzinger, *Armenpflege* (Freiburg, 1884), in all probability the best work on Catholic charity; it contains the fullest references to the sources; Ehrle, *Beiträge zur Geschichte . . . der Armenpflege* (Freiburg, 1881); Uhlhorn, *Christliche Liebesthätigkeit* (Stuttgart, 1883–1890); Emminghaus, *Armenwesen . . . in europäischen Staaten* (1870), tr. under title, *Poor Relief in Different Parts of Europe* (London, 1873; this work was so inaccurate that it called forth the works of Ratzinger on the Catholic side and Uhlhorn on the Protestant; Stein, in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Armenpflege;* Lallemand, *Histoire de la charité* (Paris, 1902); Monnier, *Histoire de l'assistance publique dans les temps anciens et modernes* (1866); De Gérando, *De la bienfaisance publique* (1839); *La grande encyclopédie*, s. v. *Charité.*

John A. Ryan.

Charity, Congregation of the Brothers of, founded in Belgium early in the present century: the rule and constitutions were approved and confirmed by Pope Leo XIII, 4 July, 1899. The founder, the Very Rev. Pierre J. Triest, titular canon of St. Bavon of Ghent, on account of his services in the cause of charity, was surnamed the Vincent de Paul of his native country, and was three times decorated by royal hands with the highest civic orders of the land. After his death his countrymen erected a superb mausoleum to his honour in Brussels, the capital of the kingdom. The special aim of this congregation is the sanctification of its members in the religious state by the exercise of works of charity, which, in the spirit of its founder, embrace every phase of moral and physical suffering and want. They consist in a special manner in tending the sick, in sheltering poor workmen, in the care of the aged, and of insane or idiotic persons, in instructing and bringing up orphan children and young people of every condition. The services rendered by the Brothers of Charity were appreciated by the people and Government of Belgium, and in a short time they had marvellously developed. In 1906, in the mother province, they counted 42 communities in Belgium where about 1,000 brothers care for about 6,000 insane persons, hundreds of old and sick men, and a large number of blind adults. In this same province they instruct and care for more than 9,000 poor children, orphans, idiots, deaf and dumb, and blind. Here is also found the normal school of the congregation affiliated to the Government, the graduates of which teach in the numerous boarding

and model schools belonging to the order. So rapid an expansion early attracted the attention of foreign bishops. Calls for brothers came from every quarter. America, England, Holland, Ireland have in turn become large and flourishing provinces. There are 3 houses in England, one in Ireland, and 2 in Holland. The American province was founded in 1865 with the arrival of 5 Belgian brothers in Montreal; the congregation was incorporated in 1869 under the title of: "Brothers of Charity of Vincent de Paul of Montreal". The Brothers of Charity direct, among other establishments, the Montreal Reformatory School, and Protectory in the city of Montreal where 30 religious are stationed, and which contains 265 inmates and 27 boarders; the S. Benoît-Joseph Labre Insane Asylum and S. Philippe de Néri Retreat at Longue-Pointe near Montreal with 25 religious, 8 novices, 7 postulants, 106 inmates; the Mont S. Bernard Commercial and Scientific College at Sorel, P. Q., with 16 religious and 160 students; the S. Frédéric Academic School at Drummondsville, P. Q., and the House of the Angel Guardian, orphanage and industrial institute, Boston, Massachusetts, with 25 religious and 317 pupils.

The novitiate for the American province is at the S. Benoît Asylum, Longue-Pointe, near Montreal, Canada. The Congregation is placed under the authority of a superior general, who is elected by the brothers from among themselves and who resides in Ghent, Belgium, the cradle of the congregation. He is assisted by a council composed of four members who constitute with him the central council of the congregation. Moreover, assistant visitors, a general secretary, and a general procurator are appointed to aid him in governing.

BROTHER PHILEMON.

Charity, DAUGHTERS OF. See DAUGHTERS OF CHARITY.

Charity, IRISH SISTERS OF. See AIKENHEAD, MARY.

Charity, SISTERS OF.—The various sisterhoods included under this general title are treated of below under their respective names.

SISTERS OF CHARITY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, a congregation of women with simple vows, founded in 1633 and devoted to corporal and spiritual works of mercy. Their full title is Sisters or Daughters of Charity (the founder preferred the latter term), Servants of the Sick Poor. The term "of St. Vincent de Paul" has been added to distinguish them from several communities of Sisters of Charity, animated with a similar spirit, among whom they rank in priority of origin and greatness of numbers. They have always been popularly known in France as "the Grey Sisters" from the colour of their habit, which is bluish grey, but are not to be confounded with the Grey Nuns, a community well known in Canada and New England. They are not infrequently called the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, though a recent French congregation having this saint for their patron, bears that name.

In the United States several diocesan communities who follow a modified form of the rule of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul and wear a black habit, are often called the "Black Cap Sisters", while the "White Cap" or "Cornette" Sisters are those who follow the original rule and form part of the world-wide community under the direction of the Superior General of the Congregation of the Mission, or Lazarists, in Paris. These latter sisters were founded by St. Vincent de Paul and the Venerable Louise de Mérillac (1591-1660), and the widow of Antoine Le Gras, known according to a quaint usage of the time as Mlle Le Gras. The need of organization in work for the poor suggested to St. Vincent the forming of a confraternity among the people of his parish. It was so successful that it spread from the rural districts to Paris, where noble ladies often found it hard to give personal care to the wants of the poor. The majority sent their servants to minister to those in need, but often the work was slighted. St. Vincent remedied this by inducing young women from the country to go to Paris and devote themselves to the service of the poor under the direction of the Ladies of Charity. These young girls formed the nucleus of a very large community of the Sisters of Charity now spread over the world, and who have done so much to make the name of St. Vincent de Paul a household word. Mlle Le Gras, who had recently devoted herself at St. Vincent's request to the superintendence of the various confraternities of charity, had charge of these young girls, who lodged at some convent or with the ladies of the confraternity. They met on Sundays at St. Vincent's house for instruction and encouragement. But after three or four years Mlle Le Gras received a few of the most promising of them at her house, where, on 29 Nov., 1633, she began a more systematic training in the care of the sick and in spiritual life. This is looked on as the real foundation of the community. This little snowball, as St. Vincent playfully called it, was not long in increasing, and on 31 July, 1634, St. Vincent initiated a series of conferences, extending over twenty-five years, which, written down by the sisters, have had ever since a powerful effect in their formation.

A SISTER OF CHARITY (Cornette)

For more than twelve years St. Vincent guided them thus without written rule or constitution and without seeking approval of them as a distinct organization. He let the work grow gradually as the needs of the times demanded, and little did he imagine the vast structure he was laying the foundation of. He used to explain that neither he nor Mlle Le Gras was the founder of the Sisters of Charity, for neither he nor she had ever thought of founding such a community. It sprang from the practical need for such an organization. When the idea developed it was at variance with the notions and customs of the times. Hitherto women who publicly consecrated their lives to God's service did so in convents that cut them off from the world, but his sisters were to spend their time nursing the sick in their homes, having no monastery but the homes of the sick, their cell a hired room, their chapel the parish church, their enclosure the streets of the city or wards of the hospital, "having", as St. Vincent says in the rule he finally gave them, "no grate but the fear of God, no veil but holy modesty". After a few months spent with the sisters in her house, Mlle Le Gras bound herself irrevocably by vow to the work she had undertaken, 25 March, 1634. This anniversary is religiously kept in the community, for every year the sisters make their annual vows on the feast of the Annunciation. The sisters had hitherto helped the poor and the sick in their homes, but they were now called on for hospital work. A society was formed by some ladies of rank to better the condition of the sick poor in the Hôtel-

Dieu at Paris. A community of Augustinian nuns was in charge, but the miseries of the times had overcrowded the wards, and the revenue was inadequate. It was as helpers of the ladies who in turn aided the nuns of the institution that the Sisters of Charity took up hospital work which has since become so prominent a feature in their beneficent activity. A large room near by was hired for their use, where they made delicacies for the sick and also for sale, to swell the income of the hospital. During the first year the labours of the ladies and sisters were blessed by seven hundred and sixty conversions, of Lutherans, Calvinists, and even of Turks wounded in sea-fights.

In May, 1636, Mlle Le Gras moved to more commodious quarters with her community. A house at La Chapelle was chosen because of its nearness to Saint-Lazare, the priory recently given to St. Vincent for the Congregation of the Priests of the Mission he had founded. Here the instruction of the poor children in religion and in elementary branches was taken up, the beginning of the wide-spread labour of the Sisters of Charity in teaching the children of the poor. The charge of foundlings so characteristic of St. Vincent and his sisters came to them through his finding out how miserably these tiny waifs were cared for by the State. The modern foundling asylums owe, if not their origin, at least their excellent system to the work of the Sisters of Charity. On 1 Feb., 1640, at Angers the sisters assumed complete charge of a hospital in which hitherto they had acted as aids to the charitable ladies. In 1641 the head-quarters of the community was transferred to a house opposite Saint-Lazare. Here they remained until driven away by the French Revolution. In answer to their desire to be bound by vows, authorization was finally granted to four of the sisters, and these on 25 March, 1642, took simple vows for one year. A copy of these first vows is preserved in the archives of the mission in Paris and says: "I, the undersigned, renew my baptismal promises and make a vow of poverty, chastity and obedience to the Superior of the Priests of the Mission in the Company of the Daughters of Charity, to apply myself all this year to the corporal and spiritual service of the sick poor, our true masters, with the help of God, which I ask through His Son, Jesus crucified, and by the prayers of the Blessed Virgin. Signed, Jeanne de la Croix."

During the war of the Fronde, whole provinces were reduced to the utmost destitution, and St. Vincent took upon himself the burden of relieving all this misery. In this the sisters had a large share. What they did in Paris is seen from St. Vincent's letters: "they shelter from 800 to 900 women; they distribute soup every day to 1300 bashful poor. In St. Paul's parish they aid 5000 poor, and altogether 1400 persons have for the last six months depended on them for their means of subsistence". At the request of the Queen of Poland, a former Lady of Charity, three sisters were sent to her dominions. Here for the first time the sisters appear on the field of battle. This is a ministry often given by them since, and which has secured for them the title of "Angels of the Battlefield", some dying "sword in hand", as St. Vincent used to style it. Their usefulness opened the eyes of many a dying soldier to the light of the Faith, and inspired the wish to die in the religion which produced such heroism.

While the sisters were on the battle-field in Poland, St. Vincent's daughters took up a new work in the care of the aged and infirm at the House of the Name of Jesus, the pioneer of those homes for the aged so multiplied in our day through a kindred community, the Little Sisters of the Poor. At the same time a hospital for the insane was committed to their care, practically completing the list of human miseries to which they brought alleviation.

On the death of Mlle Le Gras and St. Vincent de Paul there were, in 1660, more than forty houses of the Sisters of Charity in France, and the sick poor were cared for in their own dwellings in twenty-six parishes in Paris. As years went on their numbers grew. Switzerland received the sisters in 1750. In 1778 they were established in Piedmont, whence they spread over Italy. The Spanish community was started by six sisters from Paris in 1790. In 1789 France had 426 houses; the sisters numbered about 6000 in Europe. At the very beginning of the Reign of Terror, the mother-house of the sisters was invaded by the revolutionists, who had attacked Saint-Lazare across the street the night before, but the sight of this band of angels of mercy on their knees in the chapel, moved their assailants to leave them unmolested. In August, 1792, the sisters were ordered to quit the mother-house; and the end of 1793 saw their community disbanded officially, though the superior, Sister Antoinette Duleau, strove to keep them together as far as practicable. As soon as the Consular government was established, in 1801 the society was recalled by an edict setting forth the excellence of their work and authorizing Citoyenne Duleau, the former superior, to reorganize. Their greatest growth has been in France during the nineteenth century. Persecution has driven them from all their schools for the poor and from most of their works of mercy, but this has given hundreds of new labourers to the foreign missions. During the last hundred years their growth has been extraordinary. They have gone to Austria, Portugal, Hungary, England, Scotland, Ireland, North and South America. The Orientals call them "The Swallows of Allah" from their cornettes, and they have houses in Constantinople, Smyrna, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Damascus, Persia, Abyssinia, and China. Their number is about 25,000.

The first house in the province of the British Isles was opened at Drogheda, Ireland, in 1855. The first house in England in Sheffield in 1857; and in Scotland at Lanark in 1860. The number of foundations in 1907 was: England, 46 houses and 407 sisters; Ireland, 13 houses and 134 sisters; Scotland, 8 houses and 62 sisters, making a total of 67 houses and 603 sisters, besides 20 aspirants at the Central House, Mill Hill, London. The principal works under the care of the sisters are as follows, several of these works being carried on in the one house: orphanages, 23; industrial schools, 7; public elementary schools, 24; normal school, 1; asylum for the blind, 1; asylum for deaf mutes, 1; home for crippled boys, 1; reformatory, 1; training homes, 7; homes for working girls, 2; home for women ex-convicts, 1; asylum for insane women, 1; hospitals, 8; houses from which the sisters visit the poor, in which they have soup-kitchens, take charge of guilds and do various other works for the poor, 35.

In the United States the first community was started by Mother Elizabeth Ann Seton (q. v.) in 1809. She arranged to have sisters come over from the mother-house in Paris in 1810 to affiliate her young community at Emmitsburg, Maryland, to the daughters of St. Vincent, but Napoleon forbade the departure of the sisters for America. She had received, however, from Bishop Flaget, the rules of the Sisters of Charity, and put them in practice with some modifications which were suggested. Houses were founded in Philadelphia and New York, when through the request of Archbishop Hughes of New York, in 1846, the majority of the sisters labouring there were released from the Emmitsburg jurisdiction and formed an independent community following the same rule.

Four years after the withdrawal of the New York sisters, Mother Seton's community at Emmitsburg was received under the jurisdiction of the Superior General of the Sisters of Charity in France, and as-

ACADEMY OF MOUNT SAINT VINCENT-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK SAINT JOSEPH'S ACADEMY, EMMITSBURG, MARYLAND
SAINT ELIZABETH'S COLLEGE, CONVENT STATION, NEW JERSEY

sumed the French habit and St. Vincent's rule in its entirety. Their general mother-house is 140 Rue du Bac, Paris, and their central house at St. Joseph's Academy, Emmitsburg, Maryland. They have establishments in the Archdioceses of Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Milwaukee, New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Francisco, and the Dioceses of Albany, Alton, Buffalo, Dallas, Detroit, Grand Rapids, Harrisburg, Hartford, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Mobile, Monterey, and Los Angeles, Nashville, Natchez, Richmond, Rochester, St. Joseph, San Antonio, Syracuse, Wilmington, Porto Rico, and the Vicariate of North Carolina, where there are 1704 sisters in charge of these institutions: academy, 1; hospitals, 38; orphanages, 28; infant asylums, 14; industrial schools, 5; parochial schools, 33; asylums and schools, 6; insane asylums, 5.

The growth of St. Vincent's community has been gradual, and the slowness of their founder in giving it a written rule allowed that rule to have a practicability that has made it as fitted for the democratic notions of our day as for the aristocratic ideas of the old regime. But this is most of all because its animating principle is the saying of Christ, "So long as you do it to the least of these my brethren, you do it unto me". In 1646 the approbation of the Archbishop of Paris was asked by St. Vincent for his community, and this was granted in 1655. Though numerous privileges have been granted to the sisters by various popes, no approbation has ever been asked from the Holy See because their founder wished this community to be a lay one with only private vows. Hence the canon law concerning religious communities does not apply to them. Their confessor is the pastor or secular priest approved by the bishop. The interior administration is subject only to the superior general, or his delegates, while their exterior works are of course under the jurisdiction of the bishop. This has been the case from the very beginning, and the Holy See has on several occasions ratified their long established custom, notably in 1882.

The rule and constitution have remained unchanged since the days of St. Vincent. To his successor, as Superior General of the Congregation of the Mission and the Daughters of Charity, the sisters vow obedience. He ratifies the election of the mother general chosen by vote every three years. The community is divided into several provinces governed by a visitatrix and a director, a priest of the Congregation of the Mission, who are appointed by the central government. There is no distinction among the sisters; those from the highest as from the humblest walks of life associate together as servants of the poor. The hour of rising is everywhere at four o'clock; then follow meditation and Mass and usually Communion. At noon there is the particular examination of conscience which is made again before supper. In the afternoon there are spiritual reading and another meditation. No office is recited, for "Charity is your office", said St. Vincent. All the rest of the time is given to the poor. He used to tell them that when they left prayer to wait on the poor they were leaving God for God. After three months of approbation the candidate is sent to the "seminary", where she is trained for six months and then admitted to the habit, which is put on without any ceremony whatever, and after a trial of five years she is permitted to take the four annual vows of poverty, chastity, obedience, and the service of the poor. The dress is that of peasant women of the neighbourhood of Paris at the date of the foundation, a grey habit with wide sleeves and a long grey apron. The head-dress was at first a small linen cap, but to this was added in the early days the white linen cornette. At first it was used only in the country, being in fact the head-dress of the Ile de France district, but in 1685 its use became general. Seven sisters were martyred during the French Revolution, and ten laid down their lives for the Faith in 1870 at T'ien-tsin, among whom was an Irishwoman, Sister Alice O'Sullivan. But no one can count the numbers that have died martyrs to duty on the battle-field, or among the plague-stricken, or in the hidden ways of continuous hard work for the poor. In 1830 at the mother-house of the sisters, Rue du Bac, Paris, Sister Catherine Labouré (declared Venerable in 1907) had a vision of the Blessed Virgin, who urged her to have a medal made and distributed, since well known as the miraculous medal, through the wonders wrought in favour of those who wear it devoutly. Pope Leo XIII granted a special feast of Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal to the double family of St. Vincent. The scapular of the Passion, or red scapular, was revealed to Sister Apolline Andreveau in 1846 and approved by Pope Pius IX in 1847.

In the archives of the Sisters of Charity, Rue du Bac, Paris, is a collection of the Conferences of St. Vincent to the Sisters of Charity in thirty small books in MSS.; DEMOULIN, *Letters of St. Vincent* (Paris, 1880); BOUGARD, *Life of St. Vincent*, tr. BRADY (London, 1899); DE BROGLIE, *St. Vincent* in *The Saints* series (London, 1906); BEDFORD, *Life of St. Vincent* (London, 1901); ADDERLY, *Monsieur Vincent* (New York, 1901); *Life of Mlle Le Gras* (tr., New York, 1884); SADLIER, *Louise de Mérillac*, in *Heroines of Charity* (New York, s. d.); MURPHY, *Terra Incognita or the Convents of Great Britain* (London, 1873); *Religious Orders or Sketches of Some of the Orders and Congregations of Women* (London, 1862); STEELE, *Monasteries and Religious Houses of Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1903); *Dublin Review* (July, 1884); *The First Sisters of Charity*, in *The Catholic World* (October, 1899); BARTON, *Angels of the Battle-field* (Philadelphia, 1897); ABELLEY, *Vie de Vincent de Paul* (Paris, 1609), revised by MILON (3 vols., Paris, 1891); MAYNARD, *St. Vincent de Paul* (Paris, 1860; Paris, 1874), tr. Italian (Bologna, 1877), Latin (Peking, 1887), Polish (Cracow, 1876); GOBILLON, *Vie de Mlle Le Gras* (Paris, 1676); ed. LA COMTESSE DE RICHEMONT (Paris, 1880); H. P. A., *Histoire des Dames, Sœurs et Filles de Charité* (Paris, 1824); LYDEN, *Les Sœurs de Charité* (Paris, 1879); MARCEL, *Les Sœurs de Charité* (Paris, 1888); BOYER D'AGEN, *Héroines de la Cornette; les Laïcisations* (1891) (Paris, 1892); COSMIER, *Les Sœurs Hospitalières* (Paris, 1898); HÉLYOT, *Des Ordres Monastiques Religieux et Militaires* (Paris, 1719); SANZ, *Compendio de la historia de S. Vicente de Paul y de las Hijas de la Caridad* (Madrid, 1844); SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1889–1892); SETON, *Letters and Journal of Elizabeth Seton* (New York, 1869); WHITE, *Life of Mrs. Seton, Foundress and First Superior of the Sisters of the U. S.* (10th ed., New York, 1904). An extensive bibliography can be found in the *Annals of the Congregation of the Mission*, No. 32 (Emmitsburg, Maryland, 1902); the *Annals*, printed quarterly in several languages but not published, contains much historical information on the Sisters of Charity.

B. RANDOLPH.

SISTERS OF CHARITY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL (mother-house at Mt. St. Vincent-on-Hudson, New York).—In 1817 Sisters Rose White, Cecelia O'Conway and Elizabeth Boyle were sent by Mother Seton to found a community of the Emmitsburg Sisters of Charity in New York. It was the second branch of the new American institute, the first being at Philadelphia (1814). They took charge of the orphanage, a small wooden building at Prince and Mott Streets. In the early thirties, a young ladies' academy was opened in Oliver Street. Another academy, St. Mary's, begun shortly afterwards, was located in Grand Street, and then transferred to East Broadway, where three generations of the young women of the old East Side of New York, now the heart of its Ghetto, were educated.

Meanwhile at the mother-house at Emmitsburg negotiations were in progress for affiliation with the Sisters of Charity in France. In consequence there had been for some time a tendency to abandon certain customs observed there, because these changes were required by the French superiors; for example, the sisters in charge of boys' asylums were everywhere to be withdrawn. The measure threatened at that period the very existence of the New York orphanage. At this juncture, also, sisters could not be obtained from Emmitsburg to carry on the work of a projected and much-needed hospital in New York, the St. Vincent's of to-day. The correspondence that ensued betwen Archbishop Hughes and Father Deluol, the director of the sisterhood, in relation to these matters, resulted in a notification that all the

sisters were to be recalled to Emmitsburg from New York in July of the same year. This and other circumstances proved to the archbishop the necessity of establishing a separate community in New York, to supply the needs of the diocese. In 1846, therefore, a proposition to that effect was made to the Emmitsburg sisters, and the matter was amicably arranged. Those who wished to continue in New York were dispensed from the vow of obedience to their former superior, and of the forty-five sisters then in the diocese, thirty-five remained (8 Dec., 1846).

Sister Elizabeth Boyle became in December, 1846, the first superior of the new community. The novitiate for the New York community was at once opened at St. James's Academy, 35 East Broadway. In the following year it was removed to the new mother-house on an estate purchased at McGown's Pass, situated within the limits of the present Central Park. Here, in 1847, the Academy of Mount Saint Vincent had its foundation. In 1849 the affiliation of the Emmitsburg Sisters with the community in France took place and in the same year a band of sisters was sent from Mount Saint Vincent to Halifax, Nova Scotia. The mission was most successful and in 1856 was erected into a separate company. In 1859, under Mother Xavier, a local community was formed of the sisters then labouring in the Diocese of Newark. Meanwhile in 1857 the "Old Mount" having been absorbed in Central Park, a new "Mount" rose on the east bank of the Hudson just below Yonkers, fourteen miles from the heart of the city. Here to-day are to be found the mother-house of the community, the novitiate with a finely equipped training-school, and the Academy of Mount Saint Vincent.

The superiors succeeding Mother Elizabeth Boyle have been, Mother Jerome Ely, for over fifty years a prominent factor in New York's Catholic educational and charitable work; Mother Angela Hughes, sister of Archbishop Hughes; Mother Regina Lawless, Mother Ambrosia Sweeney, Mother Rosina Wightman, Mother Mary Rose Dolan, Mother Melita McClancy and Mother Josepha Cullen. Some idea of the growth in numbers of this community and of the importance of its present activities may be learned from the following statistics for 1908. It counts about 1400 members who conduct missions in the Dioceses of Albany, Brooklyn, and Harrisburg as well as in the Archdiocese of New York. These establishments comprise 20 academies; 73 parochial schools with about 50,000 pupils; 5 asylums with 1800 orphans; 6 high schools approved by the State; several homes containing 600 children; 11 hospitals in which 12,000 patients were treated during the year; 1 home accommodating 270 aged poor; an industrial school and a protectory with 1620 girls; a foundling asylum with 3340 children and 554 needy and homeless mothers; 2 small day nurseries caring for 100 little ones, and a retreat for the insane with 150 patients.

The superior general is the Archbishop of New York, and the community is governed by a council consisting of the mother superior and her three assistants, all residing at the mother-house, to which the seventy-four missions are subordinate. These sisters retain the black cap and religious dress adopted by Mother Seton when she founded the American Sisters of Charity. They follow the Rule of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul with some slight modifications. On 20 June, 1847, the Holy See extended to them all the privileges, Indulgences, and other spiritual graces already granted to the community of the Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg.

White, *Life of Mrs. Eliza A. Seton* (Baltimore, 1852); Brunowe, *A Famous Convent School* (New York, 1897); A. M. M. G., *Life of Mother Elizabeth Boyle* (New York, 1893); Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1890); Flynn, *The Catholic Church in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904); *Catholic Directory*, 1908.

Mary Ambrose Dunphy.

Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth (mother-house at Convent Station, near Morristown, New Jersey), a community founded at Newark, in 1859, by Mother Mary Xavier Mehegan, who for twelve years previously had been a member of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul in New York. In 1858 Bishop Bayley, of Newark, applied to the superior at Mount Saint Vincent's, New York, for sisters to form a separate mother-house in his diocese. Sister Mary Xavier, who was in charge of St. Mary's, Newark, was at his request appointed superior of the new foundation, with Sister Mary Catherine Nevin assistant. The habit and the constitutions of the Sisters of Charity in New York were retained. On 29 September, 1859, the new community was formally opened in St. Mary's, Newark, the first superior general being the Reverend Bernard J. McQuaid, later Bishop of Rochester, New York. In less than a year the first Catholic hospital in New Jersey was opened at St. Mary's, Newark. On 2 July, 1860, the mother-house was removed to the old Chegaray mansion at Madison, which had recently been vacated by Seton Hall College. An academy was opened the same year and named St. Elizabeth's, in honour of Mother Elizabeth Seton, the foundress of the American Sisters of Charity. Bishop Bayley had strongly advocated a change in the head-dress of the sisters. This, however, was not carried into effect until 1874, when the black cap adopted by Mother Seton was replaced by a white one with a black veil. To accommodate the rapidly growing community the mother-house and academy were removed in 1880 to Convent Station, near Morristown.

The principal work of the sisters is teaching, but they also labour for the poor and the sick in various charitable institutions. According to the report for 1907, there are 1073 of these sisters in the Dioceses of Newark, Trenton, and Hartford, and the Archdioceses of New York and Boston. They have one college, six academies, one preparatory school for small boys, sixty-seven parochial schools with 40,100 pupils, five orphanages, five hospitals, one home for incurables, one home for the aged, one foundling asylum, and two day nurseries. Their principal educational centre is at Convent Station, where there are schools of primary, grammar, high school, and college grades. The college course was founded in 1899 for the higher education of women. Students are admitted by examination or by certificates from approved academies or high schools. The courses of study are partially elective and lead to the degrees of B. A. and M. A. In 1907 the college library contained 20,000 volumes. The college has no endowment. In connexion with the college department is a School of Pedagogy requiring two years of college work for admission. The High School, the School of Pedagogy, and the College are registered by the New Jersey State Board of Education and by the Regents of the University of the State of New York. At the mother-house of the community is a normal training school for the young sisters.

Flynn, *The Catholic Church in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904); *Catholic Directory* (1908).

Sisters of Charity of St. Elizabeth.

Sisters of Charity (St. John, New Brunswick), founded in 1854 by Bishop, subsequently Archbishop, Connolly. Two years before this the bishop had sent Miss Honora Conway (Mother Mary Vincent) to the novitiate of the Sisters of Charity in New York to prepare for the foundation of a local community. The cholera epidemic of 1854 left many orphans in St. John and other parts of the province. When Miss Conway had finished her novitiate she returned to St. John and in a short time was joined by four other young ladies for whom Bishop Connolly drew up rules, and thus the congregation began. The care of the orphans and aged poor, and the Christian educa-

tion of the young is the work undertaken and successfully carried out by these sisters. In St. John they have an orphanage for girls, a home for the aged, and at Silver Falls a Boys' Industrial School. The sisters teach in the public schools, and the entire education of the Catholic girls of the city is in their hands. From their High School the pupils enter the Provincial Normal School and the New Brunswick University. The congregation has houses and schools in many places in the diocese and also takes charge of an orphanage in the Diocese of Prince Albert. The mother-house and novitiate of this congregation are at St. John, N. B.

Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, a congregation begun by five young women in Dublin, Ireland, 8 December, 1831, with the purpose of devoting themselves to the service of God in the education of children. They opened a school in North Ann Street, Dublin, on 19 March, 1832. Eager for more complete self-sacrifice, they resolved to leave their native land, and chose Philadelphia, U. S. A., for their field of labour, arriving there friendless and penniless, on 4 September, 1833. The Reverend T. J. Donoghoe, pastor of St. Michael's Church, who had been seeking suitable teachers for his parochial school, heard of these strangers, and with the permission of Archbishop Kenrick, employed them, and drew up a rule of life for their approval. As they organized themselves into a community under this rule, Father Donoghoe is rightly called the founder of this sisterhood with Mary Frances Clarke the first superior, and Margaret Mann the assistant and mistress of novices. On 1 November, 1833, they received the title, Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In 1843 the congregation left the flourishing vineyard of the East, to do pioneer work, and accepted the urgent invitation of Bishop Loras of Dubuque, Iowa, to settle in his diocese whither he also called Father Donoghoe to be his vicar-general. The mother-house of the congregation has since that time been located in Dubuque. A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars approved the rules in 1877, and on 26 April, 1885, Leo XIII confirmed this. The work of the sisters is that of education; they engage in no other. They had in September, 1907, one thousand members having under their direction 25,000 children.

Mary Cecilia Dougherty.

Sisters of Charity of Providence.—The community of Sisters of Providence, or, more accurately, Daughters of Charity, Servants of the Poor, was founded in Montreal, Canada, by Bishop Bourget and Madame Jean Baptiste Gamelin (Marie Emélie Eugénie Tavernier), 25 March, 1843. With the approbation of the religious and civil authorities Madame Gamelin had for some time been sheltering in her own house a number of infirm and poor old women. After a voyage to Europe Bishop Bourget wished to bring to Montreal some French Sisters of Charity, but the project came to nothing, and he decided to appeal to the young women of his own diocese. On 25 March, 1843, in the chapel of the first asylum in Montreal seven sisters received the religious habit at his hands. The new institution developed rapidly. Its object is to provide for the poor and sick spiritual and temporal relief, to shelter children and the aged, to visit the homes of the poor and the ill, to shelter the infirm and the homeless, to maintain dispensaries for the needy, and to instruct the young. The rule of the Institute of Providence was definitively approved by Leo XIII 12 September, 1900.

The community numbers about 1600 religious with more than eighty establishments, of which the principal in Montreal are the mother-house and the Gamelin Asylum, the Longue-Pointe Refuge, the Hospital for Incurables, the Home for Deaf Mutes, the Bourget Asylum, and the Auclair Asylum. Outside the Diocese of Montreal there are foundations of these sisters in the dioceses of Quebec, Ottawa, Trois-Rivières, Saint-Hyacinthe, New Westminster, Valleyfield, Joliette, Vancouver, Alberta, and Saskatchewan in Canada; and in San Francisco, Oregon City, Burlington, Great Falls, Helena, Boise, and Manchester in the United States. The general administrative body, which is located at the mother-house in Montreal, is composed of the superior general, four assistants, a secretary, and a treasurer. The community comprises seven provinces: Montreal, Hochelaga, Joliette, Trois-Rivières, Washington, Montana, and Oregon.

Vie de Mère Gamelin, by a Religious of her Order (Montreal, 1900); Auclair, *Vie de Mère Caron* (Montreal, 1908).

Elie J. Auclair.

Sisters of Charity of Jesus and Mary, a congregation founded in 1803 by Canon Triest, who was known as "the St. Vincent de Paul of Belgium", for he was the founder as well of the Brothers of St. John of God, and the Sisters of the Infant Jesus. When *curé* of Lovendeghem he laid the foundations of this congregation, and gave up his living to devote himself to training its members. He obtained the first papal recognition in 1806 and in 1816 he went to Rome to get the final approbation, which he received by Brief on September 9th of that year. The mother-house is at Ghent and there are forty branch-houses. The congregation is one of the largest in Belgium. In 1889 some of the sisters at the request of the Belgian Government went to the Congo Missions in Africa, and founded several houses there. In 1895 they went to India and opened two boarding-schools in the Punjab, and one in Ceylon. In 1888, at the invitation of the late Cardinal Vaughan, the sisters went to England and founded a large convent at Tottington near Manchester. Their principal work is teaching in their training-colleges, boarding and day-schools, and orphanages; they also nurse the infirm; they are inclosed and there are no lay-sisters. The interior spirit is one of simplicity, devotion and zeal for the salvation of souls. The congregation has over a thousand members. The habit is white with a black scapular for the professed, the novices wearing a white veil and scapular. The novitiate lasts a year.

Feller, *Biog. univ.* (1848), VIII; Steele, *Convents of Great Britain* (London, 1892); Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1907).

Francesca M. Steele.

Sisters of Charity of St. Louis.—This congregation was founded at Vannes in Brittany, in 1803, by Madame Molé, *née* de Lamoignan, for the education of poor girls, at the suggestion of Bishop de Pancemont, of Vannes, who was her director. In 1805 Pius VII blessed the undertaking, but the final approbation of Rome was not obtained till 1840. The founder was elected superior for life as Mère St. Louis. There were at first no lay sisters, but finding this plan did not answer, Oblates of St. Louis were selected to act in this capacity, but they are not allowed to take vows until they have been ten years in the community; they then, like the choir-sisters, take a fourth vow of stability, when they have reached the age of forty. The interior spirit of the congregation is one of penitence and mortification. Its work is the education of poor girls who live in orphanages attached to their convents, and to support these orphanages the sisters have pay schools. The congregation is under the government of a mother-general and the bishop, or a superior appointed by the bishop. The sisters had twenty houses in France, most of which were in Brittany, but all their schools were closed by the Government; the greater number of the sisters in consequence went to Canada, where they met with a hospitable reception, and established fourteen houses. In

1898 they went to England, and opened a house at Minehead in Dorsetshire; they have since made a foundation at Glastonbury and another at Frome. The novitiate lasts two years.

STEELE, *Convents of Great Britain* (London, 1902).

FRANCESCA M. STEELE.

SISTERS OF CHARITY OF ST. PAUL.—These sisters who now add (OF CHARTRES) to their title to distinguish them from another congregation of the same name, were founded at Chartres in 1704 by Monsignor Maréchaut, a theologian of the Cathedral of Chartres, assisted by Mlle de Tilly and Mlle de Tronche. Their first house formerly belonged to a sabot-maker, and this gave them the name of "Les Sœurs Sabotiers", by which they were originally known. They devote themselves to teaching, nursing, visiting the poor and taking care of orphans, the old and infirm, and the insane. There are no lay-sisters, but every sister must be prepared to undertake any kind of work. The interior spirit is a love of sacrifice and labour for the spiritual and temporal good of others. The postulancy lasts from six to nine months, the novitiate a year, after which the sisters take vows annually for three years, and then perpetual simple vows. The congregation was dispersed under the Commune at the French Revolution, but it was restored by Napoleon I, who gave the sisters a monastery at Chartres, which originally belonged to the Jacobins, from which they became known as "Les Sœurs de St. Jacques". They settled in England in 1847 at the invitation of Cardinal Wiseman. In 1907 they had fifty-six houses in various towns. Their work in England is mainly educational, schools being attached to all their houses; the English branch is under the government of a mother general. Until 1902 they had over two hundred and fifty houses in France where, besides various kinds of schools, they undertook asylums for the blind, the aged, and the insane, hospitals, dispensaries, and crèches. Since that date more than one hundred and sixty of these schools have been closed, also thirty of the hospitals, military and civil, in the French colonies, three convents at Blois and a hospice at Brie. On the other hand they have in the meanwhile opened five or six hospitals in the French colonies, two hospitals and three elementary schools in the Philippines, and three educational houses in Siam.

STEELE, *Convents of Great Britain* (London, 1902).

FRANCESCA M. STEELE.

SISTERS OF CHARITY OF OUR LADY MOTHER OF MERCY, a congregation founded in Holland in 1832 by the Rev. John Zwijsen, pastor of Tilburg, aided by Mary M. Leijsen, for the instruction of children and the betterment of a people deprived of spiritual aid by the disastrous effects of the Reformation. The See of Utrecht had been vacant for about three hundred years when, on the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in Holland in 1853, Bishop John Zwijsen, of Gerra, was made Archbishop of Utrecht and Primate of Holland. He found no Catholic institutions for the education of girls in this vast diocese, neither were there any teaching orders, with the exception of his humble congregation. The founder's accession to the See gave fresh impetus to his cherished work, and from this time the congregation spread rapidly throughout Holland and Belgium. There is now hardly a city of the Netherlands that has not one or more of its communities. Among these institutions are homes for the aged and infirm, the blind, the mutes and also hospitals. The Rules were approved by Gregory XVI in 1843, and Pius IX approved the congregation in 1848. About the middle of the eighteenth century, when the cholera was raging in Holland, the heroic charity of the sisters won the recognition of King William III who conferred decorations of honour on the congregation. It has three houses in England devoted to school and hospital work. In 1874 the first house in the United States was founded at Baltic, Connecticut, where there is a parochial school and an academy for young ladies. The congregation has other houses at Willimantic and Taftville where the same work is carried on. In 1907 St. Joseph's community of Willimantic donated one of the convent buildings for a city hospital, which from the outset proved a success. In 1894 the congregation took charge of the leper settlement, city and military hospitals of Paramaribo, South America; and in East India, the sisters are doing missionary work among the natives. In December, 1907, this congregation had 2621 professed members, 488 aspirants and novices and 102 houses. The number of school-children enrolled was estimated at 54,300; the sick, aged and infirm cared for 3446.

MOTHER ALOYSIO.

Charity, THE VIRTUE OF. See LOVE.

Charlemagne (French for CAROLUS, or CARLUS, MAGNUS, i. e., CHARLES THE GREAT; Ger. KARL DER GROSSE), the name given by later generations to Charles, King of the Franks, first sovereign of the Christian Empire of the West; b. 2 April, 742; d. at Aachen, 28 January, 814. Note, however, that the place of his birth (whether Aachen or Liège) has never been fully ascertained, while the traditional date has been set one or more years later by recent writers; if Alcuin is to be interpreted literally the year should be 745. At the time of Charles' birth, his father, Pepin the Short, Mayor of the Palace, of the line of Arnulf, was, theoretically, only the first subject of Childeric III, the last Merovingian King of the Franks (see FRANCE); but this modest title implied that real power, military, civil, and even ecclesiastical, of which Childeric's crown was only the symbol. It is not certain that Bertrada (or Bertha), the mother of Charlemagne, a daughter of Charibert, Count of Laon, was legally married to Pepin until some years later than either 742 or 745 ("Annal. Franc. ad an. 750", quoted by Kurze). His career led to his acknowledgment by the Holy See as its chief protector and coadjutor in temporals, by Constantinople as at least *Basileus* of the West. This reign, which involved to a greater degree than that of any other historical personage the organic development, and still more, the consolidation of Christian Europe, will be sketched in this article in the successive periods into which it naturally divides. The period of Charles the Great was also an epoch of reform for the Church in Gaul, and of foundation for the Church in Germany, marked, moreover, by an efflorescence of learning which fructified in the great Christian schools of the twelfth and later centuries.

To the Fall of Pavia (774).—In 752, when Charles was a child of not more than ten years, Pepin (see PEPIN THE SHORT) had appealed to Pope Zachary to recognize his actual rule with the kingly title and dignity. The practical effect of this appeal to the Holy See was the journey of Stephen III across the Alps two years later, for the purpose of anointing with the oil of kingship not only Pepin, but also his son Charles and a younger son, Carloman. The pope then laid upon the Christian Franks a precept, under the gravest spiritual penalties, never "to choose their kings from any other family". Primogeniture did not hold in the Frankish law of succession; the monarchy was elective, though eligibility was limited to the male members of the one privileged family. Thus, then, at St. Denis on the Seine, in the Kingdom of Neustria, on the 28th of July, 754, the house of Arnulf was, by a solemn act of the supreme pontiff, established upon the throne until then nominally occupied by the house of Merowig (Merovingians).

Charles, anointed to the kingly office while yet a mere child, learned the rudiments of war while still many years short of manhood, accompanying his

father in several campaigns. This early experience is worth noting chiefly because it developed in the boy those military virtues which, joined with his extraordinary physical strength and intense nationalism, made him a popular hero of the Franks long before he became their rightful ruler. At length, in September, 768, Pepin the Short, foreseeing his end, made a partition of his dominions between his two sons. Not many days later the old king passed away.

To better comprehend the effect of the act of partition under which Charles and Carloman inherited their father's dominions, as well as the whole subsequent history of Charles' reign, it is to be observed that those dominions comprised: first, Frankland (*Frankreich*) proper; secondly, as many as seven more or less self-governing dependencies, peopled by races of various origins and obeying various codes of law. Of these two divisions, the former extended, roughly speaking, from the boundaries of Thuringia, on the east, to what is now the Belgian and Norman coastline, on the west; it bordered to the north on Saxony, and included both banks of the Rhine from Cologne (the ancient *Colonia Agrippina*) to the North Sea; its southern neighbours were the Bavarians, the Alemanni, and the Burgundians. The dependent states were: the fundamentally Gaulish Neustria (including within its borders Paris), which was, nevertheless, well leavened with a dominant Frankish element; to the south-west of Neustria, Brittany, formerly Armorica, with a British and Gallo-Roman population; to the south of Neustria the Duchy of Aquitaine, lying, for the most part, between the Loire and the Garonne, with a decidedly Gallo-Roman population; and east of Aquitaine, along the valley of the Rhone, the Burgundians, a people of much the same mixed origin as those of Aquitaine, though with a large infusion of Teutonic blood. These States, with perhaps the exception of Brittany, recognized the Theodosian Code as their law. The German dependencies of the Frankish kingdom were Thuringia, in the valley of the Main, Bavaria, and Alemannia (corresponding to what was later known as Swabia). These last, at the time of Pepin's death, had but recently been won to Christianity, mainly through the preaching of St. Boniface (q. v.). The share which fell to Charles consisted of all Austrasia (the original Frankland), most of Neustria, and all Aquitaine except the south-east corner. In this way the possessions of the elder brother surrounded those of the younger on two sides, but on the other hand the distribution of races under their respective rules was such as to preclude any risk of discord arising out of the national sentiments of their various subjects.

CHARLES THE GREAT
(Ideal portrait by Dürer.)

In spite of this provident arrangement, Carloman contrived to quarrel with his brother. Hunald, formerly Duke of Aquitaine, vanquished by Pepin the Short, broke from the cloister, where he had lived as a monk for twenty years, and stirred up a revolt in the western part of the duchy. By Frankish custom Carloman should have aided Charles; the younger brother himself held part of Aquitaine; but he pretended that, as his dominions in the south-east were unaffected by this revolt, it was no business of his. Hunald, however, was vanquished by Charles single-handed; he was betrayed by a nephew with whom he had sought refuge, was sent to Rome to answer for the violation of his monastic vows, and at last, after once more breaking cloister, was stoned to death by the Lombards of Pavia. For Charles the true importance of this Aquitainian episode was in its manifestation of his brother's unkindly feeling in his regard, and against this danger he lost no time in taking precautions, chiefly by winning over to himself the friends whom he judged likely to be most valuable; first and foremost of these was his mother, Bertha, who had striven both earnestly and prudently to make peace between her sons, but who, when it became necessary to take sides with one or the other could not hesitate in her devotion to the elder. Charles was an affectionate son; it also appears that, in general, he was helped to power by his extraordinary gift of personal attractiveness.

Carloman died soon after this (4 December, 771), and a certain letter to Charles from "the Monk Cathwulph", quoted by Bouquet (Recueil. hist., V, 634), in enumerating the special blessings for which the king was in duty bound to be grateful, says, "Third . . . God has preserved you from the wiles of your brother. . . . . Fifth, and not the least, that God has removed your brother from this earthly kingdom". Carloman may not have been quite so malignant as the enthusiastic partisans of Charles made him out, but the division of Pepin's dominions was in itself an impediment to the growth of a strong Frankish realm such as Charles needed for the unification of the Christian Continent. Although Carloman had left two sons by his wife, Gerberga, the Frankish law of inheritance gave no preference to sons as against brother; left to their own choice, the Frankish lieges, whether from love of Charles or for the fear which his name already inspired, gladly accepted him for their king. Gerberga and her children fled to the Lombard court of Pavia. In the mean while complications had arisen in Charles' foreign policy which made his newly established supremacy at home doubly opportune.

From his father Charles had inherited the title "Patricius Romanus" which carried with it a special obligation to protect the temporal rights of the Holy See. The nearest and most menacing neighbour of St. Peter's Patrimony was Desiderius (Didier), King of the Lombards, and it was with this potenate that the dowager Bertha had arranged a matrimonial alliance for her elder son. The pope had solid temporal reasons for objecting to this arrangement. Moreover,

Charles was already, *in foro conscientiæ*, if not in Frankish law, wedded to Himiltrude. In defiance of the pope's protest (P. L., XCVIII, 250), Charles married Desiderata, daughter of Desiderius; three years later (770) he repudiated her and married Hildegarde, the beautiful Swabian. (See Hergenröther, Kircheng., 4th ed., 1904, II, 71.) Naturally, Desiderius was furious at this insult, and the dominions of the Holy See bore the first brunt of his wrath.

But Charles had to defend his own borders against the heathen as well as to protect Rome against the Lombard. To the north of Austrasia lay Frisia, which seems to have been in some equivocal way a dependency, and to the east of Frisia, from the left bank of the Ems (about the present Holland-Westphalia frontier), across the valley of the Weser and Aller, and still eastward to the left bank of the Elbe, extended the country of the Saxons, who in no fashion whatever acknowledged any allegiance to the Frankish kings. In 772 these Saxons were a horde of aggressive pagans offering to Christian missionaries no hope but that of martyrdom; bound together, normally, by no political organization, and constantly engaged in predatory incursions into the lands of the Franks. Their language seems to have been very like that spoken by the Egberts and Ethelreds of Britain, but the work of their Christian cousin, St. Boniface, had not affected them as yet; they worshipped the gods of Walhalla, united in solemn sacrifices—sometimes human—to Irminsul (Igdrasail), the sacred tree which stood at Eresburg, and were still slaying Christian missionaries when their kinsmen in Britain were holding church synods and building cathedrals. Charles could brook neither their predatory habits nor their heathenish intolerance; it was impossible, moreover, to make permanent peace with them while they followed the old Teutonic life of free village communities. He made his first expedition into their country in July, 772, took Eresburg by storm, and burned Irminsul. It was in January of this same year that Pope Stephen III died, and Adrian I (q. v.), an opponent of Desiderius, was elected. The new pope was almost immediately assailed by the Lombard king, who seized three minor cities of the Patrimony of St. Peter, threatened Ravenna itself, and set about organizing a plot within the Curia. Paul Afiarta, the papal chamberlain, detected acting as the Lombard's secret agent, was seized and put to death. The Lombard army advanced against Rome, but quailed before the spiritual weapons of the Church, while Adrian sent a legate into Gaul to claim the aid of the Patrician.

Thus it was that Charles, resting at Thionville after his Saxon campaign, was urgently reminded of the rough work that awaited his hand south of the Alps. Desiderius' embassy reached him soon after Adrian's. He did not take it for granted that the right was all upon Adrian's side; besides, he may have seen here an opportunity to make some amends for his repudiation of the Lombard princess. Before taking up arms for the Holy See, therefore, he sent commissioners into Italy to make enquiries, and when Desiderius pretended that the seizure of the papal cities was in effect only the legal foreclosure of a mortgage, Charles promptly offered to redeem them by a money payment. But Desiderius refused the money, and as Charles' commissioners reported in favour of Adrian, the only course left was war.

In the spring of 773 Charles summoned the whole military strength of the Franks for a great invasion of Lombardy. He was slow to strike, but he meant to strike hard. Data for any approximate estimate of his numerical strength are lacking, but it is certain that the army, in order to make the descent more swiftly, crossed the Alps by two passes: Mont Cenis and the Great St. Bernard. Einhard, who accompanied the king over Mont Cenis (the St. Bernard column was led by Duke Bernhard), speaks feelingly of the marvels and perils of the passage. The invaders found Desiderius waiting for them, intrenched at Susa; they turned his flank and put the Lombard army to utter rout. Leaving all the cities of the plains to their fate, Desiderius rallied part of his forces in Pavia, his walled capital, while his son Adalghis, with the rest, occupied Verona. Charles, having been joined by Duke Bernhard, took the forsaken cities on his way and then completely invested Pavia (September, 773), whence Otger, the faithful attendant of Gerberga, could look with trembling upon the array of his countrymen. Soon after Christmas Charles withdrew from the siege a portion of the army which he employed in the capture of Verona. Here he found Gerberga and her children; as to what became of them, history is silent; they probably entered the cloister.

What history does record with vivid eloquence is the first visit of Charles to the Eternal City. There everything was done to give his entry as much as possible the air of a triumph in ancient Rome. The judges met him thirty miles from the city; the militia laid at the feet of their great patrician the banner of Rome and hailed him as their *imperator*. Charles himself forgot pagan Rome and prostrated himself to kiss the threshold of the Apostles, and then spent seven days in conference with the successor of Peter. It was then that he undoubtedly formed many great designs for the glory of God and the exaltation of Holy Church, which, in spite of human weaknesses and, still more, ignorance, he afterwards did his best to realize. His coronation as the successor of Constantine did not take place until twenty-six years later, but his consecration as first champion of the Catholic Church took place at Easter, 774. Soon after this (June, 774) Pavia fell, Desiderius was banished, Adalghis became a fugitive at the Byzantine court, and Charles, assuming the crown of Lombardy, renewed to Adrian the donation of territory made by Pepin the Short after his defeat of Aistulph. (For a good defence of the genuineness of this donation, see Hüffer, Hist. Jahrbuch, 1881, II, 242; it is now generally admitted, as well as the original gift of Pepin at Kiersy in 752. The so-called "Privilegium Hadriani pro Carolo" granting him full right to nominate the pope and to invest all bishops is a forgery; see Baronius, Ann. Eccl. ad. an. 774, no. 10, and Hergenröther-Kirsch, 4th ed., 1904, II, 76.)

From 774 to the Baptism of Wittekind (Widukind) in 785.—The next twenty years of Charles' life may be considered as one long warfare. They are filled with an astounding series of rapid marches from end to end of a continent intersected by mountains, morasses, and forests, and scantily provided with roads. It would seem that the key to his long series of victories, won almost as much by moral ascendency as by physical or mental superiority, is to be found in the inspiration communicated to his Frankish champion by Pope Adrian I. Weiss (Weltgesch., II, 549) enumerates fifty-three distinct campaigns of Charles the Great; of these it is possible to point to only twelve or fourteen which were not undertaken principally or entirely in execution of his mission as the soldier and protector of the Church. In his eighteen campaigns against the Saxons Charles was more or less actuated by the desire to extinguish what he and his people regarded as a form of devil-worship, no less odious to them than the fetishism of Central Africa is to us.

While he was still in Italy the Saxons, irritated but not subdued by the fate of Eresburg and of Irminsul, had risen in arms, harried the country of the Hessian Franks, and burned many churches; that of St. Boniface at Fritzlar, being of stone, had defeated their efforts. Returning to the north, Charles sent a preliminary column of cavalry into the enemy's country

CHARLEMAGNE FRESCOES, RATHAUS, AACHEN

VICTORY AT CORDOVA
CROWNING LOUIS THE PIOUS
ENTERING PAVIA
BAPTISM OF WITTEKIND
BUILDING THE CATHEDRAL, AACHEN
OTTO III OPENING HIS TOMB

while he held a council of the realm at Kiersy (Quercy) in September, 774, at which it was decided that the Saxons (Westfali, Ostfali, and Angrarii) must be presented with the alternative of baptism or death. The north-eastern campaigns of the next seven years had for their object a conquest so decisive as to make the execution of this policy feasible. The year 775 saw the first of a series of Frankish military colonies on the ancient Roman plan established at Sigeburg among the Westfali. Charles next subdued, temporarily at least, the Ostfali, whose chieftain, Hessi, having accepted baptism, ended his life in the monastery of Fulda (see BONIFACE, SAINT; FULDA). Then, a Frankish camp at Lübbecke on the Weser having been surprised by the Saxons, and its garrison slaughtered, Charles turned again westward, once more routed the Westfali, and received their oaths of submission.

At this stage (776) the affairs of Lombardy interrupted the Saxon crusade. Areghis of Beneventum, son-in-law of the vanquished Desiderius, had formed a plan with his brother-in-law Adalghis (Adelchis), then an exile at Constantinople, by which the latter was to make a descent upon Italy, backed by the Eastern emperor; Adrian was at the same time involved in a quarrel with the three Lombard dukes, Reginald of Clusium, Rotgaud of Friuli, and Hildebrand of Spoleto. The Archbishop of Ravenna, who called himself "primate", and "exarch of Italy", was also attempting to found an independent principality at the expense of the papal state, but was finally subdued in 776, and his successor compelled to be content with the title of "Vicar" or representative of the pope (see Civiltà Cattolica, 1865, 364, 433). The junction of the aforesaid powers, all inimical to the pope and the Franks, while Charles was occupied in Westphalia, was only prevented by the death of Constantine Copronymus in September, 775 (see BYZANTINE EMPIRE). After winning over Hildebrand and Reginald by diplomacy, Charles descended into Lombardy by the Brenner Pass (spring of 776), defeated Rotgaud, and leaving garrisons and governors, or counts (*comites*), as they were termed, in the reconquered cities of the Duchy of Friuli, hastened back to Saxony. There the Frankish garrison had been forced to evacuate Eresburg, while the siege of Sigeburg was so unexpectedly broken up as to give occasion later to a legend of angelic intervention in favour of the Christians. As usual, the almost incredible suddenness of the king's reappearance and the moral effect of his presence quieted the ragings of the heathen. Charles then divided the Saxon territory into missionary districts. At the great spring hosting (*champ de Mai*) of Paderborn, in 777, many Saxon converts were baptized; Wittekind, however, already the leader and afterwards the popular hero of the Saxons, had fled to his brother-in-law, Sigfrid the Dane.

The episode of the invasion of Spain comes next in chronological order. The condition of the venerable Iberian Church, still suffering under Moslem domination, appealed strongly to the king's sympathy. In 777 there came to Paderborn three Moorish emirs, enemies of the Ommeyad Abderrahman, the Moorish King of Cordova. These emirs did homage to Charles and proposed to him an invasion of Northern Spain; one of them, Ibn-el-Arabi, promised to bring to the invaders' assistance a force of Berber auxiliaries from Africa; the other two promised to exert their powerful influence at Barcelona and elsewhere north of the Ebro. Accordingly, in the spring of 778, Charles, with a host of crusaders, speaking many tongues, and which numbered among its constituents even a quota of Lombards, moved towards the Pyrenees. His trusted lieutenant, Duke Bernhard, with one division, entered Spain by the coast. Charles himself marched through the mountain passes straight to Pampelona. But Ibn-el-Arabi, who had prematurely brought on his army of Berbers, was assassinated by an emissary of Abderrahman, and though Pampelona was razed, and Barcelona and other cities fell, Saragossa held out. Apart from the moral effect of this campaign upon the Moslem rulers of Spain, its result was insignificant, though the famous ambuscade in which perished Roland, the great Paladin, at the Pass of Roncesvalles, furnished to the medieval world the material for its most glorious and influential epic, the "Chanson de Roland".

Much more important to posterity were the next succeeding events which continued and decided the long struggle in Saxony. During the Spanish crusade Wittekind had returned from his exile, bringing with him Danish allies, and was now ravaging Hesse; the Rhine valley from Deutz to Andernach was a prey to the Saxon "devil-worshippers"; the Christian missionaries were scattered or in hiding. Charles gathered his hosts at Düren, in June, 779, and stormed Wittekind's entrenched camp at Bocholt, after which campaign he seems to have considered Saxony a fairly subdued country. At any rate, the "Saxon Capitulary" (see CAPITULARIES) of 781



SIGNATURE OF CHARLEMAGNE
(To a document given near Mainz, Aug. 31, 790.)

obliged all Saxons not only to accept baptism (and this on pain of death) but also to pay tithes, as the Franks did, for the support of the Church; moreover it confiscated a large amount of property for the benefit of the missions. This was Wittekind's last opportunity to restore the national independence and paganism; his people, exasperated against the Franks and their God, eagerly rushed to arms. At Suntal on the Weser, Charles being absent, they defeated a Frankish army killing two royal legates and five counts. But Wittekind committed the error of enlisting as allies the non-Teutonic Sorbs from beyond the Saale; race-antagonism soon weakened his forces, and the Saxon hosts melted away. Of the so-called "Massacre of Verden" (783) it is fair to say that the 4500 Saxons who perished were not prisoners of war; legally, they were ringleaders in a rebellion, selected as such from a number of other prisoners, and convicted on the information of their fellow rebels. (See Schäfer, "Die Hinrichtung d. Sachsen durch Karl den Grossen" in "Hist. Zeitschrift" for 1897.) Wittekind himself escaped beyond the Elbe. It was not until after another defeat of the Saxons at Detmold, and again at Osnabrück, on the "Hill of Slaughter", that Wittekind acknowledged the God of Charles stronger than Odin. In 785 Wittekind received baptism at Attigny, and Charles stood godfather.

Last Steps to the Imperial Throne.—The summer of 783 began a new period in the life of Charles, in which signs begin to appear of his less amiable traits. It was in this year, signalized, according to the chroniclers, by unexampled heat and a pestilence, that the two queens died, Bertha, the king's mother, and Hildegarde, his second (or his third) wife. Both of these women, the former in particular, had exercised over him a strong influence for good. Within a few months the king married Fastrada, daughter of an Austrasian count. The succeeding years were, comparatively speaking, years of harvest after the stu-

pendous period of ploughing and sowing that had gone before; and Charles' nature was of a type that appears to best advantage in storm and stress. What was to be the Western Empire of the Middle Ages was already hewn out in the rough when Wittekind received baptism. From that date until the coronation of Charles at Rome, in 800, his military work was chiefly in suppressing risings of the newly conquered or quelling the discontent of jealous subject princes. Thrice in these fifteen years did the Saxons rise, only to be defeated. Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria, had been a more or less rebellious vassal ever since the beginning of his reign, and Charles now made use of the pope's influence, exercised through the powerful bishops of Freising, Salzburg, and Regensburg (Ratisbon), to bring him to terms. In 786 a Thuringian revolt was quelled by the timely death, blinding, and banishment of its leaders. Next year the Lombard prince, Areghis, having fortified himself at Salerno, had actually been crowned King of the Lombards when Charles descended upon him at Beneventum, received his submission, and took his son Grimwald as a hostage, after which, finding that Tassilo had been secretly associated with the conspiracy of the Lombards, he invaded Bavaria from three sides with three armies drawn from at least five nationalities. Once more the influence of the Holy See settled the Bavarian question in Charles' favour; Adrian threatened Tassilo with excommunication if he persisted in rebellion, and as the Duke's own subjects refused to follow him to the field, he personally made submission, did homage, and in return received from Charles a new lease of his duchy (October, 787).

During this period the national discontent with Fastrada culminated in a plot in which Pepin the Hunchback, Charles' son by Himiltrude, was implicated, and though his life was spared through his father's intercession, Pepin spent what remained of his days in a monastery. Another son of Charles (Carloman, afterwards called Pepin, and crowned King of Lombardy at Rome in 781, on the occasion of an Easter visit by the king, at which time also his brother Louis was crowned King of Aquitaine) served his father in dealing with the Avars, a pagan danger on the eastern frontier, compared with which the invasion of Septimania by the Saracens (793) was but an insignificant incident of border warfare. These Avars, probably of Turanian blood, occupied the territories north of the Save and west of the Theiss. Tassilo had invited their assistance against his overlord; and after the Duke's final submission Charles invaded their country and conquered it as far as the Raab (791). By the capture of the famous "Ring" of the Avars, with its nine concentric circles, Charles came into possession of vast quantities of gold and silver, parts of the plunder which these barbarians had been accumulating for two centuries. In this campaign King Pepin of Lombardy co-operated with his father, with forces drawn from Italy; the later stages of this war (which may be considered the last of Charles' great wars) were left in the hands of the younger king.

The last stages by which the story of Charles' career is brought to its climax touch upon the exclusive spiritual domain of the Church. He had never ceased to interest himself in the deliberations of synods, and this interest extended (an example that wrought fatal results in after ages) to the discussion of questions which would now be regarded as purely dogmatic. Charles interfered in favour of orthodoxy in the dispute about the Adoptionist heresy (see ADOPTIONISM; ALCUIN; FELIX OF URGEL) ; His interference was less pleasing to Adrian in the matter of Iconoclasm, a heresy with which the Empress-mother Irene and Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, had dealt in the Second Council of Nicæa. The synod of Frankfort, wrongly informed, but inspired by Charles, took upon itself to condemn the aforesaid Council, although the latter had the sanction of the Holy See (see CAROLINE BOOKS). In 795 Adrian I died and was succeeded by Leo III. In 797 the Eastern Emperor Constantine VI, with whom his mother Irene had for some time been at variance, was by her dethroned, imprisoned, and blinded. It is significant of Charles' position as *de facto* Emperor of the West that Irene sent envoys to Aachen to lay before Charles her side of this horrible story. It is also to be noted that the popular impression that Constantine had been put to death, and the aversion to committing the imperial sceptre to a woman's hand, also bore upon what followed. Lastly, it was to Charles alone that the Christians of the East were now crying out for succour against the threatening advance of the Moslem Caliph Haroun al Raschid. In 795 Adrian I died (25 Dec.), deeply regretted by Charles, who held this pope in great esteem and caused a Latin metrical epitaph to be prepared for the papal tomb (Gregorovius-Ampère, "Les tombeaux des papes", Paris, 1859, also "Lib. Pont.", ed. Duchesne, Paris, 1886, I, 523). In 787 Charles had visited Rome for the third time in the interest of the pope and his secure possession of the Patrimony of Peter.

COIN OF CHARLES THE GREAT
(Royal Museum, Berlin.)

Leo III (q. v.), the immediate successor of Adrian I, notified Charles of his election (26 Dec., 795) to the Holy See. The king sent in return rich presents by Abbot Angilbert, whom he commissioned to deal with the pope in all matters pertaining to the royal office of Roman Patrician. While this letter is respectful and even affectionate, it also exhibits Charles' concept of the co-ordination of the spiritual and temporal powers, nor does he hesitate to remind the pope of his grave spiritual obligations (Jaffé, Bibl. Rer. Germ., IV, 354–56). The new pope, a Roman, had bitter enemies in the Eternal City who spread the most damaging reports of his previous life. At length (25 April, 799) he was waylaid in the streets, maltreated, and left unconscious. After escaping to St. Peter's he was rescued by two of the king's *missi*, who came with a considerable force. The Duke of Spoleto sheltered the fugitive pope, who went later to Paderborn, where the king's camp then was. Charles received the Vicar of Christ with all due reverence. Leo was sent back to Rome escorted by royal *missi;* the insurgents, thoroughly frightened and unable to convince Charles of the pope's iniquity, surrendered, and the *missi* sent Paschalis and Campulus, nephews of Adrian I and ringleaders against Pope Leo, to the king, to be dealt with at the royal pleasure.

Charles was in no hurry to take final action in this matter. He settled various affairs connected with the frontier beyond the Elbe, with the protection of the Balearic Isles against the Saracens, and of Northern Gaul against Scandinavian sea-rovers, spent most of the winter at Aachen, and was at St. Riquier for Easter. About this time, too, he was occupied at the deathbed of Liutgarde, the queen whom he had married on the death of Fastrada (794). At Tours he conferred with Alcuin, then summoned the host of the Franks to meet at Mainz and announced to them his intention of again proceeding to Rome. Entering Italy by the Brenner Pass, he travelled by way of Ancona and Perugia to Nomentum, where Pope Leo met him and the two entered Rome together. A synod was held and the charges against Leo pronounced false. On this occasion the Frankish bishops declared themselves unauthorized to pass judgment on the Apostolic See. Of his own free will Leo, under oath, declared publicly in St. Peter's that he was inno-

cent of the charges brought against him (see Jaffé, Bibl. Rer. Ger., IV, 378). Leo requested that his accusers, now themselves condemned to death, should be punished only with banishment (C. Bayet, "Léon III et la révolte des Romains" in "Ann. de la Fac. des lettres de Lyons", 1883, 173–97).

Two days later (Christmas Day, 800) took place the principal event in the life of Charles. During the Pontifical Mass celebrated by the pope, as the king knelt in prayer before the high altar beneath which lay the bodies of Sts. Peter and Paul, the pope approached him, placed upon his head the imperial crown, did him formal reverence after the ancient manner, saluted him as Emperor and Augustus and anointed him, while the Romans present burst out with the acclamation, thrice repeated: "To Carolus Augustus crowned by God, mighty and pacific emperor, be life and victory" (Carolo, piisimo Augusto a Deo coronato, magno et pacifico Imperatori, vita et victoria). These details are gathered from contemporary accounts (Life of Leo III in "Lib. Pont.", ed. Duchesne, II, 1–48; "Annales Laurissenses majores"; Einhard's "Vita Caroli"; Theophanes). Though not all are found in any one narrative, there is no good reason for doubting their general accuracy. Einhard's statement (op. cit., c. xxviii) that Charles had no suspicion of what was about to happen, and if preinformed would not have accepted the imperial crown, is much discussed, some seeing in it an unwillingness to found imperial authority on an ecclesiastical basis (Hodgkin, in bibliography, VIII, 202), others more justly a natural hesitation before a momentous step overcome by the positive action of friends and admirers, and culminating in the scene just described (Funk, "Kirchengeschichte", 3d ed., Freiburg, 1902, 275). On the other hand there seems no reason to doubt that for some time previous the elevation of Charles had been discussed, both at home and at Rome, especially in view of two facts: the scandalous condition of the imperial government at Constantinople (J. B. Bury, Later Roman Empire, 395–800, London, 1892) and the acknowledged grandeur and solidity of the Carolingian house. He owed his elevation not to the conquest of Rome, nor to any act of the Roman Senate (then a mere municipal body), much less to the local citizenship of Rome, but to the pope, who exercised in a supreme juncture the moral supremacy in Western Christendom which the age widely recognized in him, and to which, indeed, Charles even then owed the royal title that the popes had transferred to his father Pepin. It is certain that Charles constantly attributed his imperial dignity to an act of God, made known of course through the agency of the Vicar of Christ (*divino nutu coronatus, a Deo coronatus*, in "Capitularia", ed. Baluze, I, 247, 341, 345); also that after the ceremony he made very rich gifts to the Basilica of St. Peter, and that on the same day the pope anointed (as King of the Franks) the younger Charles, son of the emperor and at that time probably destined to succeed in the imperial dignity. The Roman Empire (Imperium Romanum), since 476 practically extinguished in the West, save for a brief interval in the sixth century, was restored by this papal act, which became the historical basis of the future relations between the popes and the successors of Charlemagne (throughout the Middle Ages no Western Emperor was considered legitimate unless he had been crowned and anointed at Rome by the successor of St. Peter). Despite the earlier good-will and help of the papacy, the Emperor of Constantinople, legitimate heir of the imperial title (he still called himself Roman Emperor, and his capital was officially New Rome) had long proved incapable of preserving his authority in the Italian peninsula. Palace revolutions and heresy, not to speak of fiscal oppression, racial antipathy, and impotent but vicious intrigues, made him odious to the Romans and Italians generally (C. Diehl, "Administration Byzantine dans l'Exarchat de Ravenne", 568–752; Paris, 1888). In any case, since the Donation of Pepin (752) the pope was formally sovereign of the duchy of Rome and the Exarchate; hence, apart from its effect on his shadowy claim to the sovereignty of all Italy, the Byzantine ruler had nothing to lose by the elevation of Charles. However, the event of Christmas Day, 800, was long resented at Constantinople (Hergenröther, "Photius", II, 170 sqq.; A. Gasquet, "De translatione imperii ab imperatoribus Byzantinis ad reges Francorum", Paris, 1879), where eventually the successor of Charles was occasionally called "Emperor", or "Emperor of the Franks", but never "Roman Emperor". (Otto Harnack, "Das Karoling. u. das Byz. Reich in ihren wechselz. polit. Beziehungen", Göttingen, 1880.) For a more specific account of the new Western Empire; its nature, scope, and other important points, see Holy Roman Empire; Temporal Power. Suffice it to add here that while the imperial consecration made him in theory, what he was already in fact, the principal ruler of the West, and impropriated, as it were, in the Carolingian line the majesty of ancient Rome, it also lifted Charles at once to the dignity of supreme temporal protector of Western Christendom and in particular of its head, the Roman Church. Nor did this mean only the local welfare of the papacy, the good order and peace of the Patrimony of Peter. It meant also, in face of the yet vast pagan world (*barbaræ nationes*) of the North and the Southeast, a religious responsibility, encouragement and protection of missions, advancement of Christian culture, organization of dioceses, enforcement of a Christian discipline of life, improvement of the clergy, in a word, all the forms of governmental co-operation with the Church that we meet with in the life and the legislation of Charles. Long before this event Pope Adrian I had conferred (774) on Charles his father's dignity of *Patricius Romanus*, which implied primarily the protection of the Roman Church in all its rights and privileges, above all in the temporal authority which it had gradually acquired (notably in the former Byzantine Duchy of Rome and the Exarchate of Ravenna) by just titles in the course of the two preceding centuries. (For proofs of this see Cenni, "Monum. dominat. pontif.", Rome, 1760, II, 50–52, 60, 62, 72, 75; Theiner, "Codex diplomaticus dominii temporalis Sanctæ Sedis", Rome, 1861–62; Duchesne, "Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical", Paris, 1898, tr. 1908; Schnürer, "Die Entstehung des Kirchenstaates", Cologne, 1894; Brunengo, "Le origini della sovranità temporale de' papi", Rome, 1862.) See Temporal Power. Charles, it is true, after his imperial consecration exercised practically at Rome his authority as *Patricius*, or protector of the Roman Church. But he did this with all due recognition of the papal sovereignty and principally to prevent the quasi-anarchy which local intrigues and passions, family interests and ambitions, and adverse Byzantine agencies were promoting. It would be unhistorical to maintain that as emperor he ignored at once the civil sovereignty of the pope in the Patrimony of Peter. This (the Duchy of Rome and the Exarchate) he significantly omitted from the partition of the Frankish State made at the Diet of Thionville, in 806. It is to be noted that in this public division of his estate he made no provision for the imperial title, also that he committed to all three sons "the defence and protection of the Roman Church". In 817 Louis the Pious, by a famous charter whose substantial authenticity (Hergenröther-Kirsch, op. cit. II, 102) there is no good reason to doubt, confirmed to Pope Paschal and his successors forever "the city of Rome with its duchy and dependencies, as the same have been held to this day by your predecessors, under their author-

ity and jurisdiction", adding that he did not pretend to any jurisdiction in said territory, except when solicited thereto by the pope. (Gosselin, op. cit. II, 262–63. See the documentary works, quoted above, of Cenni and Theiner, also the collection of Roskovàny "Monum. Catholica pro independentiâ potest. eccl. ab imperio civili", Nitria, 1847–78; cf. Ottolenghi, "Della dignità imperiale di Carlo magno", Verona, 1897.) It may be noted here that the chroniclers of the ninth century treat as "restitution" to St. Peter the various cessions and grants of cities and territory made at this period by the Carolingian rulers within the limits of the Patrimony of Peter. The Charter of Louis the Pious was afterwards confirmed by Emperor Otto I in 962 (see Sickel, "Das Privilegium Ottos I für die römische Kirche", Innspruck, 1883, and Hefele, "Conciliengesch." IV, 608) and by Henry II in 1020. These imperial documents make it clear that the acts of authority exercised by the new emperor in the Patrimony of Peter were only such as were called for by his office of Defender of the Roman Church. Kleinclausz (l'Empire carolingien, etc., Paris, 1902, 441 sqq.) denies the authenticity of the famous letter (871) of Emperor Louis II to the Greek Emperor Basil (in which the former recognizes fully the papal origin of his own imperial diginty), and attributes it to Anastasius Bibliothecarius in 879. His arguments are weak; the authenticity is admitted by Gregorovius and O. Harnack. Anti-papal writers have undertaken to prove that Charles' dignity of *Patricius Romanorum* was equivalent to immediate and sole sovereign authority at Rome, and in law and in fact excluded any papal sovereignty. In reality this Roman patriciate, both under Pepin and Charles, was no more than a high protectorship of the civil sovereignty of the pope, whose local independence, both before and after the coronation, of Charles, is historically certain (Gosselin, op. cit. I, 262–63; 275–84), even apart from the aforesaid imperial charters. (For the patriciate of Charles, to which he no longer laid claim after his imperial coronation, see G. Brunengo, "Il patriziato di Carlomagno", in Civiltà Cattolica, 1864–66, and the same writer, "Il patriziato romano di Carlomagno", Prato, 1893; also Braun, "Carlo Magno imperante quæ inter ecclesiam et imperium intercesserit ratio", Freiburg, 1863. For divergent views see Heinemann, "Der Patriziat der deutschen Könige", Halle, 1889, and Freeman, "The Patriciate of Pippin", in English Hist. Review, 1889, 684–713; cf. Hist. Jahrbuch, XI, 349).

The personal devotion of Charles to the Apostolic See is well known. While in the preface to his Capitularies he calls himself the "devoted defender and humble helper of Holy Church", he was especially fond of the Basilica of St. Peter at Rome. Einhard relates (Vita, c. xxvii) that he enriched it beyond all other churches and that he was particularly anxious that the City of Rome should in his reign obtain again its ancient authority. He promulgated a special law on the respect due the See of Peter (Capitulare de honorandâ sede Apostolicâ, ed. Baluze I, 255). The letters of the popes to himself, his father, and grandfather, were collected by his order in the famous "Codex Carolinus", printed in Jaffé, Biblioth. Rer. Germ. IV, 1–306. Gregory VII tells us (Regest., VII, 23) that he placed a part of the conquered Saxon territory under the protection of St. Peter, and sent to Rome a tribute from the same. He received from Pope Adrian the Roman canon law in the shape of the "Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana", and also (784–91) the "Gregorian Sacramentary" or liturgical use of Rome, for the guidance of the Frankish Church (Jaffé, op. cit. 274). He furthered also in the Frankish churches the introduction of the Gregorian chant (Varin, "Altérations de la liturgie Grégorienne en France avant le treizième siècle", Paris, 1852; Schubiger, "Die Sängerschule St. Gallens vom 8 bis 12 Jahrhundert", Einsiedeln, 1859; E. Souillier, "Causeries sur le plain chant: Charlemagne et les écoles françaises", in Etudes religieuses etc., Paris, 1891, LIV, 87–99). It is of interest to note that just before his coronation at Rome Charles received three messengers from the Patriarch of Jerusalem, bearing to the King of the Franks the keys of the Holy Sepulchre and the banner of Jerusalem, "a recognition that the holiest place in Christendom was under the protection of the great monarch of the West" (Hodgkin). Shortly after this event, the Caliph Haroun al Raschid sent an embassy to Charles, who continued to take a deep interest in the Holy Sepulchre, and built Latin monasteries at Jerusalem, also a hospital for pilgrims. To the same period belongs the foundation of the *Schola Francorum* near St. Peter's Basilica, a refuge and hospital (with cemetery attached) for Frankish pilgrims to Rome, now represented by the Campo Santo de' Tedeschi (q. v.) near the Vatican.

The main work of Charles the Great in the development of Western Christendom might have been considered accomplished had he now passed away. Of all that he added during the remaining thirteen years of his life nothing increased perceptibly the stability of the structure. His military power and his instinct for organization had been successfully applied to the formation of a material power pledged to the support of the papacy, and on the other hand at least one pope (Adrian) had lent all the spiritual strength of the Holy See to help build up the new Western Empire, which his immediate successor (Leo) was to solemnly consecrate. Indeed, the remaining thirteen years of Charles' earthly career seem to illustrate rather the drawbacks of an intimate connexion between Church and State than its advantages.

In those years nothing like the military activity of the emperor's earlier life appears; there were much fewer enemies to conquer. Charles' sons led here and there an expedition, as when Louis captured Barcelona (801) or the younger Charles invaded the territory of the Sorbs. But their father had somewhat larger business on his hands at this time; above all, he had to either conciliate or neutralize the jealousy of the Byzantine Empire which still had the prestige of old tradition. At Rome Charles had been hailed in due form as "Augustus" by the Roman people, but he could not help realizing that many centuries before, the right of conferring this title had virtually passed from Old to New Rome. New Rome, i. e. Constantinople, affected to regard Leo's act as one of schism. Nicephorus, the successor of Irene (803), entered into diplomatic relations with Charles, it is true, but would not recognize his imperial character. According to one account (Theophanes) Charles had sought Irene in marriage, but his plan was defeated. The Frankish emperor then took up the cause of rebellious Venetia and Dalmatia. The war was carried on by sea, under King Pepin, and in 812, after the death of Nicephorus, a Byzantine embassy at Aachen actually addressed Charles as *Basileus*. About this time Charles again trenched upon the teaching prerogative of the Church, in the matter of the *Filioque* (q. v.), although in this instance also the Holy See admitted the soundness of his doctrine, while condemning his usurpation of its functions.

The other source of discord which appeared in the new Western Empire, and from its very beginning, was that of the succession. Charles made no pretence either of right of primogeniture for his eldest son or to name a successor for himself. As Pepin the Short had divided the Frankish realm, so did Charles divide the empire among his sons, naming none of them emperor. By the will which he made in 806 the greater part of what was later called France went to Louis the Pious; Frankland proper, Frisia, Saxony, Hesse, and Franconia were to be the heritage of Charles the Young; Pepin received Lombardy and its Italian dependencies,

COPYRIGHT, 1908, BY ROBERT APPLETON CO.

Bavaria, and Southern Alemannia. But Pepin and Charles pre-deceased the emperor, and in 813 the magnates of the empire did homage at Aachen to Louis the Pious as King of the Franks, and future sole ruler of the great imperial state. Thus it was that the Carlovingian Empire, as a dynastic institution, ended with the death of Charles the Fat (888), while the Holy Roman Empire, continued by Otto the Great (968–973), lacked all that is now France. But the idea of a Europe welded together out of various races under the spiritual influence of one Catholic Faith and one Vicar of Christ had been exhibited in the concrete.

It remains to say something of the achievements of Charles the Great at home. His life was so full of movement, so made up of long journeys, that home in his case signifies little more than the personal environment of his court, wherever it might happen to be on any given day. There was, it is true, a general preference for Austrasia, or Frankland (after Aachen, Worms, Nymwegen, and Ingleheim were favourite residences). He took a deep and intelligent interest in the agricultural development of the realm (see the "Capitulare de villis", ed. Guérard, Paris, 1853) and in the growth of trade (see "Capitulare of 805", in "Mon. Germ. Hist.: Leges", I, 133, also Roncière, "Charlemagne et la civilisation maritime au IX^e siècle", in "Moyen Age", 1897, I, 201–23), both domestic and foreign. The civil legislative work of Charles consisted principally in organizing and codifying the principles of Frankish law handed down from antiquity; thus in 802 the laws of the Frisians, Thuringians, and Saxons were reduced to writing. Among these principles, it is important to note, was one by which no free man could be deprived of life or liberty without the judgment of his equals in the state. The spirit of his legislation was above all religious; he recognized as a basis and norm the ecclesiastical canons, was wont to submit his projects of law to the bishops, or to give civil authority to the decrees of synods. More than once he made laws at the suggestion of popes or bishops. For administrative purposes the State was divided into counties and hundreds, for the government of which counts and hundred-men were responsible. Side by side with the counts in the great national parliament (*Reichstag*, Diet) which normally met in the spring, sat the bishops, and the spiritual constituency was so closely intertwined with the temporal that in reading of a "council" under Charles, it is not always easy to ascertain whether the particular proceedings are supposed to be those of a parliament or of a synod. Nevertheless this parliament or diet was essentially bicameral (civil and ecclesiastical), and the foregoing description applies to the mutual discussion of *res mixtæ* or subjects pertaining to both orders. (See Hincmar, "De ordine palatii", ed. Prou, Paris, 1885, in "Biblioth. de l'école des Chartes, fasc. 58.) The one Frankish administrative institution to which Charles gave an entirely new character was that of the *missi dominici*, representatives (civil and ecclesiastical) of the royal authority, who from being royal messengers assumed under him functions much like those of papal legates, i. e. they were partly royal commissioners, partly itinerant governors. There were usually two for each province (an ecclesiastic and a lay lord), and they were bound to visit their territory (*missatica*) four times each year. Between these *missi* and the local governors or counts the power of the former great crown-vassals (dukes, *Herzöge*) was parcelled out. Local justice was administered by the aforesaid count (*comes*, *Graf*) in his court, held three times each year (*placitum generale*), with the aid of seven assessors (*scabini*, *rachimburgi*), but there was a graduated appeal ending in the person of the emperor (see Fustel de Coulanges, "Le gouvernement de Charlemagne", in "Revue des deux mondes", Paris, 1876; also his "Transformations de la royauté pendant l'époque carolingienne", Paris, 1892, and the classic work of G. Waitz, "Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte", 3d ed., Berlin, 1882).

While enough has been said above to show how ready he was to interfere in the Church's sacred domain, it does not appear that this propensity arose from motives discreditable to his religious character. It would be absurd to pretend that Charles the Great was a consistent lifelong hypocrite; if he was not, then his keen practical interest in all that pertained to the services of the Church, his participation even in the chanting of the choir (though, as his biographer says, "in a subdued voice"), his fastidious attention to questions of rites and ceremonies (Monachus Sangallensis), go to show, like many other traits related of him, that his strong rough nature was really impregnated with zeal, however mistaken at times, for the earthly glory of God. He sought to elevate and perfect the clergy, both monastic and secular, the latter through the enforcement of the *Vita Canonica* or common life (Bartoli, "La polizia ecclesiastica nella legislazione carolingica", Rome, 1899). Tithes were strictly enforced for the support of the clergy and the dignity of public worship. Ecclesiastical immunities (q. v.) were recognized and protected, the bishops held to frequent visitation of their dioceses, a regular religious instruction of the people provided for, and in the vernacular tongue. Through Alcuin he caused corrected copies of the Scriptures to be placed in the churches ("Monumenta Alcuiniana", ed. Jaffé, 1873, VI, 529), and earned great credit for his improvement of the much depraved text of the Latin Vulgate (S. Berger, "Hist. de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge", Paris, 1893). Education, for aspirants to the priesthood at least, was furthered by the royal order of 787 to all bishops and abbots to keep open in their cathedrals and monasteries schools for the study of the seven liberal arts and the interpretation of the Scriptures. He did much also to improve ecclesiastical music, and founded schools of church-song at Metz, Soissons, and St. Gall. For the contemporary development of Christian civilization through Alcuin, Einhard, and other scholars, Italian and Irish, and for the king's personal attainments in literature, see CARLOVINGIAN SCHOOLS; ALCUIN; EINHARD. He spoke Latin well, and loved to listen to the reading of the works of St. Augustine, especially "The City of God". He understood Greek, but was especially devoted to his Frankish (Old-German) mother tongue; its terms for the months and the various winds are owing to him. He attempted also to produce a German grammar, and Einhard tells us that he caused the ancient folk-songs and hero-tales (*barbara atque antiquissima carmina*) to be collected; unfortunately this collection ceased to be appreciated and was lost at a later date.

SEAL OF CHARLES THE GREAT ON A DOCUMENT GIVEN AT AACHEN, 9 MAY, 813

From boyhood Charles had evinced strong domestic affections. Judged, perhaps, by the more perfectly developed Christian standards of a later day, his matrimonial relations were far from blameless; but it would be unjust to criticize by any such ethical rules the obscurely transmitted accounts of his domestic life which have come down to us. For a defence of his reputation in this respect, see Weber in "Kirchenlexikon", VII, 167–70; cf. "Civiltà Cattolica", 1863, V, 40, and Liechty, "Les Femmes de Charlemagne", in "Revue du Monde Catholique" (Paris, 1880). What is certain (and pleasanter to contemplate) is the picture, which his contemporaries have left us, of

the delight he found in being with his children, joining in their sports, particularly in his own favourite recreation of swimming, and finding his greatest relaxation in the society of his sons and daughters; the latter he refused to give in marriage, unfortunately for their moral character. (See F. Lorentz, "Karls des Grossen Privat und Hofleben" in "Hist. Taschenbuch", 1832, III.) He died in his seventy-second year, after forty-seven years of reign, and was buried in the octagonal Byzantine-Romanesque church at Aachen, built by him and decorated with marble columns from Rome and Ravenna. In the year 1000 Otto III opened the imperial tomb and found (it is said) the great emperor as he had been buried, sitting on a marble throne, robed and crowned as in life, the book of the Gospels open on his knees. (See "Bulletin Monumental", 1867, III, 819–22.) In some parts of the empire popular affection placed him among the saints. For political purposes and to please Frederick Barbarossa he was canonized (1165) by the anti-pope Paschal III, but this act was never ratified by insertion of his feast in the Roman Breviary or by its extension to the Universal Church; his *cultus*, however, was permitted at Aachen [Acta SS., 28 Jan., 3d ed., II, 490–93, 303–7, 769; his office is in Canisius, "Antiq. Lect.", III (2), ed. Basnage, p. 205; Walch, "Hist. canonizat. Caroli Magni", Jena, 1750]. According to his friend and biographer, Einhard, Charles was of imposing stature, to which his bright eyes and long, flowing hair added more dignity. His neck was rather short, and his belly prominent, but the symmetry of his other members concealed these defects. His clear voice was not so sonorous as his gigantic frame would suggest. Except on his visits to Rome he wore the national dress of his Frankish people, linen shirt and drawers, a tunic held by a silken cord, and leggings; his thighs were wound round with thongs of leather; his feet were covered with laced shoes. He had good health to his sixty-eighth year, when fevers set in, and he began to limp with one foot. He was his own physician, we are told, and much disliked his medical advisers who wished him to eat boiled meat instead of roast. No contemporary portrait of him has been preserved. A statuette in the Musée Carnavalet at Paris is said to be very ancient.

For original materials, see *P. L., XCLVII–CIII*, and Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules* (Paris, 1737—), II–IX. An official royal record, contemporary and general in character (788–813), the *Annals of Lorsch* (*Annales Laurissenses majores*) are of primary importance; after 829 valuable additions were made to it in the so-called *Annales Einhardi*. To these must be added other local annals, all found in Pertz, *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, I. His prime minister Einhard has left us a sketch (*Vita Caroli*) full of valuable details written in close imitation of Suetonius. At the end of the ninth century the Poeta Saxo wrote a metrical life in five books and the Monk of St. Gall (Monachus Sangallensis) a prose life in two books, quite anecdotal and illustrative of contemporary life. The lives are best read in the *Monumenta Carolina* of Jaffé [*Bibl. Rer. Germ.* (Berlin, 1867), IV, 487-700]. His legislation (*Capitularia*, *Leges*) may be seen in the earlier edition of the *Capitularia* (q. v.) of Baluze and in the recent critical edition of Boretius and Krause [*Mon. Germ. Hist.: Leges*, II, Hanover, 1893–97]. His letters, with those sent him by Alcuin, Einhard, and Leo III (*Codex Carolinus*) are also found in Jaffé, *op. cit.*, I, 486. Numerous other important public documents pertaining to his reign are found in the *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.—Leges—Diplomata*. The most complete account of his reign is that of Abel, continued and finished by B. Simson, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches unter Karl dem Grossen* (Berlin, 1868–88); in Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* (Berlin, 2d ed., 1888) is found an exhaustive description of his political activity (legislative and constitutional). Valuable material is found in the pages of the contemporary *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne (Paris, 1886–92), 2 vols., 4to, with rich historical and antiquarian notes.

English works on Charlemagne are frequently coloured by anti-papal prejudice. Among the latest are Cutts (London, 1882), Mombert (1888), Wells (1898), Davis (1900); see also Buchanan in *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*, I, 455–61. The best English account of the great emperor (not always impartial) is that of Hodgkin in the seventh and eighth volumes of his *Italy and her Invaders* (Oxford, 1899). Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, is scholarly, but not always equitable. One of the most scholarly accounts of his reign is that of Döllinger, *Das Kaiserthum Karls des Grossen* (Munich, 1865; tr. London, 1897) criticized in the *Zeitschrift f. Kath. Theol.* (1893), XVII, 563–74. See also J. Janssens, *Karl der Grosse* (Frankfort, 1868); Vétault, *Charlemagne*, with introduction by Léon Gautier, notes by Barthélemy (2d ed., Tours, 1880) and Hauréau, *Charlemagne et sa cour* (4th ed., Paris, 1880).

Among recent studies on ecclesiastical and religious life in the reign of Charles the following are of interest: Merchier, *Essai sur le gouvernement de l'église au temps de Charlemagne* (St.-Quentin, 1887); Imbart de la Tour, *De ecclesiis rusticanis ætate Carolingicâ* (Bordeaux, 1891); Jérome, *La question métropolitaine dans l'Eglise franque* in *Revue canonique* (Paris, 1898); Dubois, *De concilii et theologicis disputationibus apud Francos Carolo Magno regnante* (Alençon, 1902); Giry, *Les Archives des églises et monastères de l'époque Carolingienne* (Paris, 1901).

Among studies on Church and State in the time of Charlemagne may be mentioned: Gosselin, *The Power of the Pope during the Middle Ages*, tr. M. Kelly, 2 vols. (Baltimore, London, 1853); Ketterer, *Karl der Grosse und die Kirche* (Munich, 1898); Greenwood, *Empire and Papacy in the Middle Ages* (London, 1902); Hergenröther, *Katholische Kirche und christlicher Staat* (Freiburg, 1872, Eng. tr., London, 1876); Höfler, *Kaiserthum und Papsthum* (Prague, 1862); Niehues, *Gesch. des Verhältnisses zwischen Kaiserthum und Papstthum im Mittelalter*, 2 vols., vol. I, 2d. ed., (Münster, 1877); Glasson, *Les rapports du pouvoir spirituel et du pouvoir temporel au moyen âge* (Paris, 1890); J. de la Servière, *Charlemagne et l'Eglise* (Paris, 1904).

Thomas J. Shahan.
E. Macpherson.

Charlemagne and Church Music.—Charlemagne's interest in church music and solicitude for its propagation and adequate performance throughout his empire, have never been equalled by any civil ruler either before or since his time. Great as was his father Pepin's care for the song of the Church, Charles's activity was infinitely more intelligent and comprehensive. Aided by a technical knowledge of the subject, he appreciated the reasons why the Church attaches so much importance to music in her cult and the manner of its performance. He used all his authority to enforce the wishes of the Church which he had made his own. The key-note of his legislation on this subject, as on every other point regarding the liturgy, was conformity with Rome. To this end, tradition tells us, he not only took members of his own chapel to Rome with him, in order that they might learn at the fountain head, but begged Pope Adrian I, in 774, to let him have two of the papal singers. One of these papal chanters, Theodore, was sent to Metz, and the other, Benedict, to the *schola cantorum* at Soissons. According to Ekkehart IV, a chronicler of the tenth century of the monastery of St. Gall, the same pope sent two more singers to the Court of Charlemagne. One of these, Peter, reached Metz, but Romanus at first being detained at St. Gall by sickness, afterwards obtained permission from the emperor to remain there, and it is to the presence in St. Gall and elsewhere, of these monks from Rome, that we owe the manuscripts without which a return to the original form of the Gregorian chant would be impossible. The great Charles made strenuous though not wholly successful efforts to wean Milan and its environs from their Ambrosian Rite and melodies. In 789 he addressed a decree to the whole clergy of his empire, enjoining on every member to learn the *Cantus Romanus* and to perform the office in conformity with the directions of his father (Pepin), who for the sake of uniformity with Rome in the whole (Western) Church, had abolished the Gallican chant. Through the synod held at Aachen in 803, the emperor commanded anew the bishops and clerics to sing the office *sicut psallit ecclesia Romana*, and ordered them to establish *scholæ cantorum* in suitable places, while he himself provided for the support of those already in existence—that is, those in Metz, Paris, Soissons Orléans, Sens, Tours, Lyons, Cambrai, and Dijon in France, and those of Fulda, Reichenau, and St. Gall. The sons of nobles of his empire and of his vassals were expected, by imperial command, to be instructed in grammar, music, and arithmetic, while the boys in the public schools were taught music and how to sing, especially the Psalms. The emperor's agents and representatives were everywhere ordered to watch

over the faithful carrying out of his orders regarding music. He not only caused liturgical music to flourish in his own time throughout his vast domain, but he laid the foundations for musical culture which are still potent to-day.

KORNMÜLLER, *Kirchenmusikalisches Lexikon*, s. v. *Carl der Grosse;* AMBROS, *Musikgesch.*, II.

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Charles Borromeo, SAINT, Archbishop of Milan, Cardinal-Priest of the Title of S. Prassede, Papal Secretary of State under Pius IV, and one of the chief factors in the Catholic Counter-Reformation, was b. in the Castle of Arona, a town on the southern shore of the Lago Maggiore in Northern Italy, 2 October, 1538; d. at Milan, 3 November, 1584. His emblem is the word HUMILITAS crowned, which is a portion of the Borromeo shield. He is usually represented in art in his cardinal's robes, barefoot, carrying the cross as archbishop; a rope round his neck, one hand raised in blessing, thus recalling his work during the plague. His feast is kept on 4 November. His father was Count Giberto Borromeo, who, about 1530, married Margherita de' Medici. Her younger brother was Giovanni Angelo, Cardinal de' Medici, who became pope in 1559 under the title of Pius IV. Charles was the second son, and the third of the six children, of Giberto and Margherita. Charles' mother died about the year 1547, and his father married again.

His early years were passed partly in the Castle of Arona, and partly in the Palazzo Borromeo at Milan. At the age of twelve his father allowed him to receive the tonsure, and, upon the resignation of his uncle, Julius Cæsar Borromeo, he became titular Abbot of Sts. Gratinian and Felinus at Arona.

When he received the tonsure he was sent by his father to Milan, where he studied Latin under J. J. Merla. In October, 1552, he left Arona for the University of Pavia, where he had as his tutor Francesco Alciato, afterwards cardinal. His correspondence shows that he was allowed a very small sum by his father, and that often he was in very straitened circumstances, which caused him considerable inconvenience. It was not only that he himself suffered, but that his retinue also were not suitably clothed. Charles evidently felt bitterly his humiliation, but he does not seem to have shown impatience. Leaving Pavia to meet his uncle, Cardinal de' Medici, at Milan, he was, within a few weeks called upon to attend the funeral of his father, who died early in August, 1558, and was buried in the church of Santa Maria delle Grazie, Milan.

Fresh responsibilities at once came to Charles, for though he was not the elder son, yet, at the request of his family, including even his brother, he assumed charge of all the family business. The question of possession of the Castle of Arona was one of great difficulty, as it was claimed by both France and Spain. Charles conducted the negotiations with great energy and diplomatic skill, and as a consequence of the Peace of Cambrai (3 April, 1559) the castle was handed over to Count Francesco Borromeo, in the name of his nephew, Federigo Borromeo, to be held by him for the King of Spain. He also did much to restore to their ancient monastic discipline the religious of his Abbey of Sts. Gratinian and Felinus. Though his studies were so often interrupted, yet his seriousness and attention enabled him to complete them with success, and in 1559 he maintained his thesis for the doctorate of civil and canon law.

In the summer of 1559 Paul IV died, and the conclave for the election of his successor, which began on 9 September, was not concluded till 26 December, when Cardinal Giovanni Angelo de' Medici was elected and took the name of Pius IV. On the 3rd of January, 1560, Charles received a message by a courier from the pope, asking him to proceed at once to Rome. He started immediately for the Eternal City, but though he travelled rapidly he was not in time for the pope's coronation (6 January). On 22 January he wrote to Count Guido Borromeo that the pope had given him the charge of the administration of all the papal states. On 31 January he was created cardinal-deacon, together with Giovanni de' Medici, son of the Duke of Florence, and Gianantonio Serbellone, cousin of the pope. Charles was given the title of Sts. Vitus and Modestus, which was in the August following changed to that of S. Martino-ai-Monti. He wished for no rejoicings at Milan; all the celebration was to be at Arona, where were to be said ten Masses *de Spiritu Sancto*. At this time Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, of Ferrara, resigned the Archbishopric of Milan, and on 8 February the pope named Charles as administrator of the vacant see. In succession he was named Legate of Bologna, Romagna, and the March of Ancona. He was named Protector of the Kingdom of Portugal, of Lower Germany, and the Catholic cantons of Switzerland. Under his protection were placed the orders of St. Francis, the Carmelites, the Humiliati, the Canons Regular of the Holy Cross of Coimbra, the Knights of Jerusalem (or Malta), and those of the Holy Cross of Christ in Portugal. By a *motu proprio* (22 January, 1561) Pius IV gave him an annual income of 1000 golden crowns from the episcopal *mensa* of Ferrara.

Charles' office of secretary of state and his care for the business of his family did not prevent him from giving time to study, and even to recreations in the form of playing the lute and violoncello, and a game of ball. He lived at first at the Vatican, but in July, 1562, removed to the Palazzo Colonna, Piazza Santi Apostoli. Soon after his arrival in Rome he founded at the Vatican an academy, which was a way of providing, by literary work, a distraction from more serious occupations. The members whether ecclesiastics or laymen, met nearly every evening, and many of their contributions are amongst the works of Charles as "Noctes Vaticanæ". Charles was very soon occupied as secretary of state in using his influence to bring about the re-assembling of the Council of Trent, which had been suspended since 1552. The state of Europe was appalling from an ecclesiastical point of view. Many were the difficulties that had to be overcome—with the emperor, with Philip II of Spain, and, greatest of all, with France, where the demand was made for a national council. Still, in spite of obstacles, the work went on with the view of re-assembling the council, and for the most part it was Charles' patience and devotion that accomplished the object.

It was not till 18 January, 1562, that the council resumed at Trent, with two cardinals, 106 bishops, 4 mitred abbots, and 4 generals of religious orders present. The correspondence which passed between Charles and the cardinal legates at Trent is enormous, and the questions which arose many times threatened to bring about the breaking-up of the council. Difficulties with the emperor, the national principles put forward on behalf of France by the Cardinal Charles of Lorraine, Archbishop of Reims, required from Charles constant attention and the greatest delicacy and skill in treatment. The twenty-fifth, and last, session of the council was held 3 and 4 December, 1563; at it were present 255 Fathers. At a consistory on the 26th of January, 1564, Pius IV confirmed the decrees of the council, and later appointed a congregation of eight cardinals to see to the execution of these decrees. During the sitting of the re-assembled council Charles' elder brother, Count Federigo, had died (28 November, 1562). This event had a very determining result as to Charles, for he immediately resolved to give himself with greater strictness to spiritual matters, and he looked upon his brother's death as a warning to him to give up all worldly things. His resolution was well needed, for, as he was now the head of the family,

great pressure was brought to bear upon him to give up the ecclesiastical state and to marry. This view was even suggested to him by the pope, at the instance of other relatives. Some months passed in these efforts to influence Charles, but finally he resolved to definitely fix himself in the ecclesiastical state by being secretly ordained priest. The ordination took place, by the hands of Cardinal Federigo Cesa, in Santa Maria Maggiore, on the 4th of September, 1563. He writes that he celebrated his first Mass on the Assumption, in St. Peter's, at the altar of the Confession. He said his second Mass at his house, attached to the Gesù, in an oratory where St. Ignatius had been accustomed to celebrate. Charles at this time had as his confessor Father Giovanni Battista Ribera, S. J. On the 7th of December, 1563, the feast of St. Ambrose, he was consecrated bishop in the Sistine Chapel; on the 23rd of March, 1564, he received the pallium, and was preconized on the 12th of May. In the following June his title was changed to that of Santa Prassede.

St. Charles Borromeo (By Crespi, Ambrosian Library)

Meanwhile Charles had provided for the spiritual wants of his diocese. Antonio Roberti, in May, 1560, had, as his vicar, taken possession of his archbishopric, and Charles sent Monsignor Donato, Bishop of Bobbio, as his deputy for episcopal functions. Monsignor Donato soon died, and in his place Charles commissioned Monsignor Girolamo Ferragato, O. S. A., one of his suffragans, to visit the diocese, and to report on its needs. Ferragato entered Milan, 23 April, 1562; on 24 June of the same year Charles sent to Milan Fathers Palmio and Carvagial, S. J., with the object of preparing the faithful of the diocese, both clergy and laity, for the carrying out of the reforms prescribed by the Council of Trent. While anxious for the spiritual welfare of his flock, he was no less solicitous for his own. There came to him the thought of what was the will of God concerning him, and whether he was to continue as the spiritual father of his diocese or retire to a monastery. It happened in the autumn of 1563, between the sessions of the Council of Trent, that the Cardinal of Lorraine went to Rome, accompanied by Ven. Bartholomew of the Martyrs, O. P., Archbishop of Braga, in Portugal (see Bartholomew of Braga). Bartholomew had already shown himself to be of a like spirit to Charles, and when Pius IV introduced them, and suggested that he should begin the reform of the cardinals in the person of Charles, Bartholomew answered that if the princes of the Church had all been like Cardinal Borromeo, he would have proposed them as models for the reform of the rest of the clergy. In a private interview, Charles opened his heart to Bartholomew and told him of his thought of retiring to a monastery. Bartholomew applauded his desire, but at the same time declared his opinion that it was God's will that he should not abandon his position. Charles was now assured that it was his duty to remain in the world; but all the more he felt he ought to visit his diocese, though the pope always opposed his departure. Bartholomew counselled patience, and represented the assistance he could give to the pope and the whole Church by remaining in Rome. Charles was satisfied, and stayed on, doing the great work necessary by sending zealous deputies. After the Council of Trent he was much occupied with the production of the catechism embodying the teaching of the council, the revision of the Missal and Breviary. He also was a member of a commission for the reform of church music, and chose Palestrina to compose three masses; one of these is the "Missa Papæ Marcelli".

Pastoral solicitude, which is the characteristic chosen for mention in the collect of his feast, made him ever anxious to have the most suitable representatives in Milan. He heard of the excellent qualities of Monsignor Nicolò Ormaneto, of the Diocese of Verona, and succeeded in obtaining the consent of his bishop to his transference to Milan. Ormaneto had been in the household of Cardinal Pole, and also the principal assistant of the Bishop of Verona. On the 1st of July, 1564, Ormaneto reached Milan, and at once carried out Charles' instructions by calling together a diocesan synod for the promulgation of the decrees of the Council of Trent. There were 1200 priests at the synod. It was with the clergy that Charles began the reform, and the many abuses needed skilful and tactful treatment. Father Palmio contributed much in bringing the clergy to a sense of the necessity for reform. The synod was followed by a visitation of the diocese by Ormaneto. In September Charles sent thirty Jesuit Fathers to assist his vicar; three of these were placed over the seminary, which was opened on the 11th of November (feast of St. Martin of Tours). Charles was constantly directing the work of restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, and the education of the young, even down to minute details, was foremost in his thoughts. The manner of preaching, repression of avaricious priests, ecclesiastical ceremonies, and church music are some of the subjects on which Charles wrote many letters. The revival of strict observance of rule in the convents of nuns was another matter to which Charles urged Ormaneto's attention; the setting up of grilles in the convent parlours was ordered, and, to remove material difficulties, Charles ordered his agent, Albonese, to pay the cost of this where the convents, through poverty, were unable to bear the

expense. This order brought about difficulties with his own relations. Two of his aunts, sisters of Pius IV, had entered the Order of St. Dominic; they resented the setting up of the grilles as casting a slur on their convent. Charles, in a letter (28th April, 1565) displaying much thought and great tact, strove to bring his aunts to see the good purpose of the order, but without success, and the pope wrote on the 26th of May, 1565, telling them that he had given general orders for the setting up of the grilles, and that it would be pleasing to him that those united to him by ties of blood and affection should set a good example to other convents.

Notwithstanding the support which Charles gave, Ormaneto was discouraged by the checks with which he met, and wished to return to his own diocese. Charles pressed the pope to allow him to leave Rome, and at the same time encouraged Ormaneto to remain. At last the pope gave his consent to Charles visiting his flock and summoning a provincial council; but, desiring his stay to be a short one, he created Charles legate *a latere* for all Italy. Charles prepared to start, chose canonists to help the council, and wrote to the Court of Spain and Philip II. He left Rome 1 September, and, passing through Florence, Bologna, Modena, and Parma, he made his solemn entry into Milan on Sunday, 23 September, 1565. His arrival was the occasion of great rejoicings, and the people did their utmost to welcome the first resident archbishop for eighty years. On the following Sunday he preached in the Duomo, on the words: "With desire I have desired to eat this pasch with you" (Luke, xxii, 15).

On the 15th of October the first provincial council met. It was attended by ten out of the fifteen bishops of the province, those absent being represented by their procurators. Three of these prelates were cardinals, and one, Nicolò Sfondrato of Cremona, was afterwards pope with the title of Gregory XIV. Charles announced that the reform must begin with the prelates: "We ought to walk in front, and our spiritual subjects will follow us more easily." He commenced by fulfilling all things required in himself, and his wonderful energy astonished the prelates. The council was finished on the 3d of November, and Charles sent a minute report to the pope. On the 6th of November he went to Trent as legate, to meet the Archduchesses Giovanna and Barbara, who were to be married to the Prince of Florence and the Duke of Ferrara. Charles conducted Barbara to Ferrara and Giovanna to Tuscany, where at Fiorenzuola, he received the news of the pope's serious illness. He reached Rome to find that the pope's condition was hopeless, and he at once bade the Holy Father turn all his thoughts to his heavenly home. On the 10th of December Pius IV died, assisted by two saints, Charles and Philip Neri. On the 7th of January, 1566, the conclave for the election of his successor was concluded by the election of Cardinal Michele Ghislieri, O. P., of Alessandria, Bishop of Mondovi, who, at the request of Charles, took the name of Pius V. It has been maintained that Charles at first favoured Cardinal Morone, but his letter to the King of Spain (Sylvain, I, 309) seems to prove that he did his utmost to secure the election of Cardinal Ghislieri.

Pius V wished to keep Charles to assist him in Rome; but though Charles delayed his departure for some time, in the end his earnest representations obtained permission for him to return to Milan, at least for the summer. He returned to his see, 5 April, 1566, having made a detour to visit the sanctuary of Our Lady of Loreto. Charles showed admirably how the Church had the power to reform from within, and, though the task he had to do was gigantic, he set about its execution with great calmness and confidence. He began with his household, gave up much of his property to the poor, and insisted that in all that concerned himself personally the greatest economy should be used; for his position as archbishop and cardinal he required due respect. He practised great mortification, and whatever the Council of Trent or his own provincial council had laid down for the life of the bishops he carried out, not only in the letter, but also in the spirit.

The rules for the management of his household, both in spiritual and temporal affairs, are to be found in the "Acta Ecclesiæ Mediolanensis". The result of the care that was taken of his household was seen in the many members of it who became distinguished bishops and prelates. More than twenty were chosen to fill important sees on account of the bright example they had shown while members of the cardinal's household; one of these was Dr. Owen Lewis, fellow of New College, Oxford, who taught at Oxford and Douai, and after being vicar-general to St. Charles was made Bishop of Cassano in Calabria.

The administration of the diocese needed to be perfected; he therefore chose a vicar-general of exemplary life, learned in law and ecclesiastical discipline. He also appointed two other vicars, one for civil and the other for criminal causes. He associated with them other officials, all chosen for their integrity, and took care that they should be well paid, so as to preclude all suspicion of venality. Corruption in such matters was specially distasteful to him. Whilst providing for upright officials, the needs of the prisoners were not forgotten, and in time his court was known as the holy tribunal. He so organized his administration that by means of reports and conferences with the visitors and the vicars forane, his pastoral visits were productive of great fruit. The canons of his cathedral chapter were in turn the object of his reforming care. He put before them his plan of giving them definite work in theology and in connexion with the Sacrament of Penance. They welcomed his reforms, as he wrote to Monsignor Bonome: "The result of the way I have taken is very different to that in vogue to-day" (27 April, 1566). Pius V congratulated Charles on his success and exhorted him to continue the work.

Another great work which was begun at this time was that of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, in order that the children might be carefully and systematically instructed. This work was really the beginning of what is now known as the Sunday-school, and there is a remarkable testimony to this in an inscription under a statue outside the Essex Unitarian Church, Kensington, London, where Cardinal Borromeo is mentioned in connexion with the work. The visitation of his flock was steadily carried out and various pious foundations were made to succour the needy and sinners. In 1567 opposition began to be made to his jurisdiction. The officials of the King of Spain announced that they would inflict severe penalties on the archbishop's officers if they imprisoned any more laymen, or carried arms. The matter was referred to the king, and finally to the pope, who counselled the Senate of Milan to support the ecclesiastical authority. Peace was not restored; and the *bargello*, or sheriff, of the archbishop was imprisoned. The archbishop pronounced sentence of excommunication on the captain of justice and several other officials. Much trouble followed, and again the matter was laid before the pope, who decided in favour of the archbishop.

In October, 1567, Charles started to visit three Swiss valleys, Levantina, Bregno, and La Riviera. In most parts, indeed, there was much to reform. The clergy especially were in many cases so lax and careless, and even living scandalous lives, that the people had grown up to be equally negligent and sinful. The hardships of this journey were great; Charles travelled on a mule, but sometimes on foot, over most difficult and even dangerous ground. His

labours bore great fruit, and a new spirit was put into both clergy and laity. In August, 1568, the second diocesan synod was held, and it was followed in April, 1569, by the second provincial council. In August, 1569, matters came to a head in connexion with the collegiate church of Santa Maria della Scala. This church had been declared by Clement VII, in 1531, exempt from the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Milan, provided that the consent of the archbishop was obtained; but this consent had never been obtained, and consequently the exemption did not take effect. Now the governor, the Duke of Albuquerque, had been induced by the opponents of the archbishop to issue an edict declaring that all who violated the king's jurisdiction should receive severe punishment. The canons of La Scala claimed exemption from the archbishop and relied on the secular power to support them. Charles announced his intention of making his visitation in accordance with the wishes of the pope, by sending Monsignor Luigi Moneta to the canons. He was met with opposition and open insult. Early in September Charles himself went, vested for a visitation. The same violent demeanour was again shown. The archbishop took the cross into his own hands and went forward to pronounce the sentence of excommunication. The armed men raised their weapons; the canons closed the door of the church against Charles, who, with eyes fixed on the crucifix, recommended himself and these unworthy men to the Divine protection. Charles was indeed in danger of his life, for the canons' supporters opened fire, and the cross in his hand was damaged. His vicar-general then put up the public notice that the canons had incurred censures. This act was followed by blows and cries, removal of the notices, and the declaration that the archbishop was himself suspended from his office. Pius V was shocked at this incident, and only with very great difficulty allowed Charles to deal with these rebellious canons, when they repented.

In October, 1569, Charles was again in great danger. The Order of the Humiliati, of which he was protector, had by his persevering care been induced to accept certain reforms, in 1567. But some of its members strove to bring about a return to their former condition. As Charles would not consent to this, some of the order formed a conspiracy to take his life. On the 26th of October, whilst Charles was at evening prayer with his household, a member of the Humiliati, dressed as a layman, having entered with others of the public who were admitted to the chapel, took his stand four or five yards from the archbishop. The motet "Tempus est ut revertar ad eum qui me misit", by Orlando Lasso, was being sung; the words "Non turbetur cor vestrum, neque formidet" had just been sung, when the assassin fired his weapon, loaded with ball, and struck Charles, who was kneeling at the altar. Charles, thinking himself mortally wounded, commended himself to God. A panic arose, which allowed the assassin to escape, but Charles motioned to his household to finish the prayers. At their conclusion it was found that the ball had not even pierced his clothes, but some of the shot had penetrated to the skin, and where the ball had struck a slight swelling appeared, which remained through his life.

It was seen how far the unruly-minded had gone, and the serious turn affairs had taken. At once the governor took prompt steps to assure Charles of his sympathy and his wish to find the assassin. Charles would not allow this, and asked the governor to use his efforts to prevent the rights of the Church being infringed. In some measure this occurrence led the canons of La Scala to sue for pardon, and on the 5th of February, 1570, Charles publicly absolved them before the door of his cathedral. Notwithstanding his wish to forgive those who had attempted his life, and his efforts to prevent their prosecution, four of the conspirators (amongst them Farina, who actually fired) were sentenced to death. All being of the clergy, they were handed over to the civil power (29 July, 1570); two were beheaded; Farina and another were hanged.

Charles at this time made a second visit to Switzerland, first visiting the three valleys of his diocese, then over the mountains to see his half-sister Ortensia, Countess d'Altemps. Afterwards he visited all the Catholic cantons, everywhere using his influence to remove abuses both amongst the clergy and laity, and to restore religious observance in monasteries and convents. He visited Altorf, Unterwalden, Lucerne, Saint Gall, Schwyz, Einsiedeln, where he said that he nowhere, except at Loreto, experienced a greater religious feeling (10 September, 1570). Heresy had spread in many of these parts, and Charles sent to them experienced missionaries to win back those who had embraced it.

At this time Pius V came to the conclusion that nothing less than the suppression of the Order of the Humiliati was adequate. He therefore issued a Bull (7 February, 1571) suppressing the order and providing for its property. This same year, owing to the short harvest, the whole province suffered from a terrible famine, during which Charles worked with unceasing toil to help the starving, relieving at his own expense as many as 3000 daily for three months. His example induced others to help, the governor, especially, giving large alms. In the summer of 1571 Charles was for some time seriously ill, in the month of August; having partly recovered, he was making his visitation when he heard of the serious illness of the governor, the Duke of Albuquerque. Charles returned to Milan only in time to console the duchess. He made use of the prayers ordered by Pius V for the success of the Christians against the Turks, to urge on his flock the necessity of averting God's anger by penance. Great were the rejoicings at the victory of Lepanto (7 October, 1571). Charles was especially interested in this expedition by reason of the papal ships being commanded by Marco Antonio Colonna, whose son Fabricio was married to his sister, Anna Borromeo.

The archbishop remained in bad health, suffering from low fever and catarrh. It was feared that consumption would set in; in spite of his illness he prepared for the third diocesan synod, which was held in his absence in April, 1572. He soon afterwards heard of the death of Pius V (1 May, 1572), and, though still feeble, he started for the conclave, which lasted one day and resulted in the election of Cardinal Ugo Buoncompagni, with the title of Gregory XIII, 13 May, 1572. As medical treatment had not restored Charles to health, he now abandoned it and returned to his ordinary rule of life, with the result that he was before long quite well. On his homeward journey he again visited Loreto, in November, and reached Milan on 12 November. He at this time resigned the offices of Grand Penitentiary, Archpriest of Santa Maria Maggiore, and other high dignities. In April, 1573, he held his third provincial council.

The new governor of Milan was Don Luigi di Requesens, who had known Charles in Rome. However, as soon as he took office, being urged by the opponents of Charles, he published some letters falsely incriminating Charles in questions of the royal authority and containing much that was contrary to the rights of the Church. Charles protested against their publication; with great reluctance, and after much anxious deliberation, he publicly pronounced, in August, sentence of excommunication explicitly against the grand chancellor and implicitly against the governor. As a consequence of this, libels were published in the city against Charles. The governor showed his displeasure by placing restrictions on the

meetings of the confraternities, also depriving Charles of the Castle of Arona. Various rumours were in circulation of more wicked plans against Charles, but his tranquillity was maintained, and he carried on his work with his usual care, despite the fact that the governor had placed an armed guard to watch his palace. None of the governor's actions succeeding, the governor was led to ask for absolution, which he obtained by deception. When Gregory XIII learned of this, he compelled the governor to make satisfaction to Charles. This was done, and on 26 November Charles announced that the governor was absolved from all penalties and censures. In this year Charles founded a college for the nobility at Milan.

In August, 1574, Henry III of France was passing through the Diocese of Milan on his way from Poland to take the French throne. Charles met him at Monza. The fourth diocesan synod was in November, 1574. Gregory XIII proclaimed a jubilee for 1575, and on the 8th of December, 1574, Charles left for Rome. He visited many shrines and, having reached Rome, performed the required devotions and started for Milan, in February. He assisted at the death-bed of his brother-in-law, Cesare Gonzaga, and continued the visitation of his province. In 1576 the jubilee was kept in the Diocese of Milan. It began on the 2nd of February. Whilst the jubilee was being celebrated, news came of outbreaks of plague in Venice and Mantua. The fourth provincial council was held in May. In August, Don John of Austria visited Milan. Religious exercises were being carried out, and his arrival was made the occasion of rejoicings and spectacular effects. All at once everything was changed, for the plague appeared in Milan. Charles was at Lodi, at the funeral of the bishop. He at once returned, and inspired confidence in all. He was convinced that the plague was sent as a chastisement for sin, and sought all the more to give himself to prayer. At the same time he thought of the people. He prepared himself for death, made his will (9 September, 1576), and then gave himself up entirely to his people. Personal visits were paid by him to the plague-stricken houses. In the hospital of St. Gregory were the worst cases; to this he went, and his presence comforted the sufferers. Though he worked so arduously himself, it was only after many trials that the secular clergy of the town were induced to assist him, but his persuasive words at last won them so that they afterwards aided him in every way. It was at this time that, wishing to do penance for his people, he walked in procession, barefooted, with a rope round his neck, at one time bearing in his hand the relic of the Holy Nail.

At the beginning of 1577 the plague began to abate, and though there was a temporary increase in the number of cases, at last it ceased. The Milanese vowed to build a church dedicated to St. Sebastian, if he would deliver them. This promise was fulfilled. Charles wrote at this time the "Memoriale", a small work, addressed to his suffragans, which had for its object to recall the lessons given by the cessation of the plague. He also compiled books of devotion for persons of every state of life. By the beginning of 1578 the plague had quite disappeared from all parts. At the end of 1578 the fifth diocesan synod was held. It lasted three days. Charles endeavoured at this time to induce the canons of the cathedral to unite with himself in community life. In this year, on the 16th of August, he began the foundation of the congregation of secular priests under the patronage of Our Lady and St. Ambrose, giving it the title of the Oblates of St. Ambrose. Though he had been helped by various orders of religious, especially by the Jesuits and the Barnabites, one of whom (now St. Alexander Sauli) was for many years his constant adviser, yet he felt the need of a body of men who could act as his assistants and, living in community, would be more easily impressed by his spirit and wishes. He was the master mind of this new congregation, and he ever insisted on the need of complete union between himself and its members. It was his delight to be with them, and, looking to him as a father, they were ready to go where he wished, to undertake works of every kind. He placed them in seminaries, schools, and confraternities. The remaining synods were held in 1579 and succeeding years, the last (the eleventh) in 1584.

His first pilgrimage to Turin, to visit the Holy Winding Sheet, was in 1578. About this time he first visited the holy mountain of Varallo to meditate on the mysteries of the Passion in the chapels there. In 1578–9 the Marquis of Ayamonte, the successor of Requesens as governor, opposed the jurisdiction of the archbishop, and in September of the latter year Charles went to Rome to obtain a decision on the question of jurisdiction. The dispute arose in consequence of the governor ordering the carnival to be celebrated with additional festivities on the first Sunday of Lent, against the archbishop's orders. The pope confirmed the decrees of the archbishop, and urged the Milanese to submit. The envoys sent by them were so ashamed that they would not themselves present the pope's reply. Gregory XIII had welcomed Charles and rejoiced at his presence. Charles did much work during his stay for his province, especially for Switzerland. In connexion with the rule which Charles drew up for the Oblates of St. Ambrose, it is to be noted that when in Rome he submitted it to St. Philip Neri, who advised Charles to exclude the vow of poverty. Charles defended its inclusion, so St. Philip said, "We will put it to the judgment of Brother Felix". This brother was a simple Capuchin lay brother at the Capuchins, close to the Piazza Barberini. St. Philip and St. Charles went to him, and he put his finger on the article dealing with the vow of poverty, and said, "This is what should be effaced". Felix was also a saint, and is known as St. Felix of Cantalicio. Charles returned to Milan by Florence, Bologna, and Venice, everywhere reviving the true ecclesiastical spirit. When he reached Milan, the joy of his people was great, for it had been said he would not return. After the beginning of Lent (1580), Charles began his visitation at Brescia; soon after, in April, he was called back to Milan to assist at the death-bed of the governor, Ayamonte. In this year Charles visited the Valtelline valley in the Grisons. In July he was brought to know a youth who afterwards reached great sanctity. He was invited by the Marquis Gonzaga to stay with him, and refused, but while staying at the archpriest's house he met the eldest son of the marquis, Luigi Gonzaga, then twelve years old, now raised to the altars of the Church as St. Aloysius Gonzaga, S. J. Charles gave him his first Communion. The next year (1581) Charles sent to the King of Spain a special envoy in the person of Father Charles Bascapè of the Barnabites, charging him to endeavour to come to an understanding on the question of jurisdiction. The result was that a governor, the Duke of Terra Nova, was sent, who was instructed to act in concert with Charles. After this no further controversy arose.

In 1582 Charles started on his last journey to Rome, both in obedience to the decrees of the Council of Trent, and to have the decrees of the sixth provincial council confirmed. This was his last visit, and during it he resided at the monastery attached to his titular church of Santa Prassede, where still are shown pieces of furniture used by him. He left Rome in January, 1583, and travelled by Siena and Mantua, where he had been commissioned by the pope to pronounce a judgment. A great portion of this year was taken up by visitations. In November he began a visitation as Apostolic visitor of all the cantons of Switzerland and the Grisons, leaving the affairs of his diocese in the hands of Monsignor Owen Lewis, his vicar-general.

He began in the Mesolcina Valley; here not only was there heresy to be fought, but also witchcraft and sorcery, and at Roveredo it was discovered that the provost, or rector, was the foremost in sorceries. Charles spent considerable time in setting right this terrible state of things. It was his especial care to leave holy priests and good religious to guide the people. Next he visited Bellinzona and Ascona, working strenuously to extirpate heresy, and meeting with much opposition from the Bishop of Coire. The negotiations were continued into the next year, the last of Charles on earth. All his work bore fruit, and his efforts in these parts ensured the preservation of the Faith. The heretics spread false reports that Charles was really working for Spain against the inhabitants of the Grisons. In spite of their falsehoods Charles continued to attack them and to defend the Catholics, who had much to suffer.

At the beginning of 1584 he had an attack of erysipelas in one leg, which obliged him to remain in bed. He however had a congress of the rural deans, sixty in number, with whom he fully discussed the needs of the diocese. He also made great exertions to suppress the licentiousness of the carnival. Knowing the needs of the invalids who left the great hospital he determined to found a convalescent hospital. He did not live to see it completed, but his immediate successor saw that the work was executed. During September and early October he was at Novara, Vercelli, and Turin. On the 8th of October he left Turin and thence travelled to Monte Varallo. He was going to prepare for death. His confessor, Father Adorno, was told to join him. On 15 October he began the exercises by making a general confession. On the 18th the Cardinal of Vercelli summoned him to Arona to discuss urgent and important business. The night before Charles spent eight hours in prayer on his knees. On the 20th he was back at Varallo; on the 24th an attack of fever came on: he concealed it at first, but suffering from sickness he was obliged to declare his state. For five days this state lasted, but still he said Mass and gave Communion daily, and carried on his correspondence. He seemed to know that death was at hand and determined to work as long as he had strength left. The foundation of the college at Ascona was not completed, and it was urgent that it should be finished in a short time, so Charles pressed on and started, in spite of his sufferings, on 29 October, having previously paid a farewell visit to the chapels. He was found prostrate in the chapel where the Burial of Our Lord was represented. He rode to Arona, thence went by boat to Canobbio, where he stayed the night, said Mass on the 30th, and proceeded to Ascona. He visited the college, and afterwards set out at night for Canobbio, staying a short time at Locarno, where he intended to bless a cemetery, but, finding himself without his pontifical vestments, he abandoned the idea. When he reached Canobbio the fever was decreasing, and he was very weak. The next day he took the boat for Arona and stayed there with the Jesuits, at the novitiate he had founded, and on All Saints' Day he said Mass for the last time, giving Communion to the novices and many of the faithful. The next day he assisted at Mass and received Holy Communion. His cousin, René Borromeo, accompanied him on the boat, and that evening he reached Milan. It was not known there that he was ill. He at once was visited by doctors, whose orders he obeyed. He would not allow Mass to be said in his room. A picture of Our Lord in the tomb was before him, together with two others of Jesus at Gethsemani and the body of the dead Christ. The physicians regarded the danger as extreme, and though there was a slight improvement, it was not maintained, and the fever returned with great severity. The archpriest of the cathedral gave him the Viaticum, which he received vested in rochet and stole. The administration of extreme unction was suggested. "At once", Charles replied. It was at once given, and afterwards he showed but little sign of life. The governor, the Duke of Terra Nova, arrived after great difficulty in getting through the crowds which surrounded and had entered the palace. The prayers for a passing soul were said, the Passion was read, with Father Bascapè and Father Adorno at the bedside, the words "Ecce venio" (Behold I come) being the last words he was heard to utter (3 November, 1584). On the 7th of November his requiem was sung by Cardinal Nicolò Sfondrato, Bishop of Cremona, afterwards Pope Gregory XIV. He was buried at night in the spot which he had chosen.

Devotion to him as a saint was at once shown and gradually grew, and the Milanese kept his anniversary as though he were canonized. This veneration, at first private, became universal, and after 1601 Cardinal Baronius wrote that it was no longer necessary to keep his anniversary by a requiem Mass, and that the solemn Mass of the day should be sung. Then materials were collected for his canonization, and processes were begun at Milan, Pavia, Bologna, and other places. In 1604 the cause was sent to the Congregation of Rites. Finally, 1 November, 1610, Paul V solemnly canonized Charles Borromeo, and fixed his feast for the 4th day of November.

The position which Charles held in Europe was indeed a very remarkable one. The mass of correspondence both to and by him testifies to the way in which his opinion was sought. The popes under whom he lived—as has been shown above—sought his advice. The sovereigns of Europe, Henry III of France, Philip II, Mary, Queen of Scots, and others showed how they valued his influence. His brother cardinals have written in praise of his virtues. Cardinal Valerio of Verona said of him that he was to the well-born a pattern of virtue, to his brother cardinals an example of true nobility. Cardinal Baronius styled him "a second Ambrose, whose early death, lamented by all good men, inflicted great loss on the Church".

It is a matter of interest to know that Catholics in England late in the sixteenth or at the beginning of the seventeenth century had circulated some life of St. Charles in England. Doubtless some knowledge of him had been brought to England by Blessed Edmund Campion, S. J., who visited him at Milan in 1580, on his way to England, stopped with him some eight days, and conversed with him every day after dinner. Charles had much to do with England in the days of his assistance to Pius IV, and he had a great veneration for the portrait of Bishop Fisher. Charles also had much to do with St. Francis Borgia, General of the Jesuits, and with St. Andrew of Avellino of the Theatines, who gave great help to his work in Milan.

The complete works of St. Charles—"Noctes Vaticanæ" and "Homilies"—were edited by J. A. Sassi and published in five volumes (Milan, 1747–8). The "Acta Ecclesiæ Mediolanensis" contain many works not included in the edition of Sassi. They were first published in 2 vols., Milan, 1599, and there have been several reprints, the last forming vols. II and III of the "Acta Eccl. Med." Vol. I of this edition will contain Acts previous to, and vol. IV Acts subsequent to, St. Charles. Some of his works which have been published separately are: "Pastorum Instructiones et Epistolæ", ed. by Westhoff, Münster, 1846; "Sermoni familiari di S. Carlo Borromeo fatti alle monache dette Angeliche", ed. by Volpi, Padua, 1720; "St. Charles' Instructions on Church Building", tr. by George J. Wrigley, London, 1857. For St. Charles' life (and bibliography) consult also a valuable article by F. Vernet, in Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, Fascic. XVII, cols. 2267–2272.

The chief sources for the life of St. Charles Borromeo are the three lives written by his contemporaries: VALERIO, *Vita*

Caroli Borromæi (Rome, 1586); BASCAPÈ, *De vitâ et rebus gestis Caroli Cardinalis S. Praxedis Archiepiscopi Mediolani* (Ingolstadt, 1592, and Lodi, 1858); GIUSSANO, *Vita di S. Carlo Borromeo* (Rome, 1610); another edition with Office of St. Charles prefixed, additions by GIUSSANO, and *Instructions to Parents and Children* by ST. CHARLES (Venice, 1613), Latin version by DE ROSSI, and notes by OLTROCCHI; *De vitâ et rebus gestis S. Caroli Borromæi* (Milan, 1751)—the notes by OLTROCCHI are most valuable as a mine of information. English version of GIUSSANO, with preface by MANNING, *The Life of St. Charles Borromeo, Cardinal Archbishop of Milan* (2 vols., London, 1884).

There are also the following: PENIA, tr. WIRTH, *S. Caroli Borromæi vita* (Cologne, 1611); TOURON, *La vie et l'esprit de S. Charles* (3 vols., Paris, 1761); MARTIN, *Histoire de la vie et l'épiscopat de S. Charles Borromée* (Paris, 1847); ANTONIO SALA, *Biografia di S. Carlo Borromeo* (Milan, 1858); ARISTIDES SALA, *Documenti circa la vita e le opere di San Carlo Borromeo* (3 vols., Milan, 1857–61); LOCATELLI, *Vita di S. Carlo* (Milan, 1882); SYLVAIN, *Histoire de S. Charles Borromée* (3 vols., Lille, 1884); HEALY THOMPSON (ed.), *Life of St. Charles Borromeo* (London, 1858 and 1893).

The following may also be consulted: BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 4 Nov.; FELLER, *Biographie universelle;* NEWMAN, *Essays, Critical and Historical*, II, 140; (for St. Charles on Preaching) ID., *Idea of a University and University Subjects* (9th ed., 1889); CATHOLIC RECORD SOCIETY, vols. II, IV, *Records of English Catholics*, II; *Douay Diaries* (London, 1878); JAMESON, *Legends of Monastic Orders* (London, 1867); *Life of Dom Bartholomew of the Martyrs*, tr. HERBERT (London, 1880); PRAT, *Vie de Ribadeneyra* (Paris, 1862); FABER, *Foreign Churches and Peoples* (London, 1842); *Cambridge Modern History*, II, III; ROHRBACHER, *Histoire de l'Eglise catholique* (Liège, 1847), XXIV; RANKE, *History of the Popes*, tr. in *Bohn's Library* (London, 1847).

WILLIAM FFRENCH KEOGH.

Charles V, EMPEROR (CHARLES I, KING OF SPAIN), b. at Ghent, 1500; d. at Yuste, in Spain, 1558; was a descendant of the house of Hapsburg, and to this descent owed his sovereignty over so many lands that it was said of him that the sun never set on his dominions. Charles was the son of Philip, Duke of Burgundy, by Joanna, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, and Burgundy was the first heritage to which he succeeded, on his father's death in 1506. As he was a minor at that time, his aunt, Margaret of Austria, undertook the regency for him. William of Chièvres, his father's chief counsellor, had charge of the prince's household; Adrian of Utrecht, the Humanist and professor of theology at Louvain, who undertook his education, appears to have exercised a deep and lasting influence on the opinions and convictions of his pupil.

Like many princes of his house, the boy developed slowly, showing no signs of a strong will. In January, 1515, he was declared to be of age, through the influence of Chièvres, who sought to destroy the power by which Margaret was forcing the Burgundian nobility into a too dynastic policy regardless of the country's need of peace. The peace of the country demanded an alliance with France, even though France should thus gain considerable influence in the internal affairs of Burgundy. Charles at once acceded to the wishes of the nobility (Treaties of Paris, 24 March, 1515, and Noyon, 13 August, 1516). Upon the death of Ferdinand of Aragon in January, 1516, Charles was named as his successor; but as the Duchess Joanna was still living, and Charles' brother Ferdinand, educated in Spain, was popular in that country, the realization of this arrangement was still in doubt. Of his own motion Charles immediately assumed the title of King of Castile, and announced his intention of going to Spain as soon as possible. It was not till the autumn of 1517 that he effected this purpose, and the Spanish opposition had meanwhile been silenced. But the power left in the hands of Chièvres, and the Burgundians provoked the uprising in Castile known as the War of the Communidad. It was a movement of the cities. In Castile the discontent of the ruling classes was joined to that of the handicraftsmen and labourers; in Valencia the movement was exclusively one of mechanics and the proletariat. The rebellion failed because the commercial cities of Southern Castile took no part in it, and because Charles, acting upon his own judgment, placed Spaniards, instead of foreigners, in positions of authority.

In 1520 Charles left Spain to take possession of the German Empire to which he had been elected. The French king, Francis I, had been his rival for the dignity; Leo X thought that his interests in Italy were endangered by Charles' election. The Kingdom of Navarre was already a matter of contention between France and Spain, while France and the Netherlands wrangled over the original Dukedom of Burgundy as well as Tournai, Flanders, Artois, and some lesser territories. War had not broken out over these questions, and nothing indicated that Charles would be a warlike prince; but he had broken the alliance with France made under Chièvres. The Holy See opposed the election of Charles even more vigorously than France. As King of Aragon, Charles was heir to the Kingdom of Naples, a papal fief; the investiture had not yet taken place, but it could not be withheld. If he should also become emperor, and thus obtain a title to Milan as well, there would result a political condition against which the popes since Innocent III had constantly fought—the union of Milan and Naples in one hand.

In spite of the opposition of Rome and France, Charles was elected (28 June, 1519), and everywhere received the title of "Emperor Elect". Leo X put no difficulties in Charles' way at Naples. The foundation had been laid for his universal empire. Not yet twenty years of age at the time of his election, he had shown a marked precocity of development. During a stay in the Netherlands of several months, after his return from Spain, and on his arrival in Germany, it became apparent that he had taken the reins of government into his own hands. His chief counsellor, Chièvres, died in May, 1521, and thenceforward Charles was practically free in all his decisions.

His first important service to the empire was to effect the successful issue of the Diet of Worms, exhibiting his entire independence and intellectual maturity. The Lutheran movement had extended so widely over Germany, that Aleander, the papal representative at the imperial Court, strenuously urged its suppression. Charles had already told him, in the Netherlands, that the affair seemed to him to be settled by the papal Bull of 15 June, 1520. But in Germany he was convinced that the opposition to the Roman Curia was widespread and that this opposition helped the monk, even among those who did not hold heretical doctrines. Still, as he told Aleander, Charles did not think it right to mix up his affairs with those of the pope. He promised the constituent estates of the empire a hearing for the monk before the imperial diet and in return received their promise that if Luther persisted in his heresy they would abandon him. Thus he gained time to turn his attention to temporal politics. He meant to bring to a successful conclusion the efforts which for a generation had been making to give the empire a better constitution, and increase its financial and military strength. An agreement was reached as to how the estates of the realm should share in its government, according to a scheme called the *Reichsregiment*—how the expenses of the imperial chamber etc. were to be met and how the estates were to furnish the emperor military assistance in war. In April, 1521, Luther appeared before the diet, but did not retract. Next day Charles in person appeared against him before the estates, and expressed his own views with an emphasis not expected from so taciturn a youth. On the 8th of May he prepared the ban against Luther, but it was not published until the 26th. In accordance with the promise given by the estates in February, he spoke for them all.

Had Charles had his way, he would have devoted himself for some time to the pressing internal needs

of his country. The constitution especially needed improvement; the finances were so disordered, and the debt so large, that the monarch was hampered in whatever he did, and could provide for the foreign interests of the empire only by very careful management. Owing to the primitive development of means of communication, he could not keep watch over the whole empire, which he therefore decided to divide into districts. Already convinced that he must make Spain the centre of his dominions and the mainstay of his politics, he for that reason determined to make it his personal charge, and went thither in the summer of 1522. Once in Spain, remote from Germany and his hereditary Hapsburg estates, he at first purposed to make them almost entirely independent of him, although he was more dissatisfied with the conditions there than with those of any other part of his empire. Reserving to himself only the general policy of the empire as a whole, he gave his Austrian possessions to his brother Ferdinand, in 1522, making him, at the same time, his representative at the head of the imperial government. The *Reichsregiment* having been abrogated in 1525, he had Ferdinand chosen King of Rome at the next opportunity (1530). He kept a firmer hold on the government of the Netherlands, but established a permanent regency for them also (1522), selecting for this function two able and thoroughly loyal women: first (till 1530), the faithful Margaret, and next his sister Maria of Hungary, who held the regency till Charles himself abdicated. Naples had been ruled by viceroys under his grandfather, and he continued this policy.

While Charles was completing these dispositions, he became involved in a great war. On the 8th of May, 1521, the date of the edict against Luther, an offensive alliance against France was signed by representatives of the pope and the emperor. Charles had desired only a defensive alliance, but Leo X, long an ally of Francis I, was now bent upon war against him, because Francis had prevented an extension of the papal territory which Leo desired. War would assuredly have broken out between Francis and Charles on the score of Navarre and Burgundy, even if Leo had not hastened the conflict; though it probably would not have attained such dimensions, nor would have lasted so long as it actually did; for Francis I was an irritable and fickle prince, not a man of strong will, and cared more for pleasure than for war. But, as a matter of fact, the main issue to be decided in the ensuing struggle (1521–29) was the extent of the papal power in Italy—the question, that is, whether the papacy or some foreign dynasty should be the dominant political power in the Peninsula. In the first year of this war Charles' generals won only a few minor victories in Spain and the Netherlands. In 1522 they took Milan from the French. To complete their victory they invaded France, in alliance with the Constable of Bourbon. But the army had been weakened by the siege of Milan, and the French succeeded in again invading Lombardy. Meanwhile Clement VII, who had succeeded Leo X, after the short pontificate of Adrian VI, feared that Charles might become too powerful in Italy, and, when the French returned, prepared to transfer his friendship to them. But before he came to a decision, the Spaniards completely defeated Francis at Pavia (24 February, 1525) and took him prisoner. Francis was carried to Spain and, to obtain his freedom, was forced to sign the Peace of Madrid (14 January, 1526), the terms of which greatly weakened the power of France and gave Charles a free hand in Italy. Charles believed that this peace would be lasting. But Clement VII exerted every effort to at once form a coalition against Charles, and to induce Francis to recommence the war. Under these circumstances Charles directed his army against Rome. The result of this action was the frightful sack of Rome by the imperial troops in 1527, which the emperor had never intended, but his generals were powerless to prevent, since discipline had vanished in presence of constant privations. After the sack, Charles' army was placed in a dangerous position, as the French advanced to relieve Rome and then besiege Naples. By superior generalship, however, the imperialists once more triumphed. The smaller Italian States, recognizing the hopelessness of opposing the imperial power, made an alliance with Charles. Clement also concluded a treaty of peace at Barcelona, 29 June, 1529; France at Cambrai, 5 August. The Peace of Cambrai settled the political situation of Western Europe for a long time, especially that of Italy.

Meantime Charles regulated the affairs of Spain and the Netherlands. These countries resembled each other in having been originally composed of many independent parts, gradually united under one sovereign. In both cases, too, the previously independent states had obstinately clung to their ancient interests, laws, and customs, and were moreover powerful against the Crown. By centralizing the general administration, and assimilating the laws and legal procedures, he sought to counteract the force of these nationalist tendencies. To this end, he perceived, the king, or (in the Netherlands) the regent, must be the centre of activity. In reorganizing the central bureaus in Spain (1523) and the Netherlands (1531), his main object was to entirely subordinate them to the royal power, and employ in them trained men who should consider themselves servants of the king. In the Netherlands, moreover, he brought about the dependence of the judicial and fiscal officials on the central administration. Through these new and efficient agencies he created an excellent police system as well as a body of laws which fostered the social and industrial life of the people, besides promoting agriculture as no other prince ever had. His commercial legislation was restrictive only when capitalistic excesses or the growth of the proletariat demanded restraint. The edict of 1531 for the Netherlands (promulgated 1540) and the state organization for the care of the poor illustrate this. The creation of these authorities and this system of laws at the same time had the effect of limiting the power of the Cortes and the States General, both of which bodies thereafter retained only the right of taxation, in the exercise of which, moreover, Charles succeeded in accustoming them to regular annual budgets, by explaining to them his own policy and enlightening them as to the needs of the country, and thus showing them why they should contribute revenue.

With individuals Charles dealt still more effectively—in Spain chiefly with the burghers, in the Netherlands with the higher nobility. The latter he won to his support by bestowing on them the most important offices and holding out hopes of the Golden Fleece; the former he hoped to win by leaving them the control of taxation, so that they might regulate it uniformly, and therefore less oppressively. He controlled the clergy by transferring to them an almost general right to the disposal of benefices, which had been granted by the popes either to his predecessors or to himself. He strove especially to foster the progressive industrial elements of the middle class. At the beginning of the century the old cloth industries of Flanders had been seriously threatened by English competition; under Charles the industries of the Netherlands were effectually protected by an entire change in system which may be regarded as a first step towards capitalistic industry. Antwerp became the world's great centre of commerce and finance. The cloth industry was strengthened by the introduction of factory methods, the linen industry fully developed. While furthering this progress, Charles used it to give political influence in the cities of the Low Countries to the progressive classes who were

CHARLES V—TITIAN

THE PINAKOTHEK, MUNICH

loyal to himself. Judged by its results, Charles' economic policy was successful in the Netherlands, but it succeeded only indifferently in Spain, where industrial progress, though much greater during this reign than it had been, was generally slow and never so marked as to produce great political changes. In Spain the opposition to Charles' policies was found in the Cortes and in the city governments, but still more among the lesser nobility, the *Hidalgueria*, who resisted all agricultural progress as well as the emperor's external policy. Most of the Castilians remained under Charles' rule the same frugal, contented, rustic people as before, in marked contrast to the people of the Netherlands. Yet by industrial improvement and political training, Charles was able to make of Spain the instrument by which his son Philip, in the time of the counter-Reformation, brought effective aid to the Catholics of Europe, and under the unfavourable circumstances this result is as remarkable as the prosperity which the Netherlands attained under his rule.

No less noteworthy were his services to the great empire rapidly springing up in America. Economical considerations being, in the early period of colonization, the most important, the management of American affairs was confided to a bureau of commerce (*casa de contratación*) in Seville; but at the same time he established in Spain a special political "Council of the Indies". In the colonies two viceroyalties and twenty-nine governments, four archbishoprics, and twenty-four bishoprics were gradually organized. Already all those great problems had arisen which still vex colonial politics—the question, how far the mother country should monopolize the products of the colonies; the question of colonization; the question of the treatment of the natives, doubly difficult because on the one hand their labour was indispensable and on the other it was most unwilling; the question, how Christianity and civilization might best be established; finally the question, how science might be systematically promoted by the government that opened up these new countries. On account of the great distance separating Spain and her colonies, the unsatisfactory means of communication, and his lack of funds, Charles was unable to carry out the principles laid down by his government. But he made the first, perhaps the only, attempt on a large scale to deal with colonial politics, in practical effect, from the double standpoint of political and economical interests and with the realization of a duty to promote Christian civilization.

When Charles received news of the Peace of Cambrai, he determined to go to Italy and settle Italian affairs by a personal interview with the pope. This difficult question, which had occupied him for almost a decade, was, as he thought, settled definitively. At Bologna he discussed with the pope principally two questions affecting all Christendom: the Turkish and the Lutheran. In 1521 the Turks had taken possession of Belgrade, the key to Hungary; in 1522, of Rhodes, the bulwark which had hitherto barred their way westward of the Ægean Sea. In the following year the daring pirate, Chaireddin Barbarossa, an ally of the sultan, placing himself at the head of the North African corsairs who were continually harassing the Italian and Spanish coasts, had built up a formidable power in the small Mohammedan States of the North African coast. On land the Turks had defeated the Hungarians at Mohács, and taken possession of almost the entire kingdom. Their way was thus opened to Vienna, which they entered in 1529. Equally great was the danger threatening Christianity from within. Lutheranism had boldly advanced when the edict against Luther remained unenforced, and it had been greatly stimulated by the social-revolutionary movements in Germany from 1522 to 1525. Since 1526 an independent State Church had been organized by the Protestants in several provinces with the aid of their sovereigns, and in 1529 these sovereigns declared at the Diet of Spires that they would allow no attacks on these organizations, nor tolerate any Catholic worship in their states.

As early as 1526 Charles was aware of these two growing dangers. He had thought that by the Peace of Madrid he would obtain freedom to carry on a war against the Turks, as well as to assume the regulation of religious affairs in Germany. But the new outbreak of war in Italy prevented him from giving attention to this work till 1529. On 24 February, 1530, he received the imperial crown from Clement VII at Bologna. On 1 February he had concluded a general peace with the pope and most of the Christian states. The retreat of the Turks from Vienna enabled Charles, before beginning war against them, to make an effort towards religious unity in Germany. In the summer he appeared at the Diet of Augsburg, accompanied by a papal legate, to hear the Protestants. The adherents of the new creed were disposed to approach him in a submissive temper, though on German soil Charles did not possess all the power they ascribed to him. He had disbanded his troops, and the purely political resources at his command were not great. Holding the Duchy of Würtemburg, he could thence exert pressure on several neighbouring princes, but his title to that duchy was not clear.

Having convinced himself that Catholics as well as Lutherans were irritated against Rome, Charles informed the pope that only the immediate summoning of a general council could bring about peace. He had always desired this; henceforth it became one of his principal aims, of which he never lost sight. At Rome he urged it with all his energy, using every effort to remove political obstacles. At the same time he was preparing to meet the next attack of the Turks. This came in 1532, on land. Charles was successful in forcing them back, and in recovering a large part of Hungary, but without inflicting any decisive defeat on the Turks. He transferred the war to the Mediterranean Sea. In 1530, by the advice of the pope, he had given to the Knights Hospitallers, the defenders of Rhodes, the island of Malta, which barred the approach of the Turkish fleet to the Tuscan Sea. In 1531 and 1532 Andrea Doria had sought the Turks in their own waters, but the Turkish fleet avoided a battle. The sultan now sought to prevent the return of Doria by giving the chief command of his navy to Chairaddin, thus making the cause of the pirates his own. Charles thereupon decided to clear the Mediterranean Sea of piracy. In 1535 he personally took part in the campaign against Tunis under the leadership of Doria. He had the largest share in the victory, and urged an immediate advance on Algiers to complete his success. His commanders, however, opposed this plan, as the season was far advanced. This campaign established Charles' reputation throughout Europe.

While Charles delivered the first serious blow against Islam on the Mediterranean, Paul III, the successor of Clement VII, had summoned a general council. But new difficulties prevented both the assembling of the council and the continuation of the war against the Turks. When Charles returned home from Africa it was evident that he must again go to war with France. Francis I opposed the meeting of the council and, moreover, entered into relations both with the Turks and with the Smalkaldic League of German Protestant princes formed against Charles soon after the Diet of Augsburg, while, upon the death of the last Sforza Duke of Milan, he renewed his claim to that fief. Charles, eager to push the war against the Turks, as well as to restore the unity of Christendom, was ready to partly forego his strict rights both in the Milanese and Burgundy, and to consider the question of the balance of power between his house and that

of Valois. Family alliances were proposed with this end in view. A war which Francis nevertheless began proved abortive, and in 1539 the rivals met at Nice, and peace seemed likely. Visiting the Netherlands and Germany, Charles soon found that new troubles awaited him, once more fomented by France. In 1538 the line of the Counts of Guelders had become extinct; but the last of that line had provided that, after his death, the countship should pass to the Dukes of Cleves-Jülich, the strongest temporal principality on the Lower Rhine. Guelders, accordingly, resisted annexation by Burgundy, and Charles would not consent to its annexation to the Duchy of Cleves-Jülich, which was favoured by Francis I and the Smalkaldic League. Moreover, Henry VIII of England, having married Anne, daughter of the Duke of Cleves, threatened to join this coalition.

In Hungary, meanwhile, the Turks were again active, and preparations were being made to unite the French and Turkish fleets in the Mediterranean. Francis sought the aid of the Danes and Scandinavians. Charles thought it best to avoid hostilities until he could break up the too formidable coalition of his enemies. He succeeded in detaching Henry of England from the alliance, and during the Diet and religious conference at Ratisbon, in 1541, where he was present in person, he brought Philip of Hesse, the leading spirit of the Smalkaldic League, under his control. He turned then upon the Turks. He intended that the imperial army should operate in Hungary while he attacked Algiers; but both plans failed. The year 1542 was an unfortunate one for him; the French entered the Netherlands, and the Smalkaldic League, with Hesse, attacked Henry of Brunswick, Charles' only ally in North Germany, and occupied his territories. The patriotism of the Netherlands held the French in check. Charles returned from Spain and, in 1543, attacked Cleves. A few days sufficed to make Guelders a part of Burgundy, which was thus protected on the side of Germany, though still exposed on its French frontier. It was to remedy this weakness that Charles established a line of fortresses which for centuries barred the way against French invasion. In 1544 he invaded France. The strength of Francis was exhausted, and, as Charles, too, was weary of war, a peace was concluded at Crespy (17 September, 1544).

Charles had now to consider whether he would allow liberty of action to the Protestant princes of Germany, to whom, under pressure of war, he had made concessions, especially at the Diet of Spires in 1544. Up to this time he had let affairs take their own course in Germany, and his brother Ferdinand had been unable to exert effectual pressure. The power of the feudatory princes, steadily increasing since 1521, was now established on a solid basis. In the emperor's absence they had, on their own initiative, found means to suppress several disturbances which might otherwise have plunged Germany into the horrors of civil war—first the League of the Knights, then the Peasants' War, then the disorders of the turbulent clergy who had embraced Lutheranism and led the masses astray, and lastly the rebellion of the Anabaptists (q. v.). By supporting Luther against Charles, the princes secured the means of maintaining the power which they had acquired by their resistance to the emperor. Charles perceived the gravity of the situation at least sufficiently to lead him to resolve upon open war against the princes. To deprive them of their religious leverage, he awaited the opening of the Council of Trent (1545). In the summer of 1546 he opened hostilities. He began by conquering South Germany, then pushed forward into Saxony, and defeated and captured the Elector at Mühlberg, 24 April, 1547. Soon after this he imprisoned Philip of Hesse. (The charges of treachery brought against Charles on this account, are not well sustained.) Charles now believed the princes to be sufficiently humbled to permit him to reorganize the empire with their help at a Diet at Augsburg, as he had previously reorganized Spain and the Netherlands. The settlement of religious difficulties was to be the basis of this reconstruction. He insisted that the council was to have the final decision in matters of doctrine; but until this decision was pronounced he wished for peace and was willing to make certain concessions to the Protestants (the *Interim*). His sense of justice, however, reserved from these concessions both the retention of the ecclesiastical property seized by the Reformers and the temporary abrogation of episcopal authority in the reformed districts. In consequence of this resolution the Interim lost all its attraction for the Evangelical princes. In dealing with the political reconstruction of the empire, Charles was ready to recognize the condition of Germany so far as it was the result of historical development. He required the feudatories to promise obedience to the imperial power only in specific cases affecting the general welfare, to bind themselves by certain recognized formulæ, and not to seek individual profit under pretext of the welfare of the empire. He therefore made here concessions like those already made to his Spanish subjects—namely, a certain degree of autonomy to the several States, in return for their aid in the unquestioned necessities of the empire. No open opposition was made at the Diet, but nothing was done. The Catholics demanded that the Interim should apply to them also; that instrument now no longer made for harmony, and the Protestants resisted it more strenuously than before. On the other hand, the German princes were as selfish and provincial as the hidalgos of Castile, and less patriotic. They procrastinated until affairs took an unfavourable turn for the emperor.

But Charles was now ready to dispose of his earthly possessions. His recent campaigns had so undermined his strength as to render it advisable for him to make his will. Warned by the grasping policy of Francis I, he determined to keep the possessions of his family together. He would not, however, leave them all to one heir, knowing how impossible it had been for even him to govern all to his own satisfaction. What his plans were is unknown, but while he was considering them the Turks and the French king (now Henry II) once more began hostilities against him (1551). In the following year some of the German Protestant princes, led by Maurice of Saxony, unexpectedly attacked the imperial forces, while Charles lay sick at Innsbruck, and Henry II occupied the Bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun. Charles escaped, but abandoned his plan for the reorganization of the imperial government. He empowered Ferdinand to conclude the Treaty of Passau with the insurgents in April, 1552, which finally gave the ascendency in the German Empire to the princes. His attempt to retake Metz, in the autumn of 1552, failed, and the war was transferred to the Netherlands, where it was waged without decisive result. In North Africa, also, and in Italy, where the Turks, the French, and some Italian States were attacking the emperor, matters became critical. Still the emperor hoped to win a final victory. For in 1553 the accession of Mary Tudor to the throne of England suddenly excited his hope that he might extend his influence in that kingdom. Mary Tudor was ready to marry his son Philip, and in 1554 this alliance became a fact. When their marriage proved childless, the emperor gave up the fight and decided to turn over the conclusion of peace to Philip and Ferdinand. Ferdinand insisted that the authority of princes in the empire, as settled by the agreement of Passau, should be legally recognized by a decree of the Diet, and the equality of the Catholic and Lutheran religions accepted. This was done at Augsburg in 1555. Charles then requested the

electors to accept his abdication and to elect Ferdinand his successor. This was done on 28 February, 1558. Shortly after the final decree of the Diet of Augsburg, in 1555, Charles convened the Estates of the Netherlands, and in their presence transferred the government to Philip. Three months later (16 January, 1556) he transferred the Spanish Crown to his son. In spite of this he could not free himself from political cares. It was September, 1556, before he could leave for his long-chosen place of retirement in Spain, accompanied by his two sisters, the widow of the French king, and Maria of Hungary. But he did not live a monastic life even at Yuste. Messengers with political despatches came to him every day. However, he took no active part in affairs. He lived his few remaining months on earth amid works of art, of which he had a keen appreciation (Titian was his favourite painter), amid the books which, as a cultured man, he studied and took pleasure in, and enjoying the music which he loved, while he prepared himself for the life to come.

SANDOVAL, *Historia de la vida y hechos del emperador Carlos V* (Antwerp, 1581); SLEIDANUS, *De statu religionis et reipublicæ Carolo V cæsare* (Strasburg, 1555); *Deutsche Reichstagsakten* (Gotha, 1893–1905); LANZ, *Korrespondenz des Kaisers Karl V* (Leipzig, 1844–46); *Staatspapiere zur Gesch. des Kaisers Karl V* (Stuttgart, 1845); *Aktenstücke u. Briefe z. Gesch. Kaiser Karls V* (Vienna, 1853); RODRIGUEZ VILLA, *El emperador Carlos V y su corte* (Madrid, 1905); *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland I. Abt.* 1533–1559 (Gotha, 1892–1900), I–IV, VIII, IX, XII; *Relazioni degli ambasciatori Veneti al senato*, ed. ALBÉRI (Florence, 1839–62), *Venetianische Depeschen vom Kaiserhofe* (1889–96); GLAY, *Négociations diplomatiques entre la France et l'Autriche durant les trente premières années du 16. siècle.* (Paris, 1845); *Papiers d'état du cardinal de Granvelle . . . publiés sous la direction de Ch. Weiss* (Paris, 1841–52); *Calendar of State Papers; Recueil des ordonnances de Charles V* (Brussels, 1898–1906); FORONDA, *Viajes y estancias de Carlos V* (Madrid, 1895); GACHARD, *Voyages des souverains des Pays-Bas* (Brussels, 1874–82); ARMSTRONG, *The Emperor Charles V* (London, 1902); BAUMGARTEN, *Geschichte Karls V* (Stuttgart, 1885–92); HÄEBLER, *Geschichte Spaniens unter den Habsburgern* (Gotha, 1907); HENNE, *Histoire du règne de Charles-Quint en Belgique* (Brussels and Leipzig, 1858–59); PIRENNE, *Geschichte Belgiens* (1477–1576) (Gotha, 1907), 1477–1576; RACHFAHL, *Wilhelm von Oranien und der niederländische Aufstand* (Halle, 1906); LAVA, *Storia documentata di Carlo V in correlazione all' Italia* (Venice and Padua, 1863–93); PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste* (Freiburg, 1906, 1907), IV.

MARTIN SPAHN.

Charles Martel, b. about 688; d. at Quierzy on the Oise, 21 Oct., 741. He was the natural son of Pepin of Herstal and a woman named Alpaïde or Chalpaïde. Pepin, who died in 714, had outlived his two legitimate sons, Drogon and Grimoald, and to Theodoald, a son of the latter and then only six years old, fell the burdensome inheritance of the Frankish monarchy. Charles, who was then twenty-six, was not excluded from the succession on account of his birth, Theodoald himself being the son of a concubine, but through the influence of Plectrude, Theodoald's grandmother, who wished the power invested in her own descendants exclusively. To prevent any opposition from Charles she had him cast into prison and, having established herself at Cologne, assumed the guardianship of her grandson. But the different nations whom the strong hand of Pepin of Herstal had held in subjection, shook off the yoke of oppression as soon as they saw that it was with a woman they had to deal. Neustria gave the signal for revolt (715), Theodoald was beaten in the forest of Cuise and, led by Raginfrid, mayor of the palace, the enemy advanced as far as the Meuse. The Frisians flew to arms and, headed by their duke, Ratbod, destroyed the Christian mission and entered into a confederacy with the Neustrians. The Saxons came and devastated the country of the Hattuarians, and even in Austrasia there was a certain faction that chafed under the government of a woman and child. At this juncture Charles escaped from prison and placed himself at the head of the national party of Austrasia. At first he was unfortunate. He was defeated by Ratbod near Cologne in 716, and the Neustrians forced Plectrude to acknowledge as king Chilperic, the son of Childeric II, having taken this Merovingian prince from the seclusion of the cloister, where he lived under the name of Daniel. But Charles was quick to take revenge. He surprised and conquered the Neustrians at Amblève near Malmédy (716), defeated them a second time at Vincy near Cambrai (21 March, 717), and pursued them as far as Paris. Then retracing his steps, he came to Cologne and compelled Plectrude to surrender her power and turn over to him the wealth of his father, Pepin. In order to give his recently acquired authority a semblance of legitimacy, he proclaimed the Merovingian Clotaire IV King of Austrasia, reserving for himself the title of Mayor of the Palace. It was about this time that Charles banished Rigobert, the Bishop of Reims, who had opposed him, appointing in his stead the warlike and unpriestly Milon, who was already Archbishop of Trier.

The ensuing years were full of strife. Eager to chastise the Saxons who had invaded Austrasia, Charles in the year 718 laid waste their country to the banks of the Weser. In 719 Ratbod died, and Charles seized Western Friesland without any great resistance on the part of the Frisians, who had taken possession of it on the death of Pepin. The Neustrians, always a menace, had joined forces with the people of Aquitaine, but Charles hacked their army to pieces at Soissons. After this defeat they realized the necessity of surrendering, and the death of King Clotaire IV, whom Charles had placed upon the throne but two years previously, facilitated the reconciliation of the two great fractions of the Frankish Empire. Charles acknowledged Chilperic as head of the entire monarchy, while, on their side, the Neustrians and Aquitanians endorsed the authority of Charles; but, when Chilperic died, the following year (720), Charles appointed as his successor the son of Dagobert III, Thierry IV, who was still a minor, and who occupied the throne from 720 to 737. A second expedition against the Saxons in 720 and the definitive submission of Raginfrid, who had been left the County of Angers (724), re-established the Frankish Monarchy as it had been under Pepin of Herstal, and closed the first series of Charles Martel's struggles. The next six years were devoted almost exclusively to the confirming of the Frankish authority over the dependent Germanic tribes. In 725 and 728 Charles went into Bavaria, where the Agilolfing dukes had gradually rendered themselves independent, and re-established Frankish suzerainty. He also brought thence the Princess Suanehilde, who seems to have become his mistress. In 730 he marched against Lantfrid, Duke of the Alemanna, whom he likewise brought into subjection, and thus Southern Germany once more became part of the Frankish Empire, as had Northern Germany during the first years of the reign. But at the extremity of the empire a dreadful storm was gathering. For several years the Mohammedans of Spain had been threatening Gaul. Banished thence in 721 by Duke Eudes, they had returned in 725 and penetrated as far as Burgundy, where they had destroyed Autun. Duke Eudes, unable to resist them, at length contented himself by negotiating with them, and to Othmar, one of their chiefs, he gave the hand of his daughter. But this compromising alliance brought him into disfavour with Charles, who defeated him in 731, and the death of Othmar that same year again left Eudes at the mercy of Mohammedan enterprise. In 732 Abd-er-Rahman, Governor of Spain, crossed the Pyrenees at the head of an immense army, overcame Duke Eudes, and advanced by way of Bordeaux as far as the Loire, pillaging and burning as he went. In October, 732, Charles met Abd-er-Rahman outside of Tours and defeated and slew him in a battle which must ever remain one of the great events in the history of the world, as upon its issue depended whether

Christian civilization should continue or Mohammedanism prevail throughout Europe. It was this battle, it is said, that gave Charles his name, *Martel* (*Tudites*) "The Hammer", because of the merciless way in which he smote the enemy.

The remainder of Charles Martel's reign was an uninterrupted series of triumphant combats. In 733–734 he suppressed the rebellion instigated by the Frisian duke, Bobo, who was slain in battle, and definitively subdued Friesland, which finally adopted Christianity. In 735, after the death of Eudes, Charles entered Aquitaine, quelled the revolt of Hatto and Hunold, sons of the deceased duke, and left the duchy to Hunold, to be held in fief (736). He then banished the Mohammedans from Arles and Avignon, defeated their army on the River Berre near Narbonne, and in 739 checked an uprising in Provence, the rebels being under the leadership of Maurontus. So great was Charles' power during the last years of his reign that he did not take the trouble to appoint a successor to King Thierry IV, who died in 737, but assumed full authority himself, governing without legal right. About a year before Charles died, Pope Gregory III, threatened by Luitprand, King of Lombardy, asked his help. Now Charles was Luitprand's ally because the latter had promised to assist him in the late war against the Mohammedans of Provence, and, moreover, the Frankish king may have already suffered from the malady that was to carry him off—two reasons that are surely sufficient to account for the fact that the pope's envoys departed without gaining the object of their errand. However, it would seem that, according to the terms of a public act published by Charlemagne, Charles had, at least in principle, agreed to defend the Roman Church, and death alone must have prevented him from fulfilling this agreement. The reign, which in the beginning was so full of bloody conflicts and later of such incessant strife, would have been an impossibility had not Charles procured means sufficient to attract and compensate his partisans. For this purpose he conceived the idea of giving them the usufruct of a great many ecclesiastical lands, and this spoliation is what is referred to as the secularization by Charles Martel. It was an expedient that could be excused without, however, being justified, and it was pardoned to a certain extent by the amnesty granted at the Council of Lestines, held under the sons of Charles Martel in 743. It must also be remembered that the Church remained the legal owner of the lands thus alienated. This spoliation and the conferring of the principal ecclesiastical dignities upon those who were either totally unworthy or else had naught but their military qualifications to recommend them—as, for instance, the assignment of the episcopal Sees of Reims and Trier to Milon—were not calculated to endear Charles Martel to the clergy of his time. Therefore, in the ninth century Hincmar of Reims related the story of the vision with which St. Eucher was said to have been favoured and which showed Charles in hell, to which he had been condemned for robbing the Church of its property.

But notwithstanding the almost exclusively warlike character of his reign, Charles Martel was not indifferent to the superior interests of civilization and Christianity. Like Napoleon after the French Revolution, upon emerging from the years 715–719, Charles, who had not only tolerated but perpetrated many an act of violence against the Church, set about the re-establishment of social order and endeavoured to restore the rights of the Catholic hierarchy. This explains the protection which in 723 he accorded St. Boniface (Winfrid), the great apostle of Germany, a protection all the more salutary as the saint himself explained to his old friend, Daniel of Winchester, that without it he could neither administer his church, defend his clergy, nor prevent idolatry. Hence Charles Martel shares, to a certain degree, the glory and merit of Boniface's great work of civilization. He died after having divided the Frankish Empire, as a patrimony, between his two sons, Carloman and Pepin.

Chronicorum Fredegarii scolastici continuatio, in *Scriptores rerum merovingicarum*, II; CAUER, *De Karolo Martello*, (Berlin, 1846); VELTMAN, *De Karoli Martelli patriciatu*, (Münster, 1836); BREYSIG, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reichs* (Leipzig, 1869); RICHTER, *Annalen der deutsch. Gesch. im M. A.* (Halle, 1873), I; BUCHANAN in *Dict. of Christian Biog.* (Boston, 1877), I, 461–63.

GODEFROID KURTH.

Charleston, DIOCESE OF (CAROLOPOLITANA), now comprises the entire State of South Carolina, U. S. A. (area 30,170 sq. miles). It was established 12 July, 1820, and then included both Georgia and North Carolina. The former state became the territory of the new Diocese of Savannah in 1850, and in 1868 North Carolina became a vicariate Apostolic. Mass was first said in Charleston in 1786, by an Italian

CATHEDRAL OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST

priest on his way to South America, for a congregation of twelve persons. A year or two later the congregation numbered about 200, at which time an Irish priest named O'Reilly (according to Ramsay) or Ryan (according to Shea) celebrated Mass for 200 Catholics in an abandoned Methodist meeting-house. In 1789 this property was purchased by the Rev. Thomas Keating and the building renovated as St. Mary's Church. Religious disabilities were still on the law-books, but in 1791 an Act of the Legislature incorporated the Roman Catholic Church of Charleston. The first Bishop of Charleston, the Rt. Rev. John England, was consecrated in Cork, Ireland, 21 Sept., 1820, and reached Charleston in December of that year. Because of dissensions in St. Mary's congregation he erected a plain wooden structure in 1821, and made it his cathedral under the title of St. John and St. Finbar. His admirable administration marks an epoch not only in the history of the diocese, but also in that of the Catholic Church in the United States, and is more fully treated in the article ENGLAND, JOHN. He died 11 April, 1842, lamented by all. His former coadjutor, the Rt. Rev. William Clancy was transferred in 1843 to the Vicariate Apostolic of Guiana. The second Bishop of Charleston, the Rt. Rev. Ignatius A. Reynolds, was consecrated in Cincinnati, 10 March, 1844, and signalized his episcopate by the publication of an edition (in five volumes) of the works of his predecessor and the erection of a new cathedral. He was a very ascetic man and tireless worker, and died 9 March, 1855. The third bishop of the see was the Rt. Rev. Patrick Neisen Lynch, a brilliant graduate of the Propaganda Col-

lege at Rome, and one of the most learned members of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States; his numerous lectures, essays and treatises exhibit the versatility and accuracy of his knowledge. His episcopate was marked by grievous afflictions. The disastrous fire of 1861, closely following the opening of hostilities in Charleston harbour during the Civil War, destroyed the cathedral, the bishop's residence, and other valuable property, together with the diocesan library. The subsequent bombardment of the city for nearly two years wrought further damage, closed most of the churches, and depleted and impoverished the congregations. General Sherman's occupation of Columbia was marked by the burning of St. Mary's College, the Sisters' Home and the Ursuline Convent.

Towards the end of the war Bishop Lynch went to Europe as the accredited representative of the Confederacy on a confidential mission. On his return immediately after the war, he stood in the midst of ruins, among a destitute and dejected people, with a diocesan debt of over $200,000 pressing upon him. He at once began to collect funds throughout the country for the immediate needs of his diocese and to liquidate its indebtedness. Most of the succeeding seventeen years were devoted to this work; he left but a small balance of the debt unpaid at his death, 22 February, 1882, having in the meantime built a pro-cathedral, purchased an episcopal residence and restored much church property. He was a member of the Vatican Council (1869-70) to which he was accompanied by the Rev. Dr. James A. Corcoran (q. v.) one of the most erudite of the American priesthood then working in the Charleston Diocese. During the frequent absence of Bishop Lynch the diocese was ably governed by his vicar-general, Dr. Quigley, pastor of St. Patrick's Church, under whom was opened St. Francis Xavier's Infirmary, built with the bequest of a devout lady, and conducted by the Sisters of Mercy.

The fourth bishop, the Rt. Rev. Henry Pinckney Northrop (consecrated 8 January, 1882), was transferred (27 January, 1883) from the Vicariate Apostolic of North Carolina to Charleston. On the night of 31 August, 1886, Charleston was visited by an earthquake which wrecked the pro-cathedral and episcopal residence, and wrought great damage to ecclesiastical property in the city. Through the generous contributions of benefactors in the North, churches, rectories and institutions were completely restored. Under previous bishops churches were erected in the principal cities of the diocese. Bishop Northrop kept pace with the material progress of the State, and dedicated twelve churches, besides the new Cathedral of St. John the Baptist, one of the most beautiful in the South, consecrated 14 April, 1907. The solicitude of Bishop England for the spiritual welfare of the coloured people was emulated by his successors. In 1867 Bishop Lynch purchased and dedicated a church for them exclusively. Its flourishing school is in charge of the Sisters of Mercy residing at St. Catherine's Convent attached to the church, established under Bishop Northrop, and named for Mother Catherine Drexel, the generous benefactress of this church and school and of the coloured congregation at Catholic Cross Roads. The Sisters of Mercy, who were introduced in 1829, care for the orphans and devote their educational labours to academies and parochial schools. The Ursulines began their foundation in 1834, and have had as pupils daughters of the leading citizens of the State. In 1907 Bishop Northrop introduced the Ladies of the Cenacle. The religious statistics (1908) are as follows: Priests, 19; churches with resident priests, 12; missions with churches, 17; stations, 75; religious women and postulants, 98; students in seminary, 4; academies for young ladies, 5; pupils, 337; parishes with parochial schools, 8; pupils, 590; orphans cared for, 72; hospital, 1; Catholic population, 9,650.

SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1889–92); O'GORMAN, *Hist. of the Cath. Ch. in the U. S.* (New York, 1895), passim; *The United States Catholic Miscellany*, files (Charleston, 1822–1862).

P. L. DUFFY.

Charlevoix, FRANÇOIS-XAVIER, historian, b. at St-Quentin, France, 24 October, 1682, d. at La Flèche, 1 February, 1761. He entered the Society of Jesus, 15 September, 1698, at the age of sixteen, studied philosophy at the Collège de Louis le Grand (1700–1704), and then went to Quebec, where he taught grammar from 1705 to 1709. During the years spent in Canada, he gathered material for his future "History of New France". He returned to Paris in 1709 and studied theology for four years. In 1720, under instructions from the French Court, he began his travels through the French colonies to gather information for the discovery of the Western sea. He embarked at La Rochelle in July of that year, and reached Quebec towards the end of September. He proceeded up the St. Lawrence River and through the Great Lakes to Michillimackinac, from which place he journeyed to the lower end of the territory of the Puans or Winnebago Indians. Entering Lake Michigan he continued along the eastern shore and at length after much endeavour reached the Illinois, whence he descended the Mississippi to its mouth. The vessel upon which he embarked for San Domingo was wrecked near the Bahamas and the expedition was temporarily abandoned.

Charlevoix and his companions returned to the Mississippi by way of the coast of Florida. His second attempt to gain the Island of San Domingo proved more successful, and he reached this colony at the beginning of September, 1722, and left at the end of the same month. He embarked for Havre 24 December, 1722. After his return to France, in 1723, he made a journey to Italy, fulfilling the various duties of his order and working for twenty-two years as an editor of the "Mémoires de Trévoux", a monthly journal of bibliography, history, and science.

His works are: (1) "Histoire du Japon" (3 vols., 12mo, Rouen, 1715); entirely rewritten (2 vols., 4to, and 9 vols., 12mo, Paris, 1736); revised and re-edited (6 vols., 12mo, Paris, 1754). The history is enriched with maps and plates, and embraces all that is interesting in Kämpfer's work, "History of Japan and Siam". At the end is a résumé of all the works on Japan published up to that time. (2) "La Vie de la Mère Marie de l'Incarnation" (8vo, Paris, 1724). (3) "Histoire de l'Isle Espagnole ou de S. Domingue" (2 vols., 4to, Paris, 1730–31; 2 vols., 8vo, Amsterdam, 1733). This work was compiled from data and manuscripts furnished him by Père Le Pers, who had lived in San Domingo for twenty-five years, and also from reports which are preserved in the Dépôt de la Marine of France. (4) "Histoire et description générale de la Nouvelle-France" (3 vols. 4to, and 6 vols. 12mo, Paris, 1744), with maps and plates; English translation (2 vols., 8vo, London, 1761; London, 1763: 2 vols., 8vo, Dublin, 1766). The English version of 1763 has the following descriptive title: "Letters to the Duchess of Lesdiguières; giving an Account of a voyage to Canada, and travels through that vast Country, and Louisiana to the Gulf of Mexico. Undertaken By Order of the present King of France. By Father Charlevoix. Being a more full and accurate description of Canada, and the neighbouring Countries than has been before published; the character of every Nation or Tribe in that vast Tract being given: their Religion, Customs, Manners, Traditions, Government, Languages, and Towns; the Trade carried on with them, and at what places; the Posts or Forts, and settlements, established by the French; the Great Lakes, Water Falls and Rivers, with the manner of navigating them; the Mines, Fisheries, Plants, and Animals

of these Countries. With reflections on the Mistakes the French have committed in carrying on their Trade and Settlements; and the most proper method of proceeding pointed out. Including also an account of the Author's Shipwreck in the Channel of the Bahamas, and return in a boat to the Mississippi, along the Coast of the Gulf of Mexico, with his voyage from thence to St. Domingo and back to France." John Gilmary Shea issued a translation in six volumes (New York, 1866–72). The edition, limited to 25 copies in quarto and 250 in octavo, contains several portraits engraved on copper (cf. J. R. G. Hassard, in Catholic World, September, 1873). (5) "Histoire du Paraguay" (3 vols., 4to, Paris, 1756; 6 vols., 12mo, Paris, 1757; tr., 2 vols., 8vo, London, 1769). (6) "Eulogy on Cardinal de Polignac", published in the "Mémoires de Trévoux", 1742, pp. 1053–1091. (7) "Suggestions for a History of the New World", founded upon the chronological records of America, also in the "Mémoires de Trévoux", 1735, pp. 161–172, and inserted in the "History of New France".

What the critics thought of his works may be found in his own preface to "L'Histoire de la Nouvelle-France". One censor found the whole first volume useless, another complained that he was too concise. He is accused of depreciating Kämpfer's work in the "Histoire du Japon" and of having given too much space to religious matters. Rochemonteix, though regarding him as a "historien de valeur", finds fault with him for occasional carelessness and for differing somewhat in his history from the accounts of the missionaries. With regard to his "Histoire de la Nouvelle-France", John Gilmary Shea says that "it is too well known and too highly esteemed both for style and matter to need any explanation of its scope or object. The praise of Gibbon will alone assure the reader that as an historical work it is of no inconsiderable merit".

SHEA, *History of New France* (translation, New York, 1866–72); ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1895–96), III, 367; THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896–1901), index, 149; MICHAUD, *Biog. Univ.*, VII, 658; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II, 1075–1080.

E. P. SPILLANE.

Charlier, JEAN. See GERSON.

Charlottetown, DIOCESE OF (CAROLINAPOLITANA), includes all Prince Edward Island (formerly called St. John's Island), the smallest province of the Dominion of Canada. It is situated in the southern waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and, together with the Magdalen Islands lying about sixty miles to the north-east of it, constitutes a diocese which takes its name from Charlottetown, the chief town of Prince Edward Island. The history of Catholicity in the territory now comprised in the Diocese of Charlottetown goes back to the year 1719, when all the islands in the Gulf of St. Lawrence were granted by the King of France to Count Saint-Pierre, a nobleman of his court. Up to that time the population of Prince Edward Island consisted of a few Indians, but on its concession to Count Saint-Pierre immigration set in, and soon a number of settlements were formed, the chief one being at Port La Joie, where the count had established his head-quarters. The first priest to labour in the new colony was René-Charles De Breslay, a Sulpician who came from France in April, 1721, and who was joined a few months later by Marie-Anselme de Metivier, a priest of the same community. These two priests remained only about two years, and on their return to France their place was taken by Franciscans, who for thirty years ministered to the spiritual wants of the colony. Meanwhile, by the influx of settlers from France and Acadia, the population had so increased that a system of parochial organization became necessary, and parishes were gradually formed, to preside over which four priests came from France by request of the Bishop of Quebec, whose diocese then comprised the whole of Canada. Thus, in 1753, five priests laboured in Prince Edward Island, viz., Father Girard at Point Prim, Father Cassiet at Scotchfort, Father Biscaret at St. Peter's, Father Dosquet at Malpeque, and Father Aubré, a Franciscan, at Port La Joie. Unfortunately, these prosperous conditions did not long endure. They gave way before the English invasion of 1758, when most of the people were driven out, the churches razed to the ground, and the clergy forced to leave the country. For these reasons Prince Edward Island was without a resident priest from 1758 till 1772, when there arrived an immigration of Scottish Catholics, accompanied by a priest, the Rev. James Macdonald, who continued in charge of the whole colony till his death in 1785. Five years later a second band of Scottish Catholics came to swell the population, bringing with them the Rev. Angus Bernard MacEachern, the most striking figure in the early history of Catholicity in the Diocese of Charlottetown.

At this time Father Le Roux laboured in the Magdalen Islands, having been sent thither by the Bishop of Quebec to minister to the Acadians who had settled in that locality. He built a small church at the foot of Demoiselle Mountain on Amherst Island, where he remained till 1793, when he was succeeded by Father Alain. In 1798 two priests, Father De Calonne and Father Pichard, came to Prince Edward Island and took up their residence, the former in Charlottetown, the latter at Rustico. The first bishop to visit Prince Edward Island was the Rt. Rev. Pierre Denaut, Bishop of Quebec, who went there in the summer of 1803. In 1812 his successor, the Rt. Rev. Joseph-Octave Plessis, visited the Maritime Provinces, bringing with him a priest, the Rev. Jean-Louis Beaubien, whom he stationed at Rustico, and to whom he entrusted the spiritual care of all the Acadian missions in Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen Islands. In the year 1819 Father MacEachern was named titular Bishop of Rosea, and received episcopal consecration in Quebec 17 June, 1821. The following year witnessed the ordination at Quebec of the first native priest, Father Bernard Donald Macdonald, who returned home in the early autumn to take charge of the Acadian missions. The Bishop of Rosea at first was merely vicar-general to the Bishop of Quebec, and, though performing episcopal duties throughout the greater part of the Maritime Provinces, he did so without independent jurisdiction. But in August, 1829, Charlottetown was raised to the dignity of an episcopal see, and the Rt. Rev. Angus Bernard MacEachern became its first bishop. Besides Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen Islands, the new diocese comprised the whole of New Brunswick.

On taking possession of his see, one of the first duties to devolve on Bishop MacEachern was to establish an institution for the education of students destined for the priesthood, and accordingly St. Andrew's College was founded at St. Andrews, Prince Edward Island, in November, 1831. On 22 April, 1835, the first Bishop of Charlottetown died and was succeeded by the Rev. Bernard Donald Macdonald, consecrated bishop at Quebec, 15 October, 1837. Five years later the diocese was dismembered, New Brunswick being made a separate diocese, with the see at St. John. Bishop Macdonald closed the college at St. Andrews in 1844, and in the beginning of the year 1855 the present College of St. Dunstan opened its doors to its first students. On the 28th of September, 1857, four sisters of the Congregation of Notre-Dame opened a convent in Charlottetown, where they began to give instruction to about sixteen pupils. Bishop Macdonald was called to his reward 30 December, 1859, and in the following year his successor, the Rt. Rev. Peter MacIntyre, received episcopal consecration in the

cathedral of Charlottetown, 15 August, 1860. The episcopate of Bishop MacIntyre covered a period of over thirty years, during which many churches and schools were erected throughout the diocese. He died 30 April, 1891, and was succeeded by the Rt. Rev. James Charles Macdonald, who had been named coadjutor with right of succession in the preceding year.

Catholicity is flourishing in the Diocese of Charlottetown. A population of fifty thousand, under the guidance of forty-five priests, worship in fifty-one churches, of which many are neat and elegant structures. Eight convents, wherein fifty nuns of the Congregation of Notre-Dame give instruction to over one thousand pupils, and St. Dunstan's College, with a roster of one hundred and thirty students, tell what is being done for Catholic education, whilst a fully-equipped hospital, under the care of the Sisters of Charity of Quebec, furnishes relief to the sick and suffering.

CASGRAIN, *Les Sulpiciens et les prêtres des Missions Etrangères en Acadie* (Quebec, 1897); IDEM, *Une Seconde Acadie; Archives of the Archdiocese of Quebec; Archives of the Diocese of Charlottetown;* MACMILLAN, *The Early History of the Catholic Church in Prince Edward Island* (Quebec, 1905).

J. C. MACMILLAN.

Charpentier, FRANÇOIS-PHILIPPE, a French engraver, inventor, and mechanician, b. at Blois, 1734; d. there 22 July, 1817. His father was a bookbinder, a poor man who made many sacrifices that his son might attend the Jesuit College at Blois; but after young Charpentier had studied there a few years he was compelled to leave and work to support himself. He chose to pursue the art of engraving as best suited to his talent and inclination, and entered the atelier of an excellent copperplate engraver in Paris whom he very soon surpassed. Charpentier is celebrated, however, far more for his inventions, which revolutionized reproductive art, than for his own work with the burin or in aquatint. His first discovery was that of a purely mechanical process for engraving in aquatint (*gravure au lavis*) and in colour. Wash-drawings and water-colours were copied with marvellous exactitude, sketches by the great masters were reproduced by his machine, and thus otherwise unknown art was placed within the reach of the people. Charpentier made many beautiful and effective plates with his new appliance, and then sold the secret. That admirable engraver and great patron of art, Count Caylus, was one of the first to use the new machine.

Louis XVI gave him the appointment of "Royal Mechanician" (*Mécanicien du Roi*), and provided a studio for him in the gardens of the Louvre, where he used the burning-mirror for melting metals without fire. He invented a fire-engine which was very generally adopted and, in 1771, a machine for drilling metals. Another invention for mechanical engraving was one which enabled lace-manufacturers to engrave in a few hours elaborate patterns and designs which formerly had required at least six months' work of the burin. Charpentier's device for lighthouse-illumination so pleased Louis XVI that he offered the inventor a pension and a place as the head of the Department of Beacons, asking him to fix the price for his discovery. Charpentier refused the pension and suggested that the office be given to a younger man, saying that he would "prefer freedom in order to devote himself to the development of his ideas". He received a thousand crowns for his discovery.

During the Directoire he made an instrument for boring six gun-barrels at once, and a machine to saw six boards simultaneously. For these the government paid him 24,000 francs and named him director of the *Atelier de perfectionnement*, established at the Hôtel Montmorency. Charpentier received many flattering offers from Russia and England for his labour-saving devices, but refused them all. Pious, generous, simple, credulous, Charpentier was the dupe of beggars and schemers, many of whom affixed their names to his inventions and made fortunes thereby. He died as he had lived, in poverty. The chief extant works of his, all prints, are: "Education of the Virgin", after Boucher; "Death of Archimedes", after Ferri; "Shepherdess", after Berchem; "Descent from the Cross", in colour, after Vanloo.

Biographie universelle s. v.; BRYAN, *Dict. of Painters and Engravers* (London, 1903).

LEIGH HUNT.

Charron, PIERRE, moralist, b. in Paris, 1541; d. there 6 Nov., 1603. He studied law at Bourges, but after several years' practice he embraced the ecclesiastical state. For thirty years he preached with so much success that the bishops vied with one another to engage his services. Queen Margaret of Navarre entertained him as her preacher in ordinary, and King Henry delighted to hear him even before his conversion to the Catholic Faith. In Bordeaux he met the famous Michel de Montaigne. Their acquaintance ripened into a close and lasting friendship. Montaigne bequeathed to his friend the right to wear his coat of arms, and Charron in return made the sister of Montaigne heir to his possessions. Charron published three books: "Les trois vérités" (Bordeaux, 1594), "Les discours chrestiens" (Cahors, 1600), and "Sagesse" (Bordeaux, 1601). Whilst engaged in bringing out a second edition of the latter, he died suddenly of apoplexy.

At a period of extraordinary religious agitation the "Trois vérités" (Three Truths) proved to be a very opportune and valuable apology. The "Discours chrestiens" were published only a few months before "Sagesse", and, like "Trois vérités", they were perfectly orthodox. But the book which carried Charron's influence and fame beyond the borders of France and down to our time is his "Sagesse". Its rich material, which Charron had gathered chiefly from Montaigne's conversations and essays, he divides into three parts: the nature of man; the duties of man as man; and the particular duties of the various classes and conditions of men. His standpoint is invariably that of a human philosopher. The sceptic spirit which pervades the whole book allows it to be summed up in a very few words: by his own natural light and strength man is incapable of finding principles of religion and morality sufficiently certain; and, being sure of nothing, it is consequently wise to live as conveniently and pleasurably as the common usage of the people among whom one lives allows. No attempt is made anywhere in the body of the book to conceal the baldness of this doctrine.

Had Charron, instead of engraving his easy-going "Je ne sçay" as the essence of all his worldly wisdom on the title-page of his "Sagesse" and over the entrance of his house, taken, like Descartes, the time and the trouble of finding a solid basis of moral and religious certainty, he would have shown himself a deeper and more independent philosopher and a worthier moralist. As it is, we need not wonder that the second edition of the "Sagesse" encountered great opposition and was allowed to appear only after some passages had been softened down, and others explained or corrected. Nor is the fierce onslaught of Garasse, who called Charron "*athée et le patriarche des esprits forts*", surprising, especially when, even in our days, nearly the same charge is made and ably supported by Ad. Franck in the "Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques". These accusations, however, take account neither of the time in which Charron lived, when philosophic uncertainty was not held to imply clearly the rejection of revealed authority; nor of the author's explicit professions that he intended his "Sagesse" as the best introduction to his "Trois vérités" and his "Discours chrestiens"; nor of the constant good opinion in which the author was held to the end of his life by his many ecclesiastical superiors.

Pierre Charron, *De la Sagesse* (Paris, 1632); Ad. Franck, in *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques;* G. Lanson in *La Grande Encyclopédie.*

Charles B. Schrantz.

Charterhouse.—From the fact that St. Bruno founded the first house of his austere order at Chartreux, near Grenoble, the institution has ever since been known by the name of that place. By lingual corruption, just as each house of that order is known in Spain as *cartuja* and in Italy as *certosa*, so in England the corruption of Chartreux took the form of charterhouse. The first English house of the order—the first charterhouse—was founded by King Henry II at Witham in Somersetshire, in 1181 (with a cell on Mendip); the last was the celebrated charterhouse of Sheen in Surrey, founded in 1414 by King Henry V. The other charterhouses were those of Hethorpe, the large cloister, within which is generally found the cemetery. From this cloister open out the monks' cells, each of which is a complete dwelling by itself. Besides the garden allotted to each recluse, which he cultivates according to his taste, he has a corridor where he may walk in the recreation hour. On the ground-floor a workroom stocked with tools affords him the necessary relaxation from his spiritual exercises, which fill up a considerable portion of the day. Above are two rooms: one, for sleeping, furnished with a board covered with a blanket; the other containing a stall and *prie-Dieu*, a work-table, bookshelf, two chairs, and a "refectory" set in the window recess.

The Carthusian's habit is white; his food consists of bread, fruit, herbs, and vegetables, varied on feast days by fish and cheese; once a week, at least, the



The London Charterhouse (Contemporary Drawing)

or Locus Dei, in Gloucestershire (1222), removed to Hinton in Somersetshire (1227); Beauvale, or Gresley Park, Nottinghamshire (1343); St. Anne's near Coventry, Warwickshire (1381); Kingston-upon-Hull, Yorks, East Riding (1378); and Mountgrace, Yorks, North Riding (1396); but the most renowned of these houses, because of the fate meted out to its prior, Blessed John Houghton, in 1535, and to its community by Henry VIII, was that of London. It was founded in 1371 by Sir Walter Manny, one of Edward the Third's most illustrious knights.

As all Carthusian houses follow the same plan in the main outlines of their disposition, though there may be variations in detail, one description stands for all. There are two court-yards, an outer and an inner. The outer one is flanked by long buildings containing the cells of the lay brethren, and such offices as the kitchen, pantry, bakehouse, forge, and carpenters' shop. Adjoining these buildings is the guest-house. The inner court-yard gives on to the chapter house and the refectory, which is divided into two portions, one for the choir-monks, the other for the lay brethren. At the further end is the church, which has no aisles, and, like the refectory, is divided into two parts. Beyond the church is Carthusian fasts on bread, water, and salt; flesh he never touches, even when ill. The chief feature of the life in a charterhouse is its complete solitude, which has served to preserve intact in all its austerity the original spirit of the order; so that the saying that it has never been reformed because it never grew lax is justified—"Cartusia nunquam reformata, quia nunquam deformata." See Carthusians.

Tractatus Statutorum Ordinis Cartusiensis pro Noviciis, etc. (Mon. Angl., VI, pp. v, xii); Gasquet, *English Monastic Life* (London, 2d ed., 1904); Hendriks, *The London Charterhouse* (London, 1889); Thompson, *A History of the Somerset Carthusians* (London, 1895).

Henry Norbert Birt.

Chartier, Alain, a French poet, b. about 1390, at Bayeux; d. between 1430 and 1440. It is believed he studied at the University of Paris, as did his brother Guillaume, Bishop of Paris, who died in 1472. Alain was considered an eminent writer during his life, and a century later he was still regarded by the best men of letters as a "noble poet and orator" (Jean Lemaire de Belges), and as "the father of French eloquence" (Jean Bouchet). He is better known to us by the famous story of Margaret of Scotland, who is said to have kissed his lips while



CATHEDRAL OF NOTRE DAME, CHARTRES

he was sleeping on a bench in her palace, to honour, she said, "the mouth which elicited so many virtuous words". However pretty this story may be, it is only a legend, because Margaret of Scotland came to France only in 1436, and, according to the best authorities, Chartier was already dead. We know nothing of Chartier's youth. His first work was "Le livre des quatre dames", written not long after the defeat of Agincourt (1415). During the civil war and amidst the horrors of the English invasion, the poet devoted himself to allegorical and controversial love poems, in which he attained a considerable skill. Among them are: "Le débat de reveille-matin"; "Le débat des deux fortunés d'amour"; "Belle dame sans merci". These compositions were highly praised by contemporaries, but to a modern reader they appear lifeless and pedantic, a most complete example of the scholarly method which, at that time, tended to take the place of inspiration in French poetry. His "Bréviaire des Nobles", a code of the perfect knight, is better than his love songs. In 1417 Chartier was driven from Bayeux by the English invasion, and in 1418 from Paris by the Burgundian faction. He entered the service of Dauphin Charles, "King of Bourges", afterwards King Charles VII, whom he served as private secretary most faithfully. He was entrusted with important missions for the king. In 1424 he went to Germany and in 1428 to Scotland.

Chartier is noteworthy as a prose writer, his prose being far superior to his poetry; his style is full of harmony, constantly enlightened by fine sentences, which are compared by Pasquier to those of Seneca. The "Quadrilogue invectif", composed in 1422, is a dialogue in which France entreats nobility, people, and clergy, to unite their efforts to save her from invasion and civil war. The "Livre de l'espérance" or "Livre des trois vertus" is a moral dissertation. The "Curial" deals with the dangers and corruption of the courtier's life. Because of the loftiness, courage, and dignity of his life, Chartier was entitled to teach moral lessons and to preach disinterestedness and Christian virtues. Chartier's works were edited by Duchesne (Paris, 1617); Buchberger mentions an edition of his works by Montaiglon (Paris, 1861).

PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française* (Paris, 1896), II; DELAUNAY, *Alain Chartier* (Paris, 1876); LENIENT, *La satire au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1876), XV; CHEVALIER, *Rep. Bio-bibl.* (Paris, 1905), 892–93.

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Chartophylax. See GREEK CHURCH.

Chartres (CARNUTUM), DIOCESE OF, comprises the department of Eure-et-Loir. Dismembered by the formation of the new Diocese of Blois, in 1697, it was suppressed in 1802, the entire department of Eure-et-Loir being placed under the jurisdiction of the new Bishopric of Versailles. However, in 1822, the See of Chartres was re-established and made suffragan to the Archbishopric of Paris. The catalogue of the church of Chartres gives as its first bishops, Adventus, Optatus, and Valentinus, the last-named being contemporary with St. Martin. According to the Abbé Duchesne the Bishopric of Chartres may thus be traced back to the time of Constantine. Among its bishops the church of Chartres claims: Saints Martinus Candidus and Anianus (fifth century); St. Solennis, instrumental in the conversion of Clovis; St. Adventinus, present at the Council of Orléans in 511; St. Leobinus, at the Council of Orléans in 549; St. Chaletricus, at the Council of Tours in 567; St. Boetharius (about 594), chaplain to Clotaire II and, for a while, the captive of Thierry, King of Burgundy; Fulbert (1007–1029), professor and poet, whose name is identified with the history of the cathedral; St. Yves (1090–1115), Abbot of Saint-Quentin-de-Beauvais, noted as an ecclesiastical writer and canonist, and imprisoned for two years by King Philip I for having opposed the repudiation of Queen Bertha; John of Salisbury (1176–1180), an illustrious writer, former secretary to St. Thomas Becket and Alexander III; Godet des Marais (1690–1709), a writer and the arch-enemy of Quietism, also co-operator with Madame de Maintenon in the founding of Saint-Cyr; the future Cardinal de Latil (1821–1824), at first chaplain to the Comte d'Artois and subsequently Archbishop of Reims; Monseigneur Clausel de Montals (1824–1853), ardently attached to Gallican ideas and noted for his opposition to the Abbé Chatel's schismatic "French Church", and for his efforts in favour of freedom of instruction.

Special honour is paid to St. Arnulphus (Arnoul), assassinated in the forest of Yveline about 534; to St. Avitus (Avit) who, in the beginning of the sixth century, founded a monastery at Châteaudun; to St. Laumer (d. 593), founder and Abbot of Saint-Martin de-Dreux, and to Blessed Bernard (end of the eleventh century), founder and Abbot of Tiron. The mystic Arnaud (twelfth century), author of the "Traité de l'œuvre des six jours" and biographer of St. Bernard, and François-Auguste de Thou, beheaded for political reasons under Richelieu, were both Abbots of Bonneval in the Diocese of Chartres; Philippe Desportes, poet (1546–1606), and the Abbé de Saint-Pierre (1658–1743), author of the famous "Projet de paix perpétuelle", were Abbots of Tiron. Among the natives of the diocese may be mentioned: Godeau, the poet, Bishop of Vence (1605–1672), known at the Hôtel de Rambouillet as "Julie's dwarf" and also J.-B. Thiers (1636–1703), *curé* of Champrond, noted for his disagreements with the Chapter of Chartres and his history of wigs ("Histoire des perruques").

According to Didron, the archæologist, the Chartres cathedral is "the most curious monument in France, perhaps even in all Europe; a unique monument". "If elsewhere may be found more beautiful parts", said the archæologist Visconti, "nowhere else is there a more beautiful whole". The substructure of the present cathedral encloses a well and a vault around which cluster traditions of the origin of the church. The early Christians of the place, it was said, found here an altar surmounted by a statue representing a woman seated with her child upon her knees—both the altar and statue, "Virgini parituræ", had been erected by the Druids. About the year 67 Saints Altinus and Eodaldus, sent from Sens by Saints Savinianus and Potentianus, built a church over this grotto, where, during the persecution the virgin Modesta, daughter of the governor, Quirinus, was martyred, and her body flung into the well. Whatever may be held as to the time in which Saints Savinianus and Protentianus lived, it would seem that the foundation of the primitive church of Chartres, all that now can be seen, was laid in the days of Constantius Chlorus (beginning of the fourth century). The church was several times destroyed by fire. About 1020 Bishop Fulbert invited all the sovereigns of Europe to contribute towards the rebuilding of the cathedral, but three more fires (1030–1134–1194) interfered with the progress of the work. However, in 1220, Guillaume le Breton could write: "entirely rebuilt in dressed stone and terminating in a vault that may be compared to the shell of a tortoise, the cathedral of Chartres need fear nothing further from temporal fire until the Day of Judgment."

The pious enthusiasm of which Notre-Dame of Chartres was then the object is attested by the "Poème des Miracles" (1210), recently published by Antoine Thomas, and by Jean le Marchand's poem of 1262. The consecration of the cathedral occurred in 1260, and St. Louis is supposed to have attended the ceremony. The stained glass windows date back to the thirteenth century, and are the finest in the world—they contain 3889 figures. The upper windows were presented by St. Louis, and St. Ferdi-

nand and Queen Blanche of Castile. The porches and windows represent in magnificent symbolism the glorification of Mary. The choir enclosure with its beautifully sculptured groups dates from the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries.

Among the pilgrims who came to Chartres history mentions St. Louis who, in order to reach there, travelled seven leagues on foot; Philip the Fair; Charles the Fair; Philip of Valois; John the Good who went there three times and left his pilgrim's staff, which has become the *bâton cantoral* of the Chapter; Charles V (of France) who went thither twice barefooted; Louis XI; Henry III who made eighteen pilgrimages; Henry IV who was crowned there 27 February, 1594; Louis XIV and Popes Pascal II, Innocent II, and Alexander III. The object of this yet

Monastery of the Grande Chartreuse

very popular pilgrimage is threefold: to venerate (1) the statue of Notre-Dame-sous-Terre, inaugurated in 1857, and modelled after the old statue burned in 1793, being therefore a reproduction of the figure honoured by the Druids. Devotions are held in the crypt which is the largest in France; (2) the "Vierge Noire de Notre-Dame-du-Pilier" (Black Virgin) in the upper church; (3) the "Voile de la Vierge" (Veil of the Blessed Virgin), given to Charlemagne by Constantine Porphyrogenitus and Irene, transferred about 876 by Charles the Bald from Aachen to Chartres, and raised as a standard in 911 by Gantelme, the bishop, to put to flight the Norman Rollo. In 1360 Edward III of England, and in 1591 Henry IV of France, passed reverently beneath the reliquary containing this veil, which, until the end of the eighteenth century, was considered a chemise, and "chemisettes", emblematic of this veil, were worn on the breast. The church of Saint-Pierre of Chartres of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries has some very beautiful fourteenth-century windows; it was dependent upon a Benedictine abbey founded in the sixth century.

Several local congregations of women take charge of the schools and the sick: the Sisters of Providence (founded in Chartres, 1654); the Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres (founded 1690), who have 123 establishments in the French colonies and others in the countries of the extreme East; the Sisters of the Bon-Secours (founded 1736); the Sisters of the Immaculate Conception of Nogent-le-Rotrou (founded 1808), and the Sisters of Our Lady of Chartres (founded 1853). In 1900 the diocese had the following religious institutions: 1 foundling asylum, 17 infant schools, 1 school for deaf-mutes, 17 orphanages, 21 hospitals and hospices, and 2 houses of religious nurses. At the end of 1905 (the close of the Concordat period) the population was 275,433, and there were 25 pastorates, 351 succursals, or second-class parishes, and 15 curacies then remunerated by the State.

Gallia Christiana (ed. nova, 1744), VIII, 1089–1208 and *instrumenta*, 287–410; Fisquet, *La France pontificale* (Chartres, Paris, 1873); Hénault, *Origines chrétiennes de la Gaule celtique, Recherches historiques sur la fondation de l'Eglise de Chartres et des Eglises de Paris, de Troyes et d'Orléans* (Paris, 1884); de Mély, *Le trésor de Chartres* (Paris, 1886); Bulteau and Brou, *Monographie de la cathédrale de Chartres* (Chartres, 1887–92); Clerval, *Chartres, sa cathédrale, ses monuments* (Chartres, 1905); Huysmans, *La cathédrale* (Paris, 1902); Massé, *The City of Chartres, its Cathedral and Churches* (London, 1900); Chevalier, *Topo-bibl.*, 661–64.

Georges Goyau.

Chartreuse, La Grande.—The mother-house of the Carthusian Order lies in a high valley of the Alps of Dauphiné, at an altitude of 4268 feet, fourteen miles north of Grenoble. Medieval writers were awestruck by the desolation of the spot, and Martène, who visited it in 1760, writes: "One cannot conceive how it could enter into the mind of man, to establish a community in a spot so horrible and so barren as this." Modern writers praise its picturesqueness, but some, like Ruskin, find the mountains around, "the simplest commonplace of Savoy cliff, with no peaks, no glaciers, no cascades, nor even any slopes of pine in extent of majesty". The monastery lies in an open pasture. On the east the ridge of the

Grand-Som towers above its roof, on the south the road approaches through a narrow gorge, while on the north and west the valley is shut in by heights covered with woods, due to the planting of the earlier monks, but now the property of the State. The first monastery, built by St. Bruno in 1084 on the spot marked by the chapel of Notre-Dame de Casalibus, was destroyed by an avalanche in 1132, and the new buildings were erected on part of the site of the present *grand cloître*. The monastery was burnt eight times between 1320 and 1676. At the latter date the prior, Innocent Le Masson, began to rebuild the greater part of it in the somewhat cold and heavy style of the period. His work was solid, and there is a severe monastic element about it. The buildings of to-day are substantially as he left them, though they have been extensively restored during the nineteenth century. They are on the typically Carthusian plan, with the addition of the great guest-houses and capitular hall, constructed to accommodate the Carthusian priors attending the general chapters, together with their attendants. The most ancient portions are the Gothic parts of the *grand cloître* (over 700 feet long) and the church, which dates in part from 1320 or perhaps earlier, but owes its present form to restoration in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. The monastery, with a small portion of the surrounding pastures, was rented from the State till, in accordance with the Association Laws of 1901, the last monks were expelled by two squadrons of dragoons on the 19th of April, 1903. For the history of the monastery and order and for the famous liqueur see CARTHUSIAN ORDER.

La Grande Chartreuse par un chartreux (Lyons, 1898), tr. WHITEHEAD (London, 1893); CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibl.* (Paris, 1894–99), 665.

RAYMUND WEBSTER.

Chartulary (*Cartularium, Chartularium*, also called *Pancarta* and *Codex Diplomaticus*), a medieval manuscript volume or roll (*rotulus*) containing transcriptions of original documents relating to the foundation, privileges, and legal rights of ecclesiastical establishments, municipal corporations, industrial associations, institutions of learning, and private families. The term is also, though less appropriately, applied to collections of original documents bound in one volume or attached to one another so as to form a roll. The allusion of St. Gregory of Tours to *chartarum tomi* in the sixth century is commonly taken to refer to chartularies; the oldest, however, that have come down to us belong to the tenth century. Those belonging to the centuries from the tenth to the thirteenth are very numerous. Sometimes the copyist of the chartulary reproduced the original document with literary exactness. Sometimes, however, he took liberties with the text to the extent of modifying the phraseology, modernizing proper names of persons or places, and even changing the substance of the meaning for some such purpose as to extend the scope of the privileges or immunities which the document granted. The value of a chartulary as an historical document depends, of course, on the extent to which it reproduces the substantial meaning of the original, and this question must be settled by the well-known canons of historical criticism. Generally speaking, a chartulary should rank as a public document possessing greater value than a private letter or the narrative of an annalist. We have as yet no complete inventory of the chartularies of the various institutions of the Middle Ages. In recent years many chartularies of medieval monasteries and churches have been published, more or less completely. The "Catalogue général des cartulaires des archives départementales" (Paris, 1847) and the "Inventaire des cartulaires" etc. (Paris, 1878–9) are the chief sources of information regarding the chartularies of medieval France. For the principal English (printed) chartularies, see Gross, "Sources and Literature of English History", etc. (London, 1900), 204–7 and 402–67. The important chartulary of the University of Paris was edited by Father Denifle, O. P., and M. Chatelain, "Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis" (Paris, 1889, sqq.).

GIRY, *Manuel de diplomatique* (Paris, 1894), I, 28 sqq.; BRESSLAU, *Urkundenlehre* (Leipzig, 1889); OESTERLEY, *Wegweiser durch die Literatur der Urkundensammlungen* (Berlin, 1855–6); *Grande encyclopédie*, s. v. *Cartulaire*.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Chastellain (or CHASTELAIN), GEORGES, a Burgundian chronicler, b. in the County of Alost, Flanders, in 1403; d. at Valenciennes in 1475. He studied at Louvain, and, after a few years in the army, travelled in England and France. He next entered the service of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, whose successor, Charles the Bold, coming to Valenciennes in 1473, to hold a chapter of the Golden Fleece, conferred upon him the honour of knighthood, with the title of *Indiciarius* of the order.

Chastellain's more important works include (1) "Chronique des choses de mon temps", a history of the years 1417–74, of which only fragments remain, continued after Chastellain's death, by his disciple, Jean Molinet. It was first edited by Buchon in "Les chroniques nationales" (1827) and re-edited by Kervyn de Lettenhove (8 vols., Brussels, 1863–67). (2) "Récollections des merveilles advenues en mon temps" (Antwerp, 1505). (3) "Chronique de Messire Jean de Lalaing", a delightful biography. In spite of excessive partiality to the Duke of Burgundy, Chastellain's historical works are valuable for the accurate information they contain. As a poet he was famous among his contemporaries. He was the great master of the school of *grands rhétoriqueurs*, whose principal characteristics were fondness for the most artificial forms and a profusion of latinisms and græcisms.

BUCHON, *Notice sur Chastellain* (in vol. I of his edition, 1827); REIFFENBERG, *Notice sur G. Chastellain* (1836); QUICHERAT in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* (1842), IV, 62 sq.

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Chastellain, PIERRE, missionary among the Huron Indians, b. at Senlis, France, in 1606; d. at Quebec, 14 August, 1684. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1624 and at the age of thirty sailed from France with two future martyrs, Fathers Isaac Jogues and Charles Garnier, and the new Governor of Canada, Montmagny, the successor in that post of Champlain. In July, 1636, Chastellain and Garnier left Three Rivers with the Indian trading canoes to join the mission in the Huron country. In the September following, both were attacked by smallpox, but recovered. For nearly fifty years Chastellain toiled on the mission of Canada at different stations among the Hurons as well as in Quebec. With great strength of character he combined a gentleness that was never ruffled and an unfailing charity towards others. During his laborious mission work he composed his book "Affectus amantis Christum seu Exercitium amoris erga Dominum Jesum pro totâ hebdomadâ", a quarto of 483 pages (Paris, 1647).

Menology of the Society of Jesus, English Assistancy (Roehampton, 1902), II, 70, 71; THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896–1901), VIII, 307; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II.

EDWARD P. SPILLANE.

Chastity.—In this article chastity is considered as a virtue; its consideration as an evangelical counsel will be found in the articles on CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY, CONTINENCY, and VIRGINITY. As a VOW, chastity is discussed in the article VOW.

AS A VIRTUE.—Chastity is the virtue which excludes or moderates the indulgence of the sexual appetite. It is a form of the virtue of temperance,

which controls according to right reason the desire for and use of those things which afford the greatest sensual pleasures. The sources of such delectation are food and drink, by means of which the life of the individual is conserved, and the union of the sexes, by means of which the permanence of the species is secured. Chastity, therefore, is allied to abstinence and sobriety; for, as by these latter the pleasures of the nutritive functions are rightly regulated, so by chastity the procreative appetite is duly restricted. Understood as interdicting all carnal pleasures, chastity is taken generally to be the same as continency, though between these two, Aristotle, as pointed out in the article on CONTINENCY, drew a marked distinction. With chastity is often confounded modesty, though this latter is properly but a special circumstance of chastity or rather, we might say, its complement. For modesty is the quality of delicate reserve and constraint with reference to all acts that give rise to shame, and is therefore the outpost and safeguard of chastity. It is hardly necessary to observe that the virtue under discussion may be a purely natural one. As such, its motive would be the natural decency seen in the control of the sexual appetite, according to the norm of reason. Such a motive springs from the dignity of human nature, which, without this rational sway, is degraded to brutish levels. But it is more particularly as a supernatural virtue that we would consider chastity. Viewed thus, its motives are discovered in the light of faith. These are particularly the words and example of Jesus Christ and the reverence that is owing to the human body as the temple of the Holy Ghost, as incorporated into that mystic body of which Christ is the head, as the recipient of the Blessed Eucharist, and finally, as destined to share hereafter with the soul a life of eternal glory. According as chastity would exclude all voluntary carnal pleasures, or allow this gratification only within prescribed limits, it is known as absolute or relative. The former is enjoined upon the unmarried, the latter is incumbent upon those within the marriage state. The indulgence of the sexual appetite being prohibited to all outside of legitimate wedlock, the wilful impulse to it in the unmarried, like the wilful impulse to anything unlawful, is forbidden. Moreover, such is the intensity of the sexual passion that this impulse is perilously apt to bear away the will before it. Hence, when wilful, it is a grave offence of its very nature. It must be observed too, that this impulse is constituted, not merely by an effective desire, but by every voluntary impure thought. Besides the classification already given, there is another, according to which chastity is distinguished as perfect, or imperfect. The first-mentioned is the virtue of those who, in order to devote themselves more unreservedly to God and their spiritual interests, resolve to refrain perpetually from even the licit pleasures of the marital state. When this resolution is made by one who has never known the gratification allowed in marriage, perfect chastity becomes virginity. Because of these two elements—the high purpose and the absolute inexperience—just referred to, virginal chastity takes on the character of a special virtue distinct from that which connotes abstinence merely from illicit carnal pleasure. Nor is it necessary that the resolution implied in virginity be fortified by a vow, though as practised ordinarily and in the most perfect manner, virginal chastity, as St. Thomas following St. Augustine, would imply, supposes a vow. (Summa Theol., II–II, Q. clii, a. 3, ad 4.) The special virtue we are here considering involves a physical integrity. Yet while the Church demands this integrity in those who would wear the veil of consecrated virgins, it is but an accidental quality and may be lost without detriment to that higher spiritual integrity in which formally the virtue of virginity resides. The latter integrity is necessary and is alone sufficient to win the aureole said to await virgins as a special heavenly reward (St. Thomas, Suppl., Q. xcvi, a. 5). Imperfect chastity is that which is proper to the state of those who have not as yet entered wedlock without however having renounced the intention of doing so, of those also who are joined by the bonds of legitimate marriage, and finally of those who have outlived their marital partners. However in the case of those last mentioned the resolution may be taken which obviously would make the chastity practised that which we have defined as the perfect kind.

THE PRACTICE OF CHASTITY.—To point out the untenableness of the arguments advanced by McLennon, Lubbock, Morgan, Spencer, and others, for an original state of sexual promiscuity among mankind, belongs more immediately to the natural history of marriage. Westermarck, in his "History of Human Marriage" (London, 1891), has clearly shown that many of the representations made of people living promiscuously are false and that this low condition may not be looked upon as characteristic of savages, much less be taken as evidencing an original promiscuity (History of Human Marriage, 61 sqq.). According to this author, "the number of uncivilized peoples among whom chastity, at least as regards women, is held in honour and as a rule cultivated, is very considerable" (op. cit., 66). A fact which cannot be overlooked, of which travellers give unfailing testimony is the pernicious effect, as a rule, upon savages of contact with those who come to them from higher civilization. According to Dr. Nansen, "the Eskimo women of the larger colonies are freer in their ways than those of the small outlying settlements where there are no Europeans" (Nansen, The First Crossing of Greenland, II, 329). Of the tribes of the Adelaide plains of South Australia, Mr. Edward Stephens says: "Those who speak of the natives as a naturally degraded race, either do not speak from experience, or they judge them by what they have become when the abuse of intoxicants and contact with the most wicked of the white race have begun their deadly work. I saw the natives and was much with them before those dreadful immoralities were known and I say it fearlessly that nearly all their evils they owed to the white man's immorality and to the white man's drink" (Stephens, The Aborigines of Australia, in Jour. Roy. Soc. N. S. Wales, XXIII, 480). Of the primitive Turko-Tatars, Professor Vambrey observes: "The difference in immorality which exists between the Turks affected by a foreign civilization and kindred tribes inhabiting the steppes becomes very conspicuous to anyone living among the Turkomans and Kara Kalpaks, for whether in Africa or Asia certain vices are introduced only by the so-called bearers of culture" (Vambrey, Die primitive Cultur des Turks tartarischen Volkes, 72). Testimonies to the same effect could be multiplied indefinitely.

THE PRACTICE OF CHASTITY AMONG THE JEWS.—Several of the Mosaic ordinances must have operated strongly among the ancient Jews, to prevent sins against chastity. The legislation of Deut., xxii, 20–21, according to which a bride who had deceived her husband into thinking her a virgin was stoned to death at her father's door, must in the circumstances have powerfully deterred young women from all impure practices. The effect, too, of the law, Deut., xxii, 28–29, must have been wholesome. According to this enactment, if a man sinned with a virgin "he shall give to the father of the maid fifty sicles of silver and shall have her to wife because he hath humbled her. He may not put her away all the days of his life." The Mosaic law against prostitution of Jewish women was severe, nevertheless through foreign women this evil became widespread in Israel. It is to be observed that the Hebrews were ever prone to fall



1. ENGLISH CHASUBLE, FOURTEENTH CENTURY 2. ITALIAN CHASUBLE, SEVENTEENTH CENTURY
3–8. SHOWING DEVELOPMENT FROM THE TWELFTH TO THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

into the sexual sins of their heathen neighbours, and the inevitable result of polygamy was seen in the absence of a recognized obligation of continence in the husband parallel to that imposed on the wife.

The unchastity of the post-Homeric Greeks was notorious. With this people marriage was but an institution to supply the State with strong and sturdy soldiers. The consequence of this to the position of women was most baneful. We are told by Polybius that sometimes four Spartans had one wife in common. (Fragm. in Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll., ed. Mai, II, 384.) The Athenians were not so degraded, yet here the wife was excluded from the society of her husband, who sought pleasure in the company of hetairai and concubines. The hetairai were not social pariahs among the Athenians. Indeed many of them attained to the influence of queens. Although the Romans styled excess of debauchery "Græcizing", they nevertheless sounded greater depths of filthy wantonness in the days following the early republic than ever did their eastern neighbours. The Greeks threw a glamour of romance and sentiment about their sexual sins. But with the Romans, immorality, even of the abnormal kind, stalked about, its repulsiveness undisguised. We gather this clearly from the pages of Juvenal, Martial, and Suetonius. Cicero makes the public statement that intercourse with prostitutes had never been a thing condemned in Rome (Pro Cælio, xv), and we know that as a rule marriage was looked upon as a mere temporary relation to be severed directly it became irksome to either party. Never did woman sink to such degradation as in Rome. In Greece the enforced seclusion of the wife acted as a moral protection. The Roman matron was not thus restricted, and many of these of highest social rank did not hesitate in the time of Tiberius to have their names inscribed upon the ædiles' list as common prostitutes in order thus to escape the penalties which the Julian Law attached to adultery.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE PRACTICE OF CHASTITY.—Under Christianity chastity has been practised in a manner unknown under any other influence. Christian morality prescribes the right order of relations. It therefore must direct and control the manner of relationship sustained to each other by soul and body. Between these two there is an ineradicable opposition, the flesh with its concupiscences contending unceasingly against the spirit, blinding the latter and weaning it away from the pursuit of its true life. Harmony and due order between these two must prevail. But this means the pre-eminence and mastery of the spirit, which in turn can only mean the castigation of the body. The real as well as the etymological kinship between chastity and chastisement then is obvious. Necessarily, therefore, chastity is a thing stern and austere. The effect of the example as well as of the words of Our Saviour (Matt., xix, 11–12) is seen in the lives of the many celibates and virgins who have graced the history of the Christian Church, while the idea of marriage as the sign and symbol of the ineffable union of Christ with His spotless spouse the Church—a union in which fidelity no less than love is mutual—has borne its fruit in beautifying the world with patterns of conjugal chastity.

ST. THOMAS, *Summa*, II–II, Q. cli-clii; *Cont. Gent.*, L. III, c. CXXXVI; LESSIUS, *De Just. et jure ceterisque virt. card.*, L. IV, c. ii, n. 92 sq.; ESCHBACH, *Disputationes Physiologico-Theologicæ*, Disp. v; DÖLLINGER, *The Gentile and the Jew* etc., II, Book IX; CRAISSON, *De Rebus Venereis;* BONAL, *De Virtute Castitatis;* WESTERMARCK, *The History of Human Marriage*, ch. iv, v, vi; GAY, *The Christian Life and Virtues:* II, *Chastity.*

JOHN W. MELODY.

Chasuble, called in Latin *casula planeta* or *pænula*, and in early Gallic sources *amphibalus*, the principal and most conspicuous Mass vestment, covering all the rest. Nearly all ecclesiologists are now agreed that liturgical costume was simply an adaptation of the secular attire commonly worn throughout the Roman Empire in the early Christian centuries. The priest in discharging his sacred functions at the altar was dressed as in civil life, but the custom probably grew up of reserving for this purpose garments that were newer and cleaner than those used in his daily avocations, and out of this gradually developed the conception of a special liturgical attire. In any case the chasuble in particular seems to have been identical with the ordinary outer garment of the lower orders. It consisted of a square or circular piece of cloth in the centre of which a hole was made; through this the head was passed. With the arms hanging down, this rude garment covered the whole figure. It was like a little house (*casula*). This derivation is curiously illustrated in the prophetic utterance of Druidical origin preserved in Muirchu's "Life of St. Patrick", almost the oldest allusion to the chasuble and crosier which we possess. Before St. Patrick's coming to Ireland the Druids were supposed to have circulated this oracle:

"Adze-head [this is an allusion to the peculiar Irish form of tonsure] will come with a crook-head staff; in his house head-holed [*in suâ domu capiti perforatâ*, i. e. chasuble] he will chant impiety from his table [i. e. the altar]; from the front [i. e. the eastern] part of his house all his household [attendant clerics] will respond, 'So be it! So be it!'"

The fact that at an early date the word *casal* established itself in the Celtic language, and that St. Patrick's *casal* in particular became famous, makes the allusion of the "house head-holed" almost certain. We can hardly help being reminded of St. Isidore's definition of *casula* as "a garment furnished with a hood, which is a diminutive of *casa*, a cottage, as, like a small cottage or hut, it covers the entire person". In the earliest chronicles some modification seems to have already taken place in the primitive conception of a hole cut in a round piece of cloth. The early medieval chasubles were made of a semicircular piece of stuff, the straight edge folded in the middle, and the two borders sewn together, leaving an aperture for the head. From this it will be seen that the chasuble is only a cope of which the front edges have been sewn together. The inconvenience of the primitive chasuble will be readily appreciated. It was impossible to use arms or hands without lifting the whole of the front part of the vestment. To remedy this, more than one expedient was resorted to. The sides were gradually cut away while the length before and behind remained unaltered. Thus, after being first curtailed at the sides until it reached but little below the elbows, it was eventually, in the sixteenth century, pared away still farther, until it now hardly extends below the shoulders and leaves the arms entirely free. While this shortening was still in progress, it became the duty of the deacon and subdeacon, assisting the celebrant, to roll back the chasuble and relieve as far as possible the weight on his arms. Directions to this effect are still given in the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum", where it speaks of the vesting of a bishop (Cæremon. Episc., lib. II, cap. viii, n. 19). Another device adopted in some medieval chasubles, to remedy the inconvenience caused by the drag of the vestment upon the arms, was to insert a cord passing through rings by which the sides of the chasuble could be drawn up to the shoulders and secured in that position. This, however, was rare. The chasuble, though now regarded as the priestly vestment *par excellence*, was in the early centuries worn by all ranks of the clergy. "Folded chasubles" (*planetæ plicatæ*), instead of dalmatics, are still prescribed for the deacon and subdeacon at high Mass during penitential seasons. The precise origin of this pinning up of the chasuble is still obscure, but, like the deacon's wearing of the broad stole (*stolone*)—which represents the chasuble rolled up and hung over his shoulder like a soldier's great-

coat—during the active part of his functions in the Mass, it probably had something to do with the inconvenience caused by the medieval chasuble in impeding the free use of the arms.

Of the chasuble as now in common usage in the Western Church two principal types appear, which may for convenience be called the Roman and the French. The Roman is about 46 inches deep at the back and 30 inches wide. It is ornamented with orphreys forming a pillar behind and a tall cross in front, while the aperture for the neck is long and tapers downwards. The French type, also common in Germany and in a more debased form in Spain, is less ample and often artificially stiffened. It has a cross on the back and a pillar in front. In medieval chasubles these orphrey crosses often assume a Y form, and the crosses themselves seem really to have originated less from any symbolical purpose than from sartorial reasons connected with the cut and adjustment.

Like the other sacred vestments the chasuble, before use, requires to be blessed by a priest who has faculties for that purpose. When assumed in vesting for Mass, the act is accompanied with a prayer which speaks of the chasuble as the "yoke of Christ". But another symbolism is indicated by the form attached to the bestowal of the chasuble in the ordination services: "Receive", says the bishop, "the priestly vestment, by which is signified charity."

BRAUN, *Die liturgische Gewandung* (Freiburg, 1907), pp. 149–239; ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *La Messe* (Paris, 1886), VII; BOCK, *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder* (Bonn, 1856–71), II–III; THALHOFER, *Liturgik* (Freiburg, 1883), I; DE VERT, *Explication des cérémonies de l'église* (Paris, 1706–8); ROCK, *Church of Our Fathers* (London, 1903), II; BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *Les costumes et les usages ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1901), II; VAN DER STAPPEN, *Sacra Liturgia* (Mechlin, 1902), IV, 124–188; THURSTON, in *The Month* (Dec., 1898), and in *The Tablet* (Dec. 28, 1907); HEFELE, *Beiträge* (Tübingen, 1864), II, 150–223.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Chateaubriand, FRANÇOIS-RENÉ DE, French writer, b. at Saint-Malo, Brittany, 4 September, 1768; d. at Paris, 4 July, 1848. He studied at Dol, then at Rennes, and later at Dinan. Although at first destined for the navy, for a while he believed himself called to the ecclesiastical life, but finally, in 1786, obtained a commission as lieutenant in the regiment of Navarre, then quartered at Cambrai. Meanwhile the young officer spent much of his time in Paris, where his brother and one of his sisters resided. Upon the fall of the monarchy, he embarked at Saint-Malo for America, 8 April, 1791. The American wilderness was indeed a revelation to his poetic mind, and furnished it with an inexhaustible supply of imagery. However, when King Louis XVI was arrested at Varennes, Chateaubriand believed it his duty to place his sword at the service of imperilled royalty and, returning to France, landed there 2 January, 1792. He married, emigrated, joined the army of Condé, was wounded and left for dead during the expedition against Thionville, and succeeded in escaping to England in 1793. Here he lived in London in the most abject misery, being unable to return to France until 1800, and even then only under an assumed name.

"Le génie du Christianisme" (Paris, 1802) soon afterwards made him famous, and Bonaparte appointed him secretary of the embassy at Rome and then minister at Valais, Switzerland, a post which he resigned even before occupying it. Admitted to the French Academy to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Marie-Joseph Chénier, he refused, despite the entreaties of Napoleon, to withhold his opinion on the revolutionary ideas of his predecessor, and this retarded his reception until after the fall of the Empire. Thenceforth he was plunged into party strife. His political life has been divided into three distinct parts: (1) the purely Royalist period up to 1824; (2) the Liberal period from 1824 to 1830; (3) the period of Royalism and ideal Republicanism between 1830 and the time of his death. Appointed Minister of State after Waterloo, he eloquently and energetically opposed the Decazes ministry (1816–1820), became ambassador successively in Berlin and in London, plenipotentiary to the Congress of Verona, and finally Minister of Foreign Affairs during the Villèle ministry. In 1824 the king dismissed him for the haughtiness of character that had rendered him intolerable to his colleagues. Chateaubriand from that time on waged a merciless war for Liberal principles against all the ministerial departments, sparing not even royalty itself. Made ambassador to Rome in 1828, he resigned upon Polignac's accession to office next year, and when, in 1830, Louis-Philippe ascended the throne, he refused to take the oath of allegiance to the new regime. This was the end of his active political career.

FRANÇOIS-RENÉ DE CHATEAUBRIAND

Chief among the writings of Chateaubriand are the "Essai historique, politique et moral sur les révolutions anciennes et modernes" (London, 1797); "Atala" (Paris, 1801), an episode from "Le génie du Christianisme" (Paris, 1802, 5 vols., 8vo); "René", which, like "Atala", belonged to "Le génie du Christianisme", and was published separately by the author in 1807—a morbid romance exhibiting a picture of fatal melancholy and foolish dreams; "Les martyrs" (Paris, 1809), a prose poem intended to prove by example the superiority of Christianity over Paganism as a source of poetic inspiration. With a literary scrupulosity, rare indeed in those days, Chateaubriand made a point of visiting the places which he was to describe in the last-named work. In fact it was this tour that brought forth the "Itinéraire de Paris à Jerusalem" (Paris, 1811), a delightful and accurate book of travels. After that there appeared a series of political works: "De Buonaparte et des Bourbons" (Paris, 1814), a famous brochure said by Louis XVIII to have been worth a whole army to the Restoration; "De la monarchie selon la charte" (Paris, 1816), a brochure which deprived the author of both the title and income of Minister of State; "De la restauration et de la monarchie élective" (Paris, 1831), in which Chateaubriand made the following profession of faith: "I am Bourbon as a matter of honour, royalist according to reason and conviction, and republican by taste and character"; "Etudes, ou discours historiques" (Paris, 1831, 4 vols., 8vo), a work replete with original views and not wanting in erudition. Writings in which the author's own personality figures are his "Voyage en Amérique" (Paris, 1827) and his great posthumous work, "Les mémoires d'outre-tombe" (Paris, 1849–1850, 12 vols. in 18mo), a vast panorama of the events which made up his life or with which he was identified.

In the perusal of this long series of works one easily discovers the author's diversified talent. Chateaubriand's style is marvellously varied. In his prose poems, such as "Les martyrs", or his romances, like "Atala", or his poetic descriptions, such as occur in

"Le génie du Christianisme", his colouring is vivid and peerless, and his phraseology most harmonious. "He plays the harpsichord on all my heartstrings", said a great lady of the early nineteenth century (*Il joue du clavecin sur toutes mes fibres*). Without apparent effort he gives to his thoughts a luxuriant opulence of expression, richness, and elegance, even also a certain grandiloquence which may now appear somewhat antiquated. On the other hand, upon opening one of his political books one will find him bright, crisp, and incisive. Nor must it be said, as indeed it has been, that Chateaubriand's delightful and masterly style only serves to conceal deplorable poverty of thought, like a gorgeous drapery thrown over a feeble and insignificant body. Chateaubriand has beautiful ideas; on the past, in his historical pages; on the present, in his political writings, though the latter may not be free from error; and he has abundant views on the future, particularly on the subject of religion and the social rôle which he believed it called upon to play. His influence on literature is unanimously acknowledged. Romanticism may be traced back to him, and it may even be said that the whole literary movement characteristic of the nineteenth century begins with him. Admitting that he had predecessors, and that his style is reminiscent of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, he undoubtedly inaugurated a new literature.

Despite lamentable moral infirmities, Chateaubriand was a sincere Christian from the time of his conversion until his death. For he had need of conversion. Not, indeed, that his education was not religious. He himself relates with what pious zeal he prepared for his First Communion, and what memorable emotions that solemn day awakened within his heart. Some sixteen years later, in 1796, he published the sceptical "Essai sur les révolutions". In the interval Chateaubriand's youthful mind had been contaminated by the anti-Christian spirit then pervading France, by the reading of dangerous books, especially those of J.-J. Rousseau, and by his association with the infidel literary men of Paris between 1787 and 1791. When, at the age of twenty-one, he sailed for America, his faith was but a flickering flame likely to be extinguished at any moment. Finally, the miserable life that he was afterwards obliged to lead in London so harassed his soul as to turn him against everything, both institutions and men.

It was indeed a rude shock that awoke his dormant religion. On the 1st of July, 1798, his sister, Mme de Farcy, wrote him of his mother's death, adding that, grief-stricken at his abandonment of the Faith—a condition sadly manifest in his "Essai sur les révolutions"—she had made it her dying request that he would become reconciled to it. Chateaubriand heeded the appeal. It seemed to come as a last prayer, a tear-laden supplication from the tomb that enclosed the mortal remains of one who had loved him devotedly, and whose anguish he had so ruthlessly augmented. His heart was touched by the recollection of his childhood's days, by the pious memories with which the picture of his mother was inseparably connected, and, comparing the awful void made within his soul by false philosophy with the ineffable peace with which his religion had formerly filled it, his cruel doubts were suddenly submerged in a flood of tears. "I wept", said he, "and I believed" (Preface to the first edition of "Le génie du Christianisme"). This change of heart is the more easily explained as it was brought about by the progress of his ideas. His "Essai" is not the work of a confirmed infidel. If occasionally the author speaks like an eighteenth-century philosopher, he also speaks as a Christian; he believes and doubts by turns. The mind is not always the dupe of the heart, it is sometimes its debtor. Chateaubriand's mind oscillated between the faith of the Christian and the incredulity of the sceptic, but his heart, never wholly indifferent, threw its entire belief into the scale, and faith triumphed forever.

On the strength of Chateaubriand's moral shortcomings Sainte-Beuve has insinuated that he was not genuinely Christian; but this is a calumny. Chateaubriand, unfortunately, was not the only man who, though strong in his faith, was weak in his conduct. His religious sincerity is a well-established fact, and the critic of the day does homage to it. Indeed, this sincerity must be acknowledged, even though his word was not strictly reliable in less serious matters. For instance, J. Bédier tried to prove that the "Voyage en Amérique" was a mere fiction, maintaining that the traveller had not the means of accomplishing such a tour within the five months spent on the American continent. But this position cannot be accepted. In a work entitled "Sainte-Beuve et Chateaubriand" it has been demonstrated that the illustrious writer had all the time required for the journey, which he actually made and did not merely imagine, as Bédier had claimed.

Having had the misfortune to attack the Faith, Chateaubriand craved the honour of defending it, and in various parts of his writings he realized this ambition, but most especially in "Le génie du Christianisme". His defence of religion presented in this celebrated book is invested with a new character. Moreover, the sub-title of the first edition clearly indicates that the writer's intention was to point out the "Beauties of the Christian Religion". The apology is based on the æsthetic, and the fundamental argument of the work is thus expressed in its closing lines: "Though we have not employed the arguments usually advanced by the apologists of Christianity, we have arrived by a different chain of reasoning at the same conclusion: Christianity is perfect; men are imperfect. Now, a perfect consequence cannot spring from an imperfect principle. Christianity, therefore, is not the work of men." This argument certainly has great intrinsic weight, but it must be admitted that here and there the writer insists on details which contribute nothing to its strength, while, on the other hand, he omits views which might have established it more solidly. Besides, considered apart from its literary merit, the real apologetic value of "Le génie du Christianisme" is but relative. It was due to circumstances; the work came at the right moment and was what it should have been at that moment; hence its success. In his "Mémoires" the author was clearsighted enough to see this and courageous enough to admit it. The eighteenth century had sought to destroy Christian dogmas by holding them up to ridicule, and had thus deluded cultivated minds. Chateaubriand took up the challenge; he proved that this derided religion was the most beautiful of all, and likewise the most favourable to literature and the arts. It was just then that Bonaparte was rebuilding overthrown altars, and the author of "Le génie" and the victorious general worked towards the same end, each in his own way.

Chateaubriand's influence is incontestable. The Abbé Pradt, a writer who was hostile to his book, said in 1818: "He reinstated religion in the world, establishing it on a better footing than it had occupied, for until then it had followed, so to speak, in the wake of society, and since then it has marched visibly at the head." This apology, moreover, exercised a great influence upon the apologists. In the course of the nineteenth century Chateaubriand's idea was taken up; the beauty of Christian doctrine and its profound harmony with the inspirations of humanity were no longer studied from a merely æsthetic, but from a social and moral point of view. It is the glory of pioneers to open up productive ways in

which others go farther than they, but where they still retain the merit of having boldly taken the first steps.

SAINTE-BEUVE, *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire sous l'Empire* (Paris, new ed., 1889); for all works on Chateaubriand appearing prior to 1896 one may generally consult KERVILLER, *Essai d'une bibliographie de Chateaubriand* (Vannes, 1896); BERTRIN, *La sincérité religieuse de Chateaubriand* (Paris, 1900); ID., *Sainte-Beuve et Chateaubriand* (Paris, 1906); BÉDIER, *Études critiques* (Paris, 1904); GIRAUD, *Chateaubriand* (Paris, 1904), BIRÉ, *Mémoires d'outre-tombe* (Paris, new ed., 6 vols. in 12mo, not dated).

GEORGES BERTRIN.

Chateauneuf, PIERRE DE. See PIERRE DE CASTELNAU, BLESSED.

Chatham, DIOCESE OF (CHATHAMENSIS), comprises the northern half of the Province of New Brunswick, Canada, i. e., the counties of Gloucester, Madawaska, Northumberland, Restigouche, Victoria, and the part of Kent north of the Richibucto River. This territory formerly belonged to the Diocese of St. John, itself originally a portion of the Diocese of Quebec. On 8 May, 1860, the Diocese of St. John was divided, and the present Diocese of Chatham created. The Rev. James Rogers was appointed the first bishop and consecrated 15 August in the same year. On his arrival at Chatham, Bishop Rogers found only seven priests to attend an immense stretch of country. During his episcopate of forty-two years a wonderful improvement was witnessed, and when he resigned, 7 August, 1902, he left a diocese of 47 parishes and 51 priests. He died 22 March, 1903. On the resignation of Bishop Rogers, the Rev. Thomas Francis Barry, consecrated titular Bishop of Thugga and Coadjutor of Chatham, on 7 August, 1902, succeeded to the See of Chatham. The steady march of development, facility of communication, and immigration, require the formation of new parishes each year; there are now in the diocese 57 churches with resident priests and 25 missions with churches. The Catholic population is about 66,000; a large percentage of which is French Acadian by descent and language. The secular clergy number 65 priests, with 5 theological students, and the regular 31 priests and 7 brothers. Sisters, numbering about 200, of several religious congregations, are in charge of various institutions. There are 8 parochial schools with about 1000 pupils, one classical college (at Caraquet) for boys, directed by the Eudist Fathers, with 130 pupils, and 3 schools taught by Sisters under the Government School Law, with about 400 pupils. Two orphan asylums support 100 orphans, and 4 hospitals are directed by the Hospital Sisters of St. Joseph, among them the government hospital for lepers at Tracadie. The Trappist Fathers and the Trappistine Sisters, expelled from France, have opened monasteries in the parish of Rogersville.

LOUIS O'LEARY.

Chatillon, CARDINAL DE. See HUGUENOTS.

Chaucer, GEOFFREY, English poet, b. in London between 1340 and 1345; d. there, 25 October, 1400. John Chaucer, a vintner and citizen of London, married Agnes, heiress of one Hamo de Copton, the city moneyer, and owned the house in Upper Thames Street, Dowgate Hill (a site covered now by the arrival platform of Cannon Street Station), where his son Geoffrey was born. That his birth was not in 1328, hitherto the accepted date, is fully proved (Furnivall in The Academy, 8 Dec., 1888, 12 Dec., 1887). John Chaucer was connected with the Court, and once saw Flanders in the royal train. Geoffrey was educated well, but whether he was entered at either university remains unknown. He figures by name from the year 1357, presumably in the capacity of a page, in the household books of the Lady Elizabeth de Burgh, wife of Prince Lionel, third son of King Edward III (Bond in Fortnightly Review, VI, 28 Aug., 1873). The lad followed this prince to France, serving through the final and futile Edwardian invasion, which ended in the Peace of Brétigny (1360), and was taken prisoner at "Retters", identified by unwary biographers as Retiers near Rennes, but by Skeat as Rethel near Reims, a place mentioned by Froissart in his account of this very campaign. Thence Chaucer was ransomed by the king, who, when the Lady Elizabeth died, took over her page, and later (1367) pensioned him for life. Chaucer was married before 1374; probably the Philippa Chaucer named in the queen's grant of 1366 was then Geoffrey Chaucer's wife (Lounsbury,

GEOFFREY CHAUCER. (From a portrait in the National Portrait Gallery, London)

Studies in Chaucer, I, 95–7). It seems clear that he could not have been happy in his marriage (Hales in Dict. Nat. Biog., X, 157). He had two sons and a daughter, if not other children. Gascoigne tells us that his contemporary, Thomas Chaucer, was the poet's son. This statement, long discredited, is now fully endorsed by the best authorities (Hales in Athenæum, 31 March, 1888; Skeat, ibid., 27 Jan., 1900). Thomas Chaucer's mother was Philippa Roet, daughter of Sir Paon or Payne de Roet, Guienne king at arms. Roet had another daughter, Catherine, widow of Sir Hugh Swynford, who was for long John of Gaunt's mistress and eventually his third wife. Thus Chaucer became the brother-in-law of the great duke, who from 1368 onwards had been his most powerful patron. Thomas Chaucer (b. about 1367; d. 1434), later of Woodstock and Ewelme, became chief butler to four sovereigns, as well as Speaker of the House of Commons (in 1414). His sister Elizabeth (b. 1365) at sixteen entered Barking Abbey as a novice, John of Gaunt providing fifty pounds as her religious dowry. Lewis Chaucer, the "litel sonne Lowys", for whom the "Astrolabe" was written, is supposed to have died in childhood.

From about his twenty-sixth year Chaucer was frequently employed on important diplomatic

missions; the year 1372–3 marks the turning-point of his literary life, for then he was sent to Italy; circumstances make it extremely probable that either in Florence or at Padua he made Petrarch's acquaintance (Lounsbury, Studies, I, 67–68). The young King Richard II granted Chaucer a second life pension. It is startling to find him, in 1380, concerned in a discreditable abduction (Athenæum, 29 Nov., 1873; from the Close Roll of 3 of Richard II). He was made comptroller of the petty customs of the port of London, and complains of the burden of official life in "The House of Fame" (lines 652–60); and it would appear, from the prologue to the "Legend of Good Women", that through the influence of the new queen, Anne of Bohemia, he was enabled by 1385 to secure a permanent deputy. At this time he gave up housekeeping in Aldgate, and settled in the country, presumably at Greenwich, where he had a garden and arbour. The intrigues of the partisans of the king's uncle, Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, involved Chaucer's fortunes in partial ruin. The grants made to Philippa, his wife, ceased in 1387, so that we may suppose she was then dead; during the spring of 1388 Chaucer was obliged to sell two of his pensions; in 1390 he was twice in one day robbed of the king's money, but was excused from repaying it. Until King Richard recovered power Chaucer had lean years to undergo. For a while he was Clerk of the Works at Windsor, Westminster, and the Tower, but proved thriftless and unsuccessful in business affairs, and gave little satisfaction. Unrivalled opportunities and the fostering care of successive sovereigns could not keep him from anxiety, if not penury, towards the end. It is noticeable that his latest and most troubled period produced the "Canterbury Tales". Within four days after his accession King Henry IV, the son of Chaucer's first benefactor, increased Chaucer's remaining income by forty marks per annum. The poet then leased a pleasant house in the monastery garden at Westminster, and there, hard by the Lady Chapel of the Abbey (now replaced by the loftier erection of Henry VII), he died. For a century and a half his only memorial in Westminster Abbey was a Latin epitaph written by Surigonius of Milan, engraved upon a leaden plate, and hung up, probably at Caxton's instigation, on a pillar near the grave. The present canopied grey marble altar-tomb, on the south side, was set up by Nicholas Brigham, in 1556. All trace of its votive portrait of the venerated master disappeared long ago.

The "Canterbury Tales" were first printed by Caxton, from a faulty manuscript, in or about 1476–7; later by Pynson, and by Wynkyn de Worde. Other pieces were collected, and, between 1526–1602, often published with the "Tales". Many of these, attributed to Chaucer even by his earliest great modern editor, Tyrwhitt, are now known not to be his. (Skeat, "Chaucer's Minor Poems", Oxford, 1896; or, Idem, "Chaucerian Pieces" in the "Complete Works", Oxford, 1897, suppl. vol.) Chaucer's genuine major poems are assigned to this chronological order: The "Romaunt of the Rose", that is, the first 1705 lines, the remainder being rejected as not Chaucer's (see Chaucer Society Publications, 2nd Series, No. 19, 1884), dates from about 1366, and "The A. B. C.", from the same period; the "Book of the Duchess" from 1369; the "Complaint of Pity" from 1372; "Anelida and False Arcite" from 1372–4; "Troilus and Cressid" from 1379–83; the "Parliament of Fowls" from 1382; the "House of Fame" from 1383–4; the "Legend of Good Women" from about 1385–6; and the "Canterbury Tales", as a whole, from 1386 onwards until after 1390. It is curious that the first draft of the lovely Tales by the Second Nun, the Man of Law, the Clerk, the Knight, and part of that of the Monk, should have been produced early; and that the Tales by the Miller, the Reeve, the Shipman, and the Merchant, as well as the Wife of Bath's Prologue, should have been produced after 1387. Chaucer's objectionable work is, therefore, not the work of his youth.


Here begynneth the Segge of Thebes ful
lamentably tolde by Iohn Lidgate Monke of
Bury translatyng it to ye tales of Canibury

CANTERBURY PILGRIMS. (From MS. 18 d. ii. in British Museum)

To the intense affection, frequently expressed, of Hoccleve, we owe the first and best of Chaucer's portraits, familiar through reproduction. It appears in the margin of "The Governail of Princes", or "De Regimine Principum" (Harl. MS. 4866, in British Museum). In it we see Chaucer, limned from memory, in his familiar hood and gown, rosary in hand, plump, full-eyed, fork-bearded. (For detailed ac-

counts see Spielmann, "The Portraits of Geoffrey Chaucer", London, 1900, first issued in the "Chaucer Memorial Lectures", 111–41.) Like Dryden, he was silent, and had a "down look"; this physical characteristic was partly due to a most genuine modesty, partly to the habit of constant reading. Chaucer indeed read and annexed everything, and transmuted everything into that wonderful vocabulary of his, all plasticity and all power. He is a cosmopolite, chiefly influenced by Ovid, and by his own contemporary Italy, a debtor, if ever man was, to the whole spirit of his age; he has its fire, its impudence, its broad licentiousness; he has rather more than his share of its true-hearted pathos, its exquisite freshness and brightness, its sense of eternity. The so-called "Counsel of Chaucer" sums up, at a holy and serene moment, his philosophic outlook. He had unequalled powers of observation, and gave a highly ironic but most humane report. He is an artist through and through, and that artist had been a soldier and a diplomat; hence his genius, even in its extremes of mirth, has balance and health, remoteness and neutrality; it is never bitter, and never in the least "viewy". Matthew Arnold (Introduction to Ward's "English Poets", 1885, I, pp. xxxiv–v) accuses him of a lack of what Aristotle calls "high and excellent seriousness". But "high seriousness" is not quite the note of the fourteenth century. Chaucer's is the master-note (submerged all over Europe since the Reformation) of joy. This brings us to the question of his personal religion.

Foxe (Acts and Monuments of the Church, 1583, II, 839) started the absurd theory that Chaucer was a follower of Wyclif. The poet's own abstract habit; his association with the prince who (probably actuated by no very high motives) withdrew his favour from the contemporary reformer when solicitude for a purer practice ran into heresy and threatened revolt; his close friendship with Strode, a Dominican of Oxford and a strong anti-Lollard—these things tend of themselves to denote Chaucer's views in the matter. The opposite inference is "due to a misconception of his language, based on a misconception of his character" (Lounsbury, Studies, II, 469). Like Wyclif, Chaucer loved the priestly ideal; and he draws it incomparably in his "Poor Parson of a Town". Yet, as has been said, that very "Parson's Tale"; in its extant form, goes far to prove that its author, even by sympathy, was no Wyclifite (A. W. Ward, "Chaucer", London, 1879, p. 134, in "English Men of Letters Series"). Passionless justice was the bed-rock of Chaucer's mind. He paints that parti-coloured Plantagenet world as it was, not interfering to make it better, nor to wish it better. Where the churchman type was gross, he represents it grossly. It is well, however, to recall that the famous episode of his "beating a Friar in Fleet Street" is the invention of Speght, further embroidered by Chatterton; and that the prose tractate, "Jack Upland", full of invective against the religious orders, is proved not to be Chaucer's. His attitude towards women is just as two-sided. He shows in many a theme a reverence toward them which must have been fed by that "hy devocioun" to Our Lady which is beautifully apparent in his pages, and which Hoccleve mentions in recalling his memory; but dramatic exigencies, Boccaccio's example, presumable hard domestic experience, a laughingly merciless psychology, and a paralyzing outspokenness, contrive too often, as readers regret, to fight it down. He has been held up as a rationalist, on the strength of a few passages, and against the enormous mass of testimony which he furnishes on the soundness of his Catholic ethos. Of that, after all, as of its absence, Catholics are the best judges. The "Nuns' Priest's Tale" (Skeat's ed., lines 4424–40) raises the question of predestination, only to drop it. The context shows that the poet thinks his sudden side-issue not trivial or tedious, but quite the contrary; he quits it only because he cannot "boult it to the bren", i. e., sift it down, analyze it satisfactorily. Again, the "Knight's Tale" (Skeat's ed., lines 2809–14) implies that the author has no mind to dogmatize upon the final destiny of poor Arcite, newly slain. Both these instances have been cited in the masterly chapter on "Chaucer as a Literary Artist" (Lounsbury, Studies, II, 512–15, 520), to prove, in the one case, an easy dismissal of a mere scholastic dilemma; in the other, Chaucer's disbelief, or half-belief, in immortality. They prove, rather, a restraint in dogmatizing about the destiny of the individual, a restraint practised by the church itself. "The Legend of Good Women" opens with some fifteen lines, the purport of which need never have been questioned. They mean nothing if they do not mean that knowledge by evidence is one thing, assurance by faith another thing; and that lack of sensible proof can never discredit revelation. A somewhat playful confession of belief has here been turned into a serious profession of agnosticism, through sheer lack of spiritual understanding. His "hostility to the Church", as Professor Lounsbury calls it, is certainly not borne out by Chaucer's going out of his way, as he does, to defend her from age-long calumnies; for instance, in the "Franklin's Tale", and in the section "De Ira" of the "Parson's Tale", he witnesses to her horror of superstitions and false sciences. Chaucer, in short, though none too supernatural a person, had a most orthodox grip on his catechism.

The "Preces", or prose "retraccioums", which are usually printed at either end of the "Canterbury Tales", date from the evening of Chaucer's life. To Tyrwhitt, Hales, Ward, and Lounsbury, who suspect undue priestly influence, the "Preces" are, in their own words, "morbid", "reaction and weakness", "a betrayal of his poetic genius", "unbearable to have to accept as genuine". In the course of them, Chaucer disclaims of his books "thilke that sounen in-to sinne", i. e., those which are consonant with, or sympathetic with sin. Skeat is the only editor who understands Chaucer in his contrition (Notes to the "Canterbury Tales", in the Oxford Press complete edition, 475). Gascoigne (Theological Dictionary, Pt. II, 377, the MS. of which is in the library of Lincoln College, Oxford) unwittingly parodies the situation, and represents the old sinner "Chawserus" as dying while lamenting over pages, *quæ male scripsi de malo et turpissimo amore*. To the secular point of view it has all seemed, and may well seem, mistaken and deplorable. But nothing is manlier, or more touching and endearing, than this humble self-subordination to conscience and the moral law. "Except ye become as little children" is the hardest saying ever given to the intellectual world. There are great geniuses, Geoffrey Chaucer not least among them, to whom it was not given in vain.

The standard recent editions of Chaucer are: (1) "Chaucer's Canterbury Tales Annotated and Accented, with Illustrations of English Life in Chaucer's Time. New and revised edition, with illustrations from the Ellesmere MS." (Saunder's ed., London, 1894); (2) "The Student's Chaucer; being a Complete Edition of his Works" (Skeat ed., Oxford, 1895); (3) "The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, edited from numerous Manuscripts" (Skeat ed., 7 vols., Oxford, 1894–7); (4) "The Canterbury Tales done into Modern English, by the Rev. Walter W. Skeat" (The King's Classics Series, Gollancz ed., 1904).

The critical study of Chaucer began with TYRWHITT (1730–1786); it was splendidly revived and extended by scholars in the seventies and eighties of the nineteenth century, notably by FURNIVALL, CHILD, KÖLBING, KALUZA, GRAF, LANGE, KOCH, etc., and has come to its perfection, under HALES, LOUNSBURY, and SKEAT. The chief publications dealing with Chaucer published since 1890 are: HÆCKEL, *Das Sprichwort bei Chaucer* (Erlangen, 1890); BALLERSTEDT, *Ueber*

Chaucers Naturschilderungen (Göttingen, 1891); LOUNSBURY, *Studies in Chaucer: his Life and Writings* (3 vols., New York, 1892); AMES, *Chaucer Memorial Lectures*, ed. with an Introduction (London, 1900); SKEAT, *The Chaucer Canon: with a Discussion of the Works Associated with the Name of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1900); HALES, *The Age of Chaucer*, with an Introduction, in *Handbooks of English Literature* (London, 1901); IDEM, *Folia Litteraria: Essays and Notes on English Literature* (London, 1893) in *Chaucerіana*, 70–113; *Englische Studien* (Leipzig); *Publications of the Chaucer Society* (London); *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* (Baltimore); *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* (Boston). The best short notice of Chaucer is by HALES in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.

LOUISE IMOGEN GUINEY.

Chaumonot, PIERRE-JOSEPH, Jesuit missionary in New York and Canada, b. near Châtillon-sur-Seine in France, 1611; d. at Quebec, 21 February, 1693. His name is sometimes written Calmonotti or Calvonotti. He entered the Jesuit novitiate at Rome, at the age of twenty-one, and arrived at Quebec, 1 August, 1639. In September he was already at work on the missions of Lake Huron, where Brébeuf was superior. He remained there until after the death of Brébeuf and his companions and the destruction of the missions. He was deputed to conduct 400 Hurons to Quebec, and he established them on a reservation on the Isle of Orléans opposite the city. After Le Moyne had arranged for a mission among the Onondagas of New York, Chaumonot and Dablon were sent to organize it. This mission lasted only two years; the priests and the fifty colonists who joined them subsequently being obliged to escape in the night to avoid a general massacre. Returning to Canada, he devoted himself for the rest of his life to his Huron converts. He established his famous Christian settlement, known as Lorette, which after shifting several times was located finally on the river St. Charles where it still exists, though it is called "Jeune Lorette" in contradistinction to the "Ancienne Lorette" established by Chaumonot, who died before the last migration. He was the founder of the Congregation of the Holy Family which figures extensively in early Canadian history.

THWAITES (ed.), *Jesuit Relations*, passim; CHARLEVOIX, *History of New France* (New York, 1872), II; ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1896).

THOMAS J. CAMPBELL.

Chauncy, MAURICE, Prior of the English Carthusians at Bruges, date of birth unknown; d. at Bruges, 2 July, 1581. He was the eldest son of John Chauncy, Esq., of Ardeley, Hertford. Wood thinks he studied at Oxford, and afterwards went to Gray's Inn for a course of law. Finally he entered the London Charterhouse. In 1535 the majority of the Carthusians refused to take the oath of supremacy, but Chauncy, on his own confession, consented to take it. After the surrender of the monastery in 1537, Chauncy with a few others joined the Carthusians of Sheen who had settled in Bruges. On the accession of Mary they returned to Sheen, and in 1556 Chauncy was elected prior. In 1558 they retired again to Bruges, living with their Flemish brethren until 1569, when they obtained a house of their own in St. Clare Street. The hostility of the Calvinists compelled them to leave Bruges in 1578. Failing to settle at Douai, they retired to Louvain (May, 1578). Chauncy died at the old house in Bruges. In his history of the Carthusians he frequently laments his weakness in taking the oath of supremacy. He wrote: "Historia aliquot nostri sæculi Martyrum in Angliâ", etc. (Mainz, 1550, and Bruges, 1583); "Commentariolus de vitæ ratione et martyrio octodecim Cartusianorum qui in Angliâ sub rege trucidati sunt" (Ghent, 1608), a portion of which was reprinted; "Vitæ Martyrum Cartusianorum aliquot, qui Londini pro Unitate Ecclesiæ adversus hæreticos", etc. (Milan, 1606). "The Divine Cloud of Unknowing", in manuscript, is ascribed to him by Anthony à Wood.

Letters and Memorials of Card. Allen (London, 1878), 31; *Douai Diaries* (London, 1878), 126, 156, 180; WOOD, *Athenæ Oxoniensis*, ed. BLISS (London, 1813), I, 459; MORRIS, *Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers* (London, 1872), 1, 9, 13, 15, 24, 25; PITS, *De Angliæ Scriptoribus* (Paris, 1619), 775; CHAUNCY, *Hertfordshire* (London, 1826), I, 116, 117, 121; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.* (London, 1885), s. v.

G. E. HIND.

Chauveau, PIERRE-JOSEPH-OCTAVE, Canadian statesman, b. at Quebec, 30 May, 1820; d. at Montreal, 4 April, 1890. After a brilliant course at the preparatory seminary of Quebec, he studied law, and was admitted to the Bar in 1841. He was already a contributor to "Le Canadien" and "Le Courrier des Etats-Unis", and his ready pen showed that he was fitted to be a journalist rather than a barrister. In 1853 he published a novel dealing with Canadian customs which brought him an enviable reputation as a writer. Chauveau played a prominent political rôle. Having been elected by the County of Quebec, in 1848, to a seat in the Legislative Assembly, he was made a minister in 1851, and later solicitor-general and provincial secretary, but in 1855 abandoned politics. In that year he was chosen superintendent of education. During the twelve years of his office Chauveau gave a great impetus to primary instruction. He also established the first normal schools, and for twelve years published the "Journal de l'Instruction Publique". Having resigned his position as superintendent of education, in 1867, he returned to political life, to become first minister at Quebec. In 1873 Chauveau was called to the Senate, and became president of that body. Later he was appointed president of the Harbour Commission of Quebec, and in 1877 was made sheriff of Montreal, an office which he held until his death. He published an important work on the history of public education, as well as a detailed biography of the historian Garneau, several poems, a paraphrase of the "Dies iræ", and a number of remarkable articles in the "Journal de l'Instruction Publique".

OUIMET, *Les noces d'or de la Saint-Jean-Baptiste 1834–84* (Montreal, 1884); BIBAUD, *Le Panthéon canadien* (Montreal, 1891); BOURASSA, *M. Chauveau et l'idée nationale* (Montreal, 1895).

N. E. DIONNE.

Chavannes, PUVIS DE. See PUVIS DE CHAVANNES.

Chelm and Belz (CHELMENSIS ET BELTHIENSIS RUTENORUM), a diocese of the Greek-Ruthenian Rite in Russian Poland, subject directly to the Holy See, and formerly a suffragan of Kijow. Established in 1592, this diocese was the last of the Uniat Church to withstand the persecution of the Russian Government. In 1841 Bishop Felix Szumborski (d. 1851) consented to order a return to the rite which had been in use before the union with Rome; but, admonished by the pope, he recalled the order. A struggle ensued between the Church and the civil authorities. All the priests who remained true to their faith were exiled and the faithful oppressed. As a result of persecution and schism, the Diocese of Chelm and Belz was virtually abolished.

Kirchenlex. (Freiburg im Br., 1891), VII, 445 sq.; WERNER, *Orbis Terrarum Catholicus* (Freiburg im Br., 1890); 113; BATTANDIER, *Ann. pont. cath.*

LEO A. KELLY.

Cheminais de Montaigu, TIMOLÉON, pulpit orator, b. at Paris, 3 January, 1652; entered the Society of Jesus at fifteen, d. 15 September, 1689. After teaching rhetoric and the humanities at Orléans, Cheminais was assigned to the work of preaching. Bayle declares that "many regarded him as the equal of Bourdaloue", though others declare this exaggerated. Before many years his health gave way. He was appointed court-preacher, but was unable to accept the honour, though De Backer asserts the contrary. His voice partly failing him, he devoted himself to the instruction of

the people of the villages and country places. The sermons of Cheminais were edited by Bretonneau (4 vols., 12mo, Paris, 1690–91; 7th ed., Brussels, 1713). They were translated into German (Augsburg, 1739; Pressburg, 1788), Dutch (Rotterdam, 1724), Italian (Venice, 1735). He was also the author of a work called "Sentiments de piété" (Paris, 1691, 1693, 1700; Brussels, 1702). A later edition (Toulouse, 1706) contained the "Sentiments of James II, King of Great Britain". This work was translated into German (Cologne, 1723; Vienna, 1786), Dutch (Antwerp), and Italian (Milan, 1837).

Remarques du feu P. Cheminais sur l'éloquence in *Le Nouveau Mercure* (Feb., 1720), 19; FELLER, *Biog. univ.* (Paris, 1813); DE BACKER, *Bibl. de c. de J.*, first series (Liège, 1853).

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Cherokee Indians, the largest and most important tribe of Iroquoian stock of the southern section of the United States, and formerly holding the whole southern Alleghany mountain region of North and South Carolina, Georgia and Tennessee, with considerable portions of Alabama, Virginia and Kentucky. They now reside in Oklahoma, with the exception of some 1300 souls on reserved lands in Western North Carolina, the descendants of those who remained in their old home when the rest of the tribe was removed to the West in 1839. The origin and meaning of the name, which they pronounce *Tsaragi* or *Tsalagi*, are unknown. They commonly call themselves *Yûñwiya*, "real people".

The history of the Cherokees begins with De Soto, who passed within their territory in 1540. In 1684 they made their first treaty with the English of Carolina, with whom thereafter they maintained friendly relations throughout the Colonial period, except in the Yamasee war in 1715–1716, and in a war waged on their own account in 1759–1761. They took sides also with the English against the Americans during the Revolution, but made a treaty of peace with the United States in 1785, although the border fighting went on some years longer. In 1821 Sequoya, a mixed-blood of the tribe, invented a syllabic alphabet for the language which has been an immense factor in their progress toward civilization. In 1827 they adopted a regular form of government modelled upon that of the United States, but after long controversy with the State of Georgia, which claimed jurisdiction over most of their territory not already ceded, a treaty was forced upon them in 1835 by which they bound themselves to remove to their present home in Oklahoma. The removal was accomplished in 1839, and their tribal existence continued under the style of the "Cherokee Nation", until dissolved for American citizenship in 1906. As already noted, a small body remained behind in the old home in the East. The tribe at present numbers altogether about 20,000 persons of pure and mixed blood, exclusive of several thousand names carried upon the rolls, but repudiated by the Indians.

The Cherokees were a sedentary and agricultural people, with hunting and fishing as subordinate occupations. The women were expert potters and basket-weavers, and the men skilful carvers of stone and wood. They had no central government, each town being independent in its action. They had a system of seven clans, with descent in the female line. In religion they were pantheists, holding in special reverence the Sun, Fire and Water. Their great religious ceremony was the Green Corn dance, a thanskgiving for the new crops, and their chief athletic amusement was a ball-game which is the original of our lacrosse. They buried their dead in caves or under piles of stones.

The story of a Cherokee mission as early as 1643 must be regarded as apocryphal. So far as known, the first Christianizing, or at least civilizing effort among them was undertaken about 1736 by Christian Priber, possibly a Jesuit, but more probably a French officer or agent, who established himself among them, learned the language, organized the tribal government upon a civilized basis, and taught them the principles of Christian morality for some years, until he was seized by the English and conveyed to Charleston, South Carolina, where he died in prison. In 1801 the Moravians began work among the tribe, and were followed by Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Baptists. Catholic mission schools, in whole or part for Cherokees, are now conducted at Vinita, Tulsa, and Muscogee, Indian Territory. The whole tribe may be considered as civilized and Christian, although still retaining much of the old time belief and custom.

MOONEY, *Myths of the Cherokee*, in *Nineteenth Report, Bureau Am. Ethnology* (Washington, 1900); ADAIR, *Hist. of the Am. Indians* (London, 1775); BARTRAM, *Travels* (London, 1792).

JAMES MOONEY.

Chersonese. See TIRASPOL.

Chersonesus, (1) a titular see of Crete. The city stood on a little peninsula of the north-east coast, between Cnossus and Olous, and was the seaport of Lyttos. In the fourth century B. C. it struck coins, and was known for its temple of Britomartis. Its ruins are near the modern village of Khersonisi. Lequien (II, 269) mentions four Greek bishops, from 441 to 789; the see still figures in later "Notitiæ Episcopatuum" of the twelfth or thirteenth century. Seven Latin bishops are mentioned by Lequien (III, 915), from 1298 to 1549, of whom the last two, Dionysius and Joannes Franciscus Verdura, were present at the Council of Trent. Another bishop of Chersonesus was Pietro Coletti, at the beginning of the seventeenth century—a Catholic, but whether of his native Greek Rite or of the Latin is unknown (E. Legrand, "Bibliographie hellénique, 17e siècle", III, 143).—(2) A titular see of Thrace, and suffragan to Heracleia. The city was situated near Callipolis (Gallipoli) and Agora (Malgara?). One Greek bishop is mentioned in 449 and one Latin in 1527 (Lequien, I, 1128; III, 973).

CORNER, *Creta Sacra* (Venice, 1755); PASHLEY, *Travels in Crete* (Cambridge, 1837), I, 268 sq.; SPRATT, *Travels and Researches in Crete* (London, 1867), I, 104 sq.; SMITH, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geogr.* (London, 1878), I, 507, 508.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cherubim.—Angelic beings or symbolic representations thereof, mentioned frequently in the Old and once in the New Testament.

I. IN PHILOLOGY.—The word *cherub* (*cherubim* is the Hebrew masc. plural) is a word borrowed from the Assyrian *kirubu*, from *karâbu*, "to be near", hence it means near ones, familiars, personal servants, bodyguards, courtiers. It was commonly used of those heavenly spirits, who closely surrounded the Majesty of God and paid Him intimate service. Hence it came to mean as much as "Angelic Spirit". (The change from *K* of *Karâbu*, to *K* of *Kirub* is nothing unusual in Assyrian. The word has been brought into connexion with the Egyptian *Xefer* by metathesis from *Xeref=K-r-bh.*) A similar metathesis and play upon sound undoubtedly exists between *Kerub* and *Rakab*, "to ride", and *Merkeba*, "chariot". The late Jewish explanation by analogy between *Kerub* and *Rekûb*, "a youth", seems worthless. The word ought to be pronounced in English *qerub* and *qerubim*, and not with a soft *ch*.

II. IN ART.—Cherub and Cherubim are most frequently referred to in the Bible to designate sculptured, engraved, and embroidered figures used in the furniture and ornamentation of the Jewish Sanctuary. —(a) According to Exod., xxv, 18–21 there were placed on the *kapporeth*, or lid of the Ark, i. e. "the Mercy-Seat", the figures of two *cherubim* of wrought (= massive?) gold. (b) According to III Kings, vi, 23 sqq., and II Paralip., iii, 11 sqq., Solomon placed in the

Holy of Holies two huge Cherubim of olive-wood overlaid with gold. "They stood on their feet and their faces were towards the house", which probably means that they faced the Holy Place or the Entrance.—(c) According to Exod., xxvi, 31, cherubim were embroidered on the Veil of the Temple, separating the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies "With blue and purple and scarlet and fine twined linen" they were made. How many such cherubim were embroidered on the Paroket, or Veil, we do not know. It is often supposed that, as this veil screened the Holy of Holies, two large-sized figures to represent guardian spirits or keepers were thereon depicted.—(d) According to II Kings, vi and vii, cherubim were engraved apparently as an artistic "motif" in wood and metal. The panelling of the Temple, both interior and exterior, was covered with them, as well as with palm-trees and open flowers. The brazen sea was adorned with figures of lions, oxen, and cherubim.—(e) According to Ezechiel, xli, 18 sqq., in his visionary description of the Temple, the wall-space of the Sanctuary was ornamented with cherubim and palm-trees, and each cherub had two faces, that of a man and that of a lion, the faces respectively turned to the palm-tree to the right and left. But there is no ground whatever to suppose that the actual cherubim of the Solomonic Temple or pre-Solomonic Sanctuary were double-faced; the contrary seems certain, but from the Scripture text we cannot with certainty conclude what sort of faces these Temple cherubim had, whether animal or human. It is sometimes concluded from Ezech., x, 14, "the first face was the face of a cherub and the second that of a man, the third the face of a lion and the fourth the face of an eagle", that a cherub's face cannot have been a human one, and the face of an ox has naturally been suggested, but the argument is not conclusive.

In Egyptian art, figures with a human face and two outstretched wings attached to the arms are exceedingly common. In Assyrian art, also, winged human figures on either side of a palm-tree are very often used in decoration. They are sometimes hawk-headed, but more usually possess men's faces. However, even the Jews at the time of Christ had completely forgotten the appearance of the Temple cherubim. Josephus (Antiq., VIII, iii, § 3) says that no one knows or even can guess what form they had. The very fact, however, that the Bible nowhere gives a word of explanation, but always presupposes them well-known, makes us believe that they were among the most common figures of contemporary art.

III. In Inspired Vision.—As Jehovah was surrounded by figures of cherubim in His Sanctuary on earth, so He is, according to Scripture, surrounded in reality by cherubim in His Court above. The function ascribed to these heavenly servants of God's Majesty is that of throne-bearers, or "carriers", of His Divine Majesty. In Ps. xvii the psalmist describes the sudden descent of Jehovah to rescue a soul in distress in the following words: "He bowed the heavens and came down, and darkness was under His feet. He rode upon a cherub and flew, and flew upon the wings of the wind." Some see in the cherubim a species of storm-spirits, or angels through whose agency storm-clouds gathered, as if they were God's living chariot, swift as the wings of the wind. The idea of cherubim as the chariot of God seems indicated in I Paralip. 18, where David gives gold for the Temple cherubim, who are described as מרכבה "the Chariot", not, probably, because they had the outward shape of a vehicle, but because the Temple cherubim symbolized the swift-winged living thrones upon which the Almighty journeys through the heavens.

The Prophet Ezechiel mentions the cherubim in a two-fold connexion: (a) in his vision of the living chariot of God (Ch. i and x); (b) in his prophecy on the Prince of Tyre (Ch. xxviii, 14 sqq.). Ezechiel's vision of the Cherubim, which is practically the same in the tenth chapter as in the first, is one of the most difficult in Scripture, and has given rise to a multitude of explanations. The prophet first saw a luminous cloud coming from the north; from a distance it seemed a heavy cloud fringed with light and some intense brilliancy in the centre thereof, bright as gold, yet in perpetual motion as the flames of a fire. Within that heavenly fire he began gradually to distinguish four living beings with bodies as men, yet with four faces each: a human face in front, but an eagle's face behind; a lion's face to the left and an ox's face to the right. Though approaching, yet their knees did not bend in their march, straight and stiff they remained; and for feet they had the hoofs of oxen, shod as it were with shining brass. They had four arms, two to each shoulder, and attached along each arm a wing. Of these four winged arms two were outstretched above, and two were let down and covered their bodies. These four living beings stood together, facing in four opposite directions, and between them were four great wheels, each wheel being double, so that it could roll forward or sideways. Thus this angelic chariot, in whatever of the four directions it moved, always presented the same aspect. And both angels and wheels were all studded with eyes. And over the heads of the cherubim, so that they touched it with the points of their outstretched wings, was an expanse of crystal, and on this crystal a sapphire throne, and on the throne one resembling a man, the likeness of the glory of Jehovah.

The mystical meaning of each detail of this vision will probably remain a matter of speculation, but the meaning of the four faces seems not difficult to grasp: man is the king of creation, the lion the king of beasts of the forest, the ox the king of the kine of the field, the eagle the king of the birds of the air. On this account the cherubim have of recent years been explained as mere symbols of the fulness of earthly life, which, like the earth itself, is the footstool of God. But these faces are more naturally understood to signify that these angelic beings possessed the intelligent wisdom of man, the lithe strength of the lion, the ponderous weight of the ox, the soaring sublimity of the eagle. Early Christianity transferred this Old Testament vision to a New Testament sphere and gradually used these cherubic figures to designate the four Evangelists—a thought of rare grandeur and singular felicity, yet only a *sensus accommodatus*.

Ezechiel's Prophecy against the Prince of Tyre contains a description of the almost more than earthly glory of that ancient city. Tyre is spoken of as an angel fallen from glory. Of the King of Tyre it is said: "Thou, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. In Eden, the garden of God wert thou, all precious stones were thy covering. Thou wert a cherub with wings outstretched in protection, thou wert on the holy mountain of God, thou didst walk amongst fiery stones. Thou wert innocent in thy ways from the day on which thou wert created until iniquity was found in thee. . . . thou didst sin, therefore I will cast thee out from the mountain of God and destroy thee, O protecting cherub away from the fiery stones." —Indirectly we can gather from this passage that Cherubim were conceived to be in a state of perfection, wisdom, sinlessness, nearness to God on His Holy Mountain and of preternatural glory and happiness. Unfortunately, the words paraphrased as "with wings outstretched in protection" are difficult to translate: ממשח הסוכך may mean "cherub of anointing, who covers", therefore a royal, anointed being, overshadowing others with its wings to shelter them. If this be so, we must add royalty and beneficence to the characteristics of cherubim.

IV. In Theology.—Notwithstanding the present common opinion of advanced Protestant scholars, that cherubim are only symbolic representations of

abstract ideas, the Catholic Church undoubtedly holds that there are actually existing spiritual beings corresponding to the name. That Old Testament writers used the word *cherubim* to designate angels, not merely to express ideas, can be best gathered from Gen., iii, 24, where God sets cherubim at the entrance of Paradise. This sentence would bear no sense at all if cherubim did not stand for ministerial beings, differing from man, carrying out the behest of God. Likewise, it is difficult to read Ezechiel and to persuade oneself that the Prophet does not presuppose the actual existence of real personal beings under the name of Cherubim; in chaps. i and x he speaks again and again of חיות "living beings", and he says רוח החיה the Spirit of Life was within them, and repeatedly points out that the bodily forms he sees are but appearances of the living beings thus manifested. The living beings (ζῶα) so often mentioned in St. John's Apocalypse can only be taken as parallel to those of Ezechiel, and their personal existence in St. John's mind cannot be doubted. The frequent sentence also: "who sittest upon the Cherubim" (I Sam., iv, 4; II Sam., vi, 2; IV Kings, xix; Is., xxxvii, 37, 16; Pss. lxxix, 2, and xcviii, 1), though no doubt referring to Jehovah's actual dwelling in the Holy of Holies, yet is better understood as referring to the heavenly throne-bearers of God. There can be no doubt that the later Jews—that is from 200 B. C. onwards—looked upon the cherubim as real angelic beings; the angelology of the Book of Enoch and the apocryphal Books of Esdras give us an undeniable testimony on this point.

So the Christian Church from the first accepted the personality of the cherubim and early adopted Philo's interpretation of the name. Clem. Alex.: "The name Cherubim intends to show much understanding (αἰσθησιν πολλήν)." (Stromata, V, 240.) Though counted amongst the angels during the first centuries of Christianity, the cherubim and seraphim were not mentioned in the lists of the angelic hierarchy. At first but seven choirs of angels were reckoned, i. e. those enumerated (Eph., i, 21, and Col., i, 16), with the addition of *angeli et archangeli*. Thus St. Irenæus, Hær. II, xxx, and Origen, Περὶ ἀρχῶν, I, v. But soon it was realized that the Apostle's list was not intended to be a complete one, and the Old Testament angelic beings mentioned by Ezechiel and Isaias, the cherubim and seraphim, and others were added, so that we have eight, nine, or ten, or even eleven ranks in that hierarchy. The cherubim and seraphim were sometimes thought to be but other names for thrones and virtues (Gregory of Nyssa, "Contra Eunom.", I; Augustine in Ps., xcviii, 3). Since Pseudo-Dionys., De Cœlesti Hier. (written about A. D. 500), the ninefold division of the angelic order has been practically universal; and the cherubim and seraphim take the highest place in the hierarchy, a rank which was ascribed to them already by St. Cyril of Jerusalem (370) and by St. Chrysostom (about 400), and which Pope Gregory the Great, once aprocrisarius or nuncio at Constantinople, made familiar to the West. Pope Gregory divided the nine angelic orders into three choirs, the highest choir being: thrones, cherubim, and seraphim. Of the cherubim he says (Hom. in Ev., xxxiv, 10), that *cherubim* means "the fulness of knowledge, and these most sublime hosts are thus called, because they are filled with a knowledge which is the more perfect as they are allowed to behold the glory of God more closely". This explanation of St. Gregory is ultimately derived from Philo's similar statement, and was already combined with the Old Testament function of the cherubim by St. Augustine in his sublime comment on Ps., lxxix, 2, "Who sitteth upon the Cherubim": "Cherubim means the Seat of the Glory of God and is interpreted: Fulness of Knowledge. God then has His seat upon Fulness of Knowledge. Though we realize that cherubim are exalted heavenly powers and virtues; yet if thou wilt, thou too shalt be one of the cherubim. For if cherubim means, Seat of God, remember what the Scripture says: The soul of the just is the Seat of Wisdom."

KEIL, *Commentary on Ezechiel*, I, 20–46, in *Clark's Foreign Lib.* (Edinburgh, 1876), IV; KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius in Ezechielem* (Paris, 1890), 21–41; ZSCHOKKE, *Theologie der Propheten* (Freiburg im Br., 1877), 250 sqq.; BAREILLE in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v. *Anges*, 1206–11; WULFF, *Cherubim, Throne und Seraphim* (Altenburg, 1894); PERROT AND CHIPIEZ, *Le temple de Jérusalem* (Paris, 1889); VIGOUROUX, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes*, IV, 358–409; RYLE in HASTINGS, *Bible Dict.*, s. v.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Cherubini, MARIA LUIGI CARLO ZENOBIO SALVATORE, composer, b. in Florence, 14 September, 1760; d. at Paris, 15 March, 1842. His instruction in music began at the early age of six, his father being a musician, and at thirteen he had composed a Te Deum, a Credo, a Miserere, a Mass, and a Dixit. When he was eighteen he attracted the attention of the Grand Duke, afterwards the Emperor Leopold II of Germany, who allowed him a pension. This enabled Cherubini to study counterpoint and the Roman School under Giuseppe Sarti (1729–1802) in Bologna. Sarti advised his pupil to abandon the Neapolitan School, and take Palestrina and his contemporaries as his models. It was part of Sarti's plan of instruction to have his pupils copy the scores of the masters of the Roman schools, a practice which Cherubini kept up throughout his life and enforced when he became director of the Paris Conservatoire, for he held that, while text books are good, analysis is better. While still under the influence of his master he wrote music to liturgical texts, but soon yielded to the trend of the time by turning his attention to the operatic stage. In 1780 his first opera, "Quinto Fabio", was produced at Alessandria. This was followed by six other operas brought out in various Italian cities. In 1784 Cherubini was invited to visit London, where he composed and had represented two operas, "La Finta Principessa" and "Giulio Sabino", works which brought him the appointment of composer to the Court. The year 1786–87 he spent in Paris, returning to Italy for the winter of 1787–88. He then definitely took up his abode in Paris, at that time the scene of the operatic war between Gluck and Piccini, the former representing the principle that music should be the expression of dramatic truth, and the latter the prevailing notion of the Italian school, that music is mainly an external ornamental addition to the dramatic situation, an opportunity of display for vocal virtuosi.

MARIA LUIGI CHERUBINI

From 1788 to 1805 were trying years for Cherubini. All through this period of political change and unrest he underwent many hardships and humiliations and laboured for recognition and an artistic existence in Paris without permanent success. His operas, "Démophon", "Lodoiska", "Elisa", "Medée", "L'hôtellerie portugaise", "La Punition", "Emma" (La prisonnière), "Les deux journées", "Epicure", "Anacréon", written during this time, had to be performed in the small Théâtre de la Foire Saint-Germain (where he directed the performances from 1789–1792) because the grand opera house was closed to him.

When the Conservatoire was organized in 1795, Cherubini was appointed one of the inspectors. This was about the only distinction conferred upon him during all the years he laboured in Paris. His high ideals, his independent disposition, but above all the pure, lofty character of his music, were responsible for his failure to become popular with his contemporaries, and especially with Napoleon I. In 1805 Cherubini received an invitation from Vienna to write an opera and to direct it in person. "Faniska" was produced the following year and received the enthusiastic approbation of the musical world in general, and in particular, of Haydn and Beethoven. The latter especially admired Cherubini, considering him to be the greatest dramatic composer of his time. Napoleon, holding his court at Schönbrunn during Cherubini's visit to Vienna, pressed him into service and commanded him to take charge of his court concerts. In spite of this, Cherubini could not win the approval of the emperor. The latter preferred the lighter Italian style of Paisiello and Zingarelli, who wrote music to which, in the words of Cherubini, Napoleon might listen without ceasing to think about affairs of state. It was hoped that the opera "Pygmalion", which he brought out after he returned to Paris, would secure for the composer the favour and protection of the head of the State, but in vain.

Disappointed and discouraged by lack of recognition, Cherubini produced scarcely anything in the two years which followed. He was broken-hearted and in ill health. He accepted an invitation from the Prince de Chimay to visit him and recuperate, and then devoted most of his time to drawing and the study of botany. The dedication of a church in the village of Chimay was the circumstance which changed his career. He was requested to write a mass for this occasion, and the great Mass in F was the result. For thirty years he had written for the stage and had failed to find popular favour. His art was too lofty for general appreciation. Although he did not now entirely forsake the dramatic form (five more operas came from his hand after the Mass in F) he was more and more drawn again toward the field of church music, which he had not cultivated for eighteen years. Cherubini's great inventiveness and powers of expression were now at their height. His previous activity and experience had developed and matured him both morally and artistically, fitting him for the creation of works he has left us. In a material sense also there was soon to be a change for the better. In 1815 the London Philharmonic Society commissioned him to write a symphony, an overture, and a composition for chorus and orchestra, the performance of which he went especially to London to conduct. This increased his fame abroad. After the accession of Louis XVIII to the throne, Cherubini's fortunes rose rapidly. He was successively appointed Royal Superintendent of Music and Director of the Conservatoire. He was now at the head of music in France. For the first time in his career he enjoyed the favour and approval of those in power and the recognition of the people in general. His greatest works were written during this period, and as the head of the Conservatoire he influenced the growing generation of musicians, and was an effective barrier against the incipient school of impressionism headed by young Berlioz. Cherubini remained active until 1841, when he resigned his various official positions. Remarkable for organic unity of style, elevation of form, truth of expression and ingenious orchestration as are Cherubini's dramatic works, he became truly himself in his creations to liturgical texts. The sublimity of conception, vividness, and sustained power displayed in his Mass in F, in the Mass in A written for the coronation of Charles X, his two requiems (especially the one in D minor for three men's voices and orchestra, which he wrote for his own funeral), place these works among the greatest in all musical literature. Pathetic tenderness alternates with epical grandeur and brilliancy. They are master-works of religious music but are not available for liturgical purposes. The immoderate length of most of them and their violently dramatic character at times exclude them from use during Divine service. Moreover, he takes liberties with the sacred text. Cherubini's masses, like Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis", are frequently performed in Germany and elsewhere on festival occasions when large vocal and instrumental bodies unite for the interpretation of the loftiest musical productions of the human mind. Cherubini left some 450 works, about 100 of which have appeared in print. Among them are 11 masses, 2 requiems, motets, litanies, cantatas, and 25 operas.

CROWEST, *Cherubini, A Monograph* (London, 1890); BELLASIS, *Memorials of Cherubini* (London, 1876); URIEL, *Vie de Cherubini* (Paris, 1842).

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Chester, ANCIENT DIOCESE OF (CESTRENSIS), in England. Though the See of Chester, schismatically created by Henry VIII in 1541, was recognized by the Holy See only for the short space of Queen Mary's reign, the city had in earlier times possessed a bishop and a cathedral, though only intermittently. Even before the Norman Conquest the title "Bishop of Chester" is found in documents applied to prelates who would be more correctly described as Bishops of Mercia or even of Lichfield. After the Council of London in 1075 had decreed the transfer of all episcopal chairs to cities, Peter, Bishop of Lichfield, removed his seat from Lichfield to Chester, and became known as Bishop of Chester. There he chose the collegiate Church of St. John the Baptist as his cathedral. The next bishop, however, transferred the see to Coventry on account of the rich monastery there, though he retained the episcopal palace at Chester. The Diocese of Coventry and Lichfield was of enormous extent, and it was probably found convenient to have something analogous to a cathedral at Chester, even though the *cathedra* itself were elsewhere; accordingly we find that the church of St. John ranked as a cathedral for a considerable time, and had its own dean and chapter of secular canons down to the time of the Reformation. But the chief ecclesiastical foundation in Chester was the Benedictine monastery of St. Werburgh, the great church of which finally became the Cathedral Church of Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary. The site had been occupied even during the Christian period of the Roman occupation by a church dedicated to Sts. Peter and Paul, and rededicated to St. Werburgh and St. Oswald during the Saxon period. This church was served by a small chapter of secular canons until 1093, when Hugh Lupus, Earl of Chester, converted it into a great Benedictine monastery, in which foundation he had the co-operation of St. Anselm, then Prior of Bec, who sent Richard, one of his monks, to be the first abbot. A new Norman church was built by him and his successors. The monastery, though suffering loss of property both by the depredations of the Welsh and the inroads of the sea, prospered, and in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries the monks transformed their Norman church into a Gothic building which, though not to be reckoned among the greatest cathedrals of England, yet is not unworthy of its rank, and affords a valuable study in the evolution of Gothic architecture. It has been said of it that "at every turn it is satisfying in small particulars and disappointing in great features". The last of the abbots was John, or Thomas, Clark, who resigned his abbey, valued at £1,003 5s. 11d. per annum, to the king.

In 1541 Henry VIII, having thrown off all obedience to the pope, created six new bishoprics, one of which was Chester. The archdeaconry of Chester,

from the Diocese of Coventry and Lichfield, and that of Richmond, from York, were combined to form the new see, and the abbey church, now the cathedral, was to be served by a dean and six prebends, the complaisant ex-abbot becoming the first dean. At first the diocese was annexed to the Province of Canterbury, but by another Act of Parliament it was soon transferred to that of York. The first bishop was the Provincial of the Carmelites, John Bird, a doctor of divinity who had attracted the king's attention by his sermons preached against the pope's supremacy. Having already been rewarded by the Bishopric of Bangor, he was now translated to Chester. On the accession of Mary he was deprived as being a married man, and died Vicar of Dunmow in 1556. The diocese being now canonically recognized by the pope, George Cotys, Master of Balliol and Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, in which university he had been a distinguished lecturer in theology, was appointed bishop by the Holy See. In 1556 he was succeeded by Cuthbert Scott, a very learned theologian and Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University. On the accession of Elizabeth he was one of the four Catholic bishops chosen to defend Catholic doctrine at the conference at Westminster, and immediately after this he was sent to the Tower. Being released on bail, he contrived to escape to the Continent. He died at Louvain, 9 Oct., 1564. The arms of the see were: gules, three mitres with their labels, or.

LYSONS, *Cheshire* (1810); HEMINGWAY, *History of Chester* (Chester, 1831); ORMEROD, *History of Cheshire* (1882); MORRIS, *Chester during the Plantagenet and Tudor Periods* (privately printed, 1893); *Chester Architectural and Archæological Society Journal;* HIATT, *Chester: The Cathedral and See* (London, 1905).

EDWIN BURTON.

Chester Plays. See MIRACLE PLAYS.

Cheverus, JEAN-LOUIS LEFEBVRE, DE, first Bishop of Boston, U. S. A., Bishop of Montauban; Archbishop of Bordeaux, France, and Cardinal, b. at Mayenne, France, 28 January, 1768; d. at Bordeaux, 19 July, 1836. Ordained priest by dispensation when not yet twenty-three, he was appointed assistant to an uncle, whom he shortly succeeded as pastor of Mayenne, receiving faculties, also, to act as vicar-general. Refusal to take the oath imposed by the Revolution cost him his parish, and very nearly his life. He escaped from Paris to London, in disguise. Proferred aid on his arrival, he replied: "The little I have will suffice until I learn something of the language. Once acquainted with that, I can earn my living by manual labour, if necessary". In three months he knew English enough to teach, and within a year gathered a congregation. A letter from a former professor, the Rev. Francis A. Matignon, then pastor at Boston, told him of the hard conditions and crying needs of Catholic work there, urging, also, his peculiar fitness for bringing it to success, if he would only come there. The call was heeded. Arriving in Boston, 3 October, 1796, he wrote Bishop Carroll: "Send me where you think I am most needed, without making yourself anxious about the means of my support. I am willing to work with my hands, if need be".

His work in New England, covering twenty-seven years, included every form of missionary activity. He lived among the Indians, mastering their dialect; trudged on foot long distances, attending scattered Catholics; nursed the sick and buried the dead during two yellow-fever epidemics; collected funds and built a church in Boston; was business-man, adviser, peacemaker, servant, doctor for his flock, failing them in no form of helpfulness. This disinterested devotion to humble duties joined with extraordinary tact gradually won the respect of the prejudiced Puritans. Closer acquaintance, revealing Cheverus's brilliant talents, wide learning, innate refinement, transparent holiness, and Christ-like charity, deepened respect into confidence, veneration, and love. Ministers invited him to their pulpits. The legislature sought and acted on his counsels. At a state banquet to President John Adams (whose name had headed a list of Protestant contributors to the Catholic Church building fund), he was placed next the guest of honour. Named first Bishop of Boston, 8 April, 1808, he was not consecrated owing to the non-arrival of the Bulls until 1 November, 1810.

Philadelphia sought him as pastor, France as a bishop, Baltimore as coadjutor: "I pray, I supplicate, I entreat with heartfelt earnestness", he besought the pope, "that I may never be transferred; that I may be permitted to consecrate all my cares to my small but beloved flock". He had conquered prejudice, but his delicate constitution could not withstand a harsh climate. Impending loss of health was made the valid excuse of his recall to France, and he was transferred to the See of Montauban, 15 January, 1823. His departure struck Catholics with consternation. Non-Catholics formally protested. "What will become of the American church?" cried Archbishop Maréchal. "You were, next to God, my greatest dependence". Montauban was a Huguenot stronghold, but shortly after his arrival there a resident wrote: "There are no longer Protestants at Montauban; we are all bishop's people". On 30 July, 1826, he was elevated to the Archbishopric of Bordeaux; Charles X made him a peer; and on 1 February, 1835, he was created cardinal. In Massachusetts his career became an apologia for Catholicity. Dr. Channing, the eminent Unitarian divine, asked: "Who among our religious teachers would solicit a comparison between himself and the devoted Cheverus? . . . How can we shut our hearts against this proof of the Catholic religion to form good and great men? . . . It is time that greater justice were done to this ancient and widespread community". (See BOSTON, ARCHDIOCESE OF.)

HAMON, *Vie du Cardinal Cheverus* (Paris, 1837, 1883), tr. STEWART (Boston, 1839); SHEA, *Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll* (New York, 1888); LEAHY, *Archdiocese of Boston* in *History of the Catholic Church in the New England States* (Boston, 1889).

JOSEPH V. TRACY.

Chevreul, MICHEL-EUGÈNE, chemist, physicist, and philosopher, b. at Angers, France, 31 August, 1786; d. at Paris, 9 April, 1889. His father was a physician, who had himself been an investigator and had reached the age of ninety-one years. Educated in his native town at the Ecole Centrale, formerly the university, Chevreul went to Paris at the age of seventeen and obtained a place in the laboratory of Vauquelin, a chemical-manufacturer. Subsequently he became chief of this laboratory. At the age of twenty he began contributing to scientific literature, and at twenty-six had attained the rank of professor at the Lycée Charlemagne. Later he became director of the Gobelins, member of the Academy of Sciences, and was admitted to the Legion of Honour, in which he won every promotion until he ultimately received the Grand Cross. His centennial jubilee in 1886 was a very remarkable demonstration which the Government directed, and in which Chevreul participated with bodily and mental vigour. His funeral, which took place two years and seven months later, was made the occasion of paying great honour to his memory.

Although he is renowned for the extensive range of his work, Chevreul's fame rests chiefly upon two particular and important lines of investigation which he entered upon and followed up with great success: namely, in chemistry, "The Constitution of the Fats", and in physics, "The Harmony of Colours". The former is set forth in his "Recherches chimiques

sur les corps gras d'orgine animale" (1823), in which he demonstrated that fats have the constitution of ethereal salts and are neutral glycerine ethers of fatty acids; that is, that they can be separated into their respective fatty acids and glycerine. He demonstrated the reactions occurring when this phenomenon, known as saponification, is brought about by strong bases or strong acids. He distinguished the constituent acids of the common fats and determined their constants. Practical corollaries of this discovery were the establishment of the great industry of stearin candle manufacture and the introduction of glycerine into commerce on a large scale. These researches also led to a broadening amongst chemists of all countries in the study of the theory of the constitution of organic bodies.



MICHEL-EUGÈNE CHEVREUL.

Chevreul's position as director of the Gobelins, to which he had been appointed by Louis XVIII, led to his important discoveries, both in the chemistry of dyeing, previously little understood, and in the physics of colour and colour effect. His papers on the latter subject began in 1828, in the "Mémoires de l'Académie", and his great work, "The Law of Simultaneous Contrast of Colours", was published in 1839. Similar studies had engrossed the attention of Abbé Haüy, the crystallographer, and of Scherffer, a Jesuit (1754); but Chevreul was able to deduce from a vast number of his own observations the laws governing changes in intensity of tone and shade or modification of colour, and particularly the influence of one colour on another in juxtaposition. A practical application of this knowledge, together with practical results from the study of dye-stuffs, and the blending of colours in dyeing, served to bring this art to a perfection which increased again by the variety of dyes obtainable from bennol, has been of the utmost use industrially.

Chevreul also participated in many of the philosophical debates of his century. He strongly combated scepticism and materialism, and constantly asserted that the harmony of the universe and nature, and of man's life and place in them, demonstrated a wisdom which must be called Divine. To some who had written of him as an advocate of an irreligious science he answered by asserting in an open letter to a friend (published in "Le Bien Public" 17 September 1886) that he wished to be known as a savant, and at the same time a faithful Catholic: "Those who know me [illegible] also know that born a Catholic, the son of Christian parents, I live and I mean to die a Catholic." While Chevreul will not occupy a place in the history of chemistry as high as his fellow-countryman and contemporary, Dumas, he nevertheless suggests one of the best examples of the union of research with technical practice resulting in changes great enough to affect the history of nations. The following are his principal works: "Leçons de chimie appliquée à la teinture" (1828–1831); "De la loi du contraste simultané des couleurs" (1839); "Essai de mécanique chimique" (1854); "De la baguette divinatoire" (1854); "Considérations sur l'histoire de la partie de la médecine qui concerne la prescription des remèdes" (1865); "Histoire des connaissances chimiques" (1866).

"Eugène Chevreul" (Supplement to the *Journal des Savants*, 1889); BERTHELOT, *Notice sur Chevreul* (Paris, 1889); *Chevreul Jubilee* (London, 1886); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Paris, 1886); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Boston, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Philadelphia, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (New York, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Chicago, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (St. Louis, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Cincinnati, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Pittsburgh, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Cleveland, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Detroit, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Milwaukee, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Minneapolis, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Kansas City, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Omaha, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Denver, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Salt Lake City, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (San Francisco, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Portland, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Seattle, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Spokane, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Tacoma, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Vancouver, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Victoria, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Winnipeg, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Toronto, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Montreal, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Quebec, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Halifax, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (St. John, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Charlottetown, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Fredericton, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Moncton, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Sackville, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Truro, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Amherst, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Pictou, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (New Glasgow, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Stellarton, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Westville, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Springhill, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Oxford, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Parrsboro, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Advocate Harbour, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Economy, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Five Islands, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Maitland, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Noel, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Walton, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Hantsport, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Lockeport, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Liverpool, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Shelburne, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Yarmouth, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Digby, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Annapolis, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Kentville, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Wolfville, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Windsor, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Hantsport, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Lockeport, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Liverpool, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Shelburne, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Yarmouth, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Digby, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Annapolis, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Kentville, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Wolfville, 1887); *Chevreul Jubilee* (Windsor, 1887)

CHARLES F. MCKENNA.

Cheyenne, DIOCESE OF (CHEYENNENSIS), established 9 August, 1887, is coextensive with the State of Wyoming, an area of 97,575 square miles. Its first bishop, Rt. Rev. Maurice F. Burke, was consecrated 28 October, 1887. Wyoming had been included in the Diocese of Omaha, established in 1885; before that it belonged to the Vicariate Apostolic of Nebraska. The first Mass, of which there is a record, offered up within the territory of Wyoming was celebrated by the Jesuit missionary, Father De Smet, on the open prairie at the fur-traders' rendezvous on Green River, Sunday 4 July, 1840. The congregation was composed of Flatheads, Snake and other Indians, and a motley group of trappers and hunters. Father De Smet passed through Wyoming many times within the next eleven years on missionary trips, and as army-chaplain and Indian pacificator. Priests from Canada passed through en route to Indian missions and ministered to Canadian fur-traders and other Catholics whom they met at Fort Laramie and elsewhere in Wyoming. Owing to the naturally arid soil, the settlement of Wyoming has been very slow. Absentee cattle-owners ranged vast herds freely everywhere within its boundaries. The development of mines waited on the tardy building of railroads. Scores of Catholics lived in this territory over thirty years and reared families without sacraments. Mass or priest. The losses to the Faith in Wyoming, as in neighbouring states, have been appalling. Vicars Apostolic, afterwards bishops, had no funds for educating or supporting missionary priests. It would seem that in 1887, as indeed for nearly a decade after, Wyoming's need was not so much diocesan organization as travelling missionaries. The ecclesiastical census of 1907 gives the diocese about 14,000 Catholics in a population of about 100,000; 22 churches, 7 of which had been built within the year; 17 priests; 20 missions without churches; an academy and boys'-school in Cheyenne and an Indian school at St. Stephen's Mission.

"Catholic Directory, Almanac and Year-Book" (Milwaukee, 1908); CHITTENDEN AND RICHARDSON, *Life, Letters and Travels of Father Pierre-Jean De Smet, S. J.*, 4 vols. (New York, 1905), I-II, *passim*.

J. A. DUNN.

Chézy, ANTOINE-LÉONARD DE, a French Orientalist, b. at Neuilly, 15 January, 1773; d. at Paris, 31 August, 1832. His father was an engineer, and he was originally destined for a similar career, but he preferred linguistic studies and devoted himself to Arabic and Persian under Sacy and Langlès. In 1796 he was appointed assistant librarian in the department of manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale. Attracted by the Sanskrit manuscripts, he was the first Frenchman who took up the study of India's sacred language, though he had neither grammar nor dictionary to assist him. When, in 1814, the first professorship of Sanskrit in Europe was established at the Collège de France, Chézy was called to the position. Many of the foremost European Sanskritists were his pupils, among them Burnouf, Langlois, Loiseleur-Deslongchamps, and Lassen. In 1805 Chézy married Wilhelmine Christiane von Klencke, better known as Helmina von Chézy, an authoress of some reputation. The couple separated after five years.

He is the author of numerous editions and translations of Oriental works. In 1807 appeared "Les Amours de Medjnoun et Leila", a translation of

Jāmī's Persian poem "Lailā u Majnūn". "La Mort de Yadjnadatta" (Paris, 1814, and again, with Sanskrit text, 1826) is a translation of a well-known episode of the Rāmāyana, describing the slaying of a hermit by King Dašaratha (Bombay ed., II, 63). A translation of another episode from the same poem, the fight of Lakshmana with the giant Atikāya (VI, 71), appeared in 1818. Chézy's most notable work, however, was the publication in 1830 of Kalidāsa's famous drama, "Šakuntalā", under the title "La reconnaissance de Sacountala". This was the first time that the Sanskrit text of this masterpiece was printed. Other works of his are an analysis of the Meghadūta (1817), "Anthologie érotique d'Amarou", a translation of the "Amarusataka", which appeared under the pseudonym of Apudy in 1831, and "La théorie du Sloka" (1829), a disquisition on Sanskrit metre. Besides this he has left much work in manuscript.

HOUDAS in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Chiabrera, GABRIELLO, poet, b. at Savona, Italy, 8 June, 1552; d. there, 1638. When nine years of age he went to Rome to live with an uncle and there received his early education. He attended lectures on philosophy at the Jesuits' College until his twentieth year. When a youth at Rome, he was on familiar terms with the learned men of the day, and favours came to him unsought from the Dukes of Savoy, Mantua, and Florence, Pope Urban VIII and the Republic of Genoa. He spent most of his time in Florence and Genoa. When fifty years of age he married. He is said to have written this distich to be inscribed over his tomb:

Amico,
Io vivendo cervava il conforto per lo Monte Parnasso.
Tu, meglio consigliato, fa di cercarlo sul Monte Calvario.

Chiabrera and G. Marini were the greatest lyric poets of the century. Chiabrera, especially, was a devoted student of the Greeks and is often called the Italian Pindar, but Anacreon, Alcæus, and Horace as well as Pindar, and, of the French poets, Ronsard, were his models. He used to say that he strove to follow Columbus in discovering a new world, a new world of poetry, as a reaction against the conventionalities of Petrarchism and the degenerated taste of the century. This reaction led the way for the classical lyric of the eighteenth century. Although he declared himself opposed to the use of rhyme, and even wrote some of his longer poems unrhymed, many of his poems show that he was master of it; he even introduced some new metres into Italian verse; he seems to have preferred short lines and some of his poems are in the form of the Pindaric ode, with strophe, antistrophe, and epode. On the whole, his poems are marked by splendid epithets, beautiful images, grace of form, richness of rhyme, yet, in spite of all that, they seem exaggerated and cold. All that he wrote was done with exactness, but it is only his lyrics that are read to-day. Less known are his five long heroic poems. He left, besides, a dozen dramatic works in verse and eulogies and dialogues in prose.

A quaint and amusing life of Chiabrera, written by himself, is prefixed to Vol. I of his *Rime* (Milan, 1807). A good selection of his poems was edited by F. L. POLIDORI (Florence, 1865). On the older editions, see VARALDO, *Bibliografia delle opere a stampa di Gabriello Chiabrera* (Genoa, 1886).

JOSEPH DUNN.

Chiapas, DIOCESE OF, comprises almost the entire state of that name in the Republic of Mexico. San Cristóbal Las Casas, formerly called Ciudad Real, is the episcopal seat, and is the principal city of the state. The diocese is bounded by those of Guatemala, Tabasco, and Tehuantepec. From the time of its erection, 14 April, 1538, by Pope Paul III, this diocese was the centre of a successful Christianizing movement, due to the apostolic labours of the first bishop who occupied this see, the great Bartolomé de Las Casas. The baptismal record of the diocese begins in 1541. The Indians were gathered together by the Dominican brethren of the first bishop into settlements and were taught the crafts which they still practise, and instructed in Christian doctrine in their own tongue, as well as in many religious practices and customs which they have preserved to the present day. The chapter of the cathedral now numbers 7 capitulars. There are 15 secular priests and 6 Jesuits in the city. The seminary has all the ordinary classes and a good number of students. A well-equipped school for primary instruction is directed by the Marist Brothers, and a school for girls is under the care of the Sisters of the Divine Providence. There are other Catholic schools in this and other cities of the diocese. The see city possesses a good cathedral and nineteen other churches. The diocese has been governed by thirty-six bishops since its foundation.

VASQUES, *Historia de la Provincia del SS. Nombre de Jesús de Guatemala* (1714); PINEDA, *Historia de las Sublevaciones Indígenas habidas en el Estado de Chiapas, con Gramática de la lengua Tzeltal* (1888); *Colección de Documentos inéditos para la Historia de Chiapas*, ed. (in part) FRANCISCO OROZCO Y JIMÉNEZ; IDEM, *Colección de Documentos relativos á la Virgen de Caridad, en relación con la sublevación de los Indígenes en* 1712; LARRAINZAR, *Historia del Soconusco* (1843).

FRANCISCO OROZCO Y JIMÉNEZ.

Chiavari (CLAVARIUM), DIOCESE OF (CLAVARENSIS), suffragan of Genoa. Chiavari is a city of the province of Genoa in Northern Italy, situated on a little bay of the Gulf of Genoa. It became a diocese in 1892, but until 1896 was administered by the Archbishop of Genoa, to which diocese it originally belonged. The first bishop was Fortunato Vinelli. Chiavari is famous for its industry and commerce, also for its cherrywood chairs first made by Giuseppe Descalzi. Many of the inhabitants devote themselves to fishing, there being an abundance of fish about that coast. There are also many slate quarries in the neighbourhood. The beauty of the city is much enhanced by the churches of the Madonna, San Francesco, and San Giovanni. After the discovery of the conspiracy of the Fieschi (1542), and the capture of Chiavari by the Counts of Lavagna, this city suffered much, being suspected of friendliness towards the conspirators. Among its illustrious citizens were: Luca Cantiano di Moneglia, founder of a school of painting, and Giuseppe Gregorio Solari, translator of many Latin poets. The diocese has a population of 99,200, with 138 parishes, 335 churches and chapels, 293 secular and 28 regular priests, 100 ecclesiastical students, 4 religious houses of men and 5 of women.

Ann. eccl. (Rome, 1907), 392–95; GARIBALDI, *Chiavari antico, fino al 1797* (Genoa, 1853).

U. BENIGNI.

Chibchas (or MUYSCAS).—Next to the Quichuas of Peru and the Aymarás in Bolivia, the Chibchas of the eastern and north-eastern Highlands of Colombia were the most striking of the sedentary Indians in South America. At present they have ceased to form autonomous tribes and are practically extinct. In the beginning of the sixteenth century they occupied what is now the departments of Boyacá and Cundinamarca with, possibly, a few outlying settlements. The extent of territory indicated was only that of the tribes to which the name "Chibchas" is specially applied. The linguistic stock was scattered over a greater area, and indications even authorize philologists to admit as highly probable a connexion between the Chibcha dialects and some of the idioms of Costa Rica. Whence the Chibchas came is not established; indications seem to favour the North rather than the South. Their traditions allude to the appearance among them, untold ages

ago, of two (or three) powerful men (possibly Shamans) who performed miracles and attempted to teach the Indians a different mode of life. It is not quite clear whether the names "Bochica", "Nemthequeba", and "Zuhé" apply to one or several personages. Bochica, however, appears most frequently in Chibcha folk-lore, and is represented as an old man who came to Cundinamarca from the eastern plains of Venezuela and lived for a fabulous length of time at Sogamoso on the plateau of Bogotá.

The creed of the Muysca was the pantheistic fetishism of American aborigines in general. Human sacrifices were not uncommon, but most of the offerings consisted of gold, emeralds, and fruits of the field. Shamans, or *Zeques*, were numerous, and acted as medicine men, diviners, oracles. The Chibchas lived in villages, the houses being mostly circular, and of wood and thatch. In 1571 the population was approximately given at 150,000 souls. At the head of each tribe stood the usual council, guided by the oracular utterances of the leading Shamans, while an elective war-chief (*Uzaque*) represented the executive. The clan system prevailed. Agriculture, the gathering of salt, limited hunting, and war—with their neighbours and among themselves—were the chief occupations. In certain cases plurality of wives was licit. Traditional lore leads to the inference that, until the second half of the fifteenth century, the tribe of Tunja was the most powerful one of the Chibchas. About 1470 the Indians of Bogotá rose, and when Gonzalo Ximénez de Quesada began the exploration of the mountains in 1536, the Indians led by the Zippa, or war-chief of Muequeta, had to be encountered. By 1538 the Chibchas were virtually conquered, and considerable wealth in gold and emeralds was secured by the Spaniards at Tunja. Subsequent attempts at revolt on the part of the Chibchas proved ineffectual.

A short mention (from early hearsay) of the Chibchas is found in ANDAGOYA, *Relación de los sucesos de Pedrarias Dávila* in NAVARRETE, *Colección* (Madrid, 1829); tr. in *Hackluyt Society Publications* (1865), XXXIV. Report of conquests by LEBRIXA and JUAN DE SAN MARTÍN in OVIEDO, *Hist. general y natural* (Madrid, 1850), who also gives data obtained by him from Quesada. Important is PEDRO SIMON, *Noticias hist. de las Conq. de Tierra firme*, sections relative to Chibchas unpublished; *Bishop Piedrahita* (Antwerp, 1688). The same may be said of CASTELLANOS, *Elegias* (see CASTELLANOS). Accessible, though very rare, is ZAMORA, *Hist. de la provincia de San Antonio del Nuevo Reyno de Granáda* (Barcelona, 1701). GOMARA and especially HERRERA have second-hand information on the tribes. Also second hand, but valuable, are the data in LÓPEZ DE VELASCO, *Geografía y Descrip. univ. de las Indias* (written 1571–1574; published Madrid, 1894).—Among later works see HUMBOLDT, *Vues des Cordillères etc.* (Paris, 1816) and *Relation historique* (Paris, 1816–1822); URICOECHEA, *Memoria sobre las Antigüedades neo-granadinas* (Berlin, 1854); JOAQUIN ACOSTA, *Compendio histórico* (Paris, 1848); BOLLAERT, *Antiquarian, Ethnological, and other Researches* (London, 1860). On the Chibcha language, FRAY BERNARDO DE LUGO, *Gramática en la Lengua general del nuevo reyno llamada Mosca* (Madrid, 1619); RAFAEL CELEDON, *Gramática de la Lengua Kóggaba* in *Bib. Ling. américaine;* UHLE, *Compte rendu du Congrès international des Américanistes* (1888); BRINTON, *The American Race* (Philadelphia, 1891); TERNAUX COMPANS, *Essai sur l'ancien Cundinamarca* (Paris). Important, but very rare, is OCARIZ, *Genealogías del nuevo Reyno de Granada* (Madrid, 1874–6), only the first two parts printed.

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Chicago, ARCHDIOCESE OF (CHICAGIENSIS); diocese created 28 November, 1843; raised to the rank of an archdiocese, 10 September, 1880; comprises the State of Illinois, U. S. A., north of the south line of Whiteside, Lee, DeKalb, Grundy and Kankakee Counties, a territory of 10,379 square miles.

Any historical sketch of the Archdiocese of Chicago, however brief, must commence with the name of the intrepid Jesuit missionary James Marquette, who on 25 October, 1674, set out with two attendants from the station of St. Francis Xavier on Green Bay, to found a mission on the Illinois River. This was in pursuance of a promise he had made to the Illinois whom he had met at their village of Kaskaskia when returning from his voyage down the Mississippi the year previous. On the 4th of December he reached on his journey the mouth of the Chicago River. With his two companions he pushed his way over the frozen surface of the river, following the South Branch. Having proceeded about four miles, he was obliged to halt because of sickness. Here he built a cabin, the first white habitation, it would appear, erected on the site of the city of Chicago. After Marquette many of the French missionaries and voyageurs traversed the land now covered by that municipality. Father St. Cosme in all probability passed this way in 1699. Father Gravier was there in the year following. In 1795 the Pottawotomies by the treaty of Greenville ceded to the United States a tract of land six miles square at the mouth of the Chicago River. Here, in 1804, Fort Dearborn was erected, and about this garrison settled the Catholic pioneers. The Rev. Gabriel Richard of Detroit preached at the fort in 1821. In 1822 Alexander Beaubien was baptized there by Father Badin, the first priest ordained within the limits of the original thirteen of the United States. As far as known this was the first case of the administration of baptism to a white person in the vicinity of Fort Dearborn. In 1833 a petition was addressed to the Rt. Rev. Joseph Rosati, Bishop of St. Louis and Vicar-General of Bardstown, in which latter diocese the State of Illinois then lay, praying for the appointment of a resident pastor. The petition declared that there were about one hundred Catholics in Chicago and was signed by thirty-eight men representing one hundred and twenty-two souls. In answer to this request Bishop Rosati appointed Father John Mary Irenæus St. Cyr to take charge at Chicago, and he celebrated the first Mass in Mark Beaubien's log cabin on Lake Street, near Market, 5 May, 1833. Shortly thereafter Father St. Cyr secured a lot near the corner of Lake and State Streets and put up a church building twenty-five by thirty-five feet, at a cost of four hundred dollars. This modest structure was dedicated in October, 1833. A little later, when Bishop Bruté, the first Bishop of Vincennes, visited Chicago, he found there a congregation of four hundred souls. The growing necessities of the missions in Northern Illinois soon demanded the services of more than one priest. So, at the solicitation of Bishop Rosati, Bishop Bruté sent thither Fathers Fischer, Shaefer, St. Palais and Dupontavice. The last named was appointed to Joliet. Father St. Cyr was recalled in 1837. He was succeeded as pastor of the English-speaking congregation by Father O'Meara, who removed the church building erected by Father St. Cyr to Wabash Avenue and Madison Street. After the departure of Father O'Meara, Father St. Palais built on this site a new brick structure. To the priests already mentioned the names of Fathers Plunkett and Gueguen should be added as having rendered good service in the first period of the Church's history in Chicago.

CREATION OF DIOCESE.—The needs as well as possibilities of the Catholic settlement about Fort Dearborn and its vicinity were recognized to be such that the Plenary Council of Baltimore recommended, in May, 1843, the formation of the new See of Chicago. Rome acted favourably upon the advice, and in 1844 appointed as first bishop of the see the Rev. William Quarter of New York. He was born in Killurine, Kings Co., Ireland, 21 January, 1806. After a classical course made in private academies, he attended Maynooth College. He emigrated to America in 1822, where, soon after his arrival, he entered Mt. St. Mary's College at Emmitsburg, Maryland. Ordained priest, 19 September, 1829, he laboured thereafter with marked success in the Diocese of New York, until summoned to the new see of the West, for which he was consecrated bishop in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, by the Rt. Rev. John Hughes, 13 March,

1844. On his arrival in Chicago, the 5th of May following, he found there less than twenty priests. Of these only two were in Chicago, and they were of the number loaned to the mission by Bishop Bruté. Hardly a month after Bishop Quarter's arrival they were recalled to Vincennes. But one church, St. Mary's, was in the city limits at the time. The new building commenced by Father St. Palais was unfinished, and the parish moreover was encumbered with a debt of nearly five thousand dollars. This, owing to their poverty, the parishioners were unable to liquidate. It is eloquent of the unselfish zeal of the bishop and his brother that out of their private means they paid off all the indebtedness of the parish. The demand for the services of more priests was in large measure soon met. Only two years after his arrival Bishop Quarter was able to summon to a diocesan synod thirty-two clergymen. To the credit of his administration it must be noted that he established the first theological conferences held in America.

Thirty days after his arrival in Chicago, Bishop Quarter opened a college. Two professors, Rev. Jeremiah Kinsella and Rev. B. R. McGorsk, constituted the teaching corps of this institution in the beginning, while six young men made up its student body. Not content with a college, however, the bishop projected a university. In December, 1844, a charter was granted for the University of St. Mary's of the Lake, and on the 4th of July, 1846, the new institution, the first of its kind to appear in the city of Chicago, was ready to receive students. To provide for the religious instruction of young ladies, Bishop Quarter secured the services of five Sisters of Mercy. These, with Sister Mary Francis Ward, arrived in Chicago from Pittsburg, 23 September, 1846. The work of this religious community, begun in the first days of the Chicago diocese, has kept pace with the city's development. It was due principally to Bishop Quarter that the legislature of the State of Illinois passed in 1845 the bill according to which the Bishop of Chicago was incorporated as a "corporation sole", with power to "hold real and other property in trust for religious purposes". Bishop Quarter died 10 April, 1848. The four years of his episcopacy were years of foresight, zeal, and energy, fraught with lasting blessings for the Diocese of Chicago.

Second Bishop.—The successor of Bishop Quarter was a Jesuit, James Oliver Van de Velde, born 3 April, 1795, near Tearmonde in Belgium. His early education was obtained from a French priest, who had escaped to Belgium during the time of the French Revolution. Young Van de Velde had a marked talent for languages and, while a professor of languages in the Seminary of Mechlin, hearing the apostolic Father Nerinckx appeal for priests for the American missions, he decided to go to the New World, where he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Georgetown. In 1827 he was ordained priest in the Cathedral of Baltimore. After some years of missionary work in Maryland, Father Van de Velde was made professor of rhetoric and mathematics in the Jesuit College at St. Louis. He was rector of this institution in 1820, and a year later was sent to represent the Missouri province at a general congregation of the order held in Rome. Consecrated Bishop of Chicago in St. Francis Xavier's Church, St. Louis, 11 February, 1849, he was installed in his see 1 April following. At this time there were in the diocese forty priests and fifty-six churches. In the city of Chicago itself there were four churches: the cathedral of St. Mary; St. Patrick's, founded in 1846 by Rev. Walter J. Quarter; St. Peter's (German), started by Rev. John Jung; and St. Joseph's (German), the first pastor of which was the Father Jung above mentioned. Bishop Van de Velde in 1849 erected, on Wabash Avenue between Jackson and Van Buren Streets, an orphan asylum, to shelter the little ones bereft of their parents through the cholera that visited the city that year. His name is to be associated too with the General Hospital of the Lake, founded at this time by the faculty of Rush Medical College, but in which, with the permission of the bishop, the Sisters of Mercy took care of the sick. Bishop Van de Velde found the climate of Chicago detrimental to his health, and tendered his resignation to the Holy See. This was at first refused; finally, however, he was transferred to the diocese of Natchez, where, after two years, he died a victim of yellow fever.

Third Bishop.—The third Bishop of Chicago was the Right Rev. Anthony O'Regan, b. at Lavalleyroe, County Mayo, Ireland, in 1809. After completing his studies at Maynooth College he was ordained priest November, 1833, and for ten years was professor of Scripture, Hebrew, and dogmatic theology at St. Jarlath's College, Tuam, of which institution he later became president. He then accepted the invitation of Archbishop Kendrick to become the head of the theological seminary of St. Louis, U. S. A. It was from this post that he was summoned to occupy the See of Chicago. Consecrated in St. Louis, 25 July, 1854, he was installed in St. Mary's Cathedral the third of September following. Bishop O'Regan invited the Jesuits to establish themselves in his diocese. One of those sent in response to this call was the Rev. Arnold Damen, who arrived in Chicago in May, 1857, and though offered the pastorate of the Church of the Holy Name, preferred instead to found a parish out upon (what then appeared) an uninhabitable prairie. Undaunted by obstacles, he persevered until a monument to his zeal appeared in the capacious edifice of the church of the Holy Family. But Father Damen's work was not circumscribed by the limits of a single parish. No quarter of the diocese but could testify to his zeal as a missionary. Gifted with a power of rugged eloquence, Father Damen was particularly effective as a preacher to the masses. Adjoining the Holy Family Church is St. Ignatius' College, begun in 1869. For years it was the only Catholic institution of its kind in the city of Chicago, and its alumni are counted in large numbers not only among the priests of the archdiocese but among the representatives of all the higher walks of civic life. In 1857 Bishop O'Regan was relieved of a portion of his responsibility by the erection of the new See of Alton. However, he was anxious to resign the high office which in the beginning he had sought to escape. His administration had met with severe complaint on the part of some of his clergy. And so, after two years and a half in the administration of his diocese, he set out for Rome to resign his charge. His resignation (3 May, 1858) was accepted, and he was appointed titular Bishop of Dora 25 June, 1858. He died in London, 13 November, 1866, having never returned to America.

Fourth Bishop.—The Right Rev. James Duggan, who had acted as administrator of the diocese, was then appointed its bishop. He was born at Maynooth, County Kildare, Ireland, 22 May, 1825, and emigrated, in 1842, to St. Louis, U. S. A., where he was ordained priest 29 May, 1847. In 1857 he was appointed auxiliary to Archbishop Kendrick, and consecrated titular Bishop of Antigone. Two years later he was transferred to the vacant see of Chicago. From this is dated a new era in the life of Catholic Chicago. The parochial school system was organized, and charitable institutions sprang up on all sides. In 1860 the Redemptorists, and in the following year the Benedictines, established foundations among the Germans of the North Side. The Religious of the Sacred Heart opened the institution that has since rendered high service in the cause of Catholic education. Bishop Duggan chose as his vicar-general the Rev. Dennis Dunne, pastor of St. Patrick's, a priest

CHICAGO

ALTAR, CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF SORROWS

ST. PHILOMENA'S SCHOOL

THE CATHEDRAL

COLLEGE OF THE SACRED HEART

THE CATHEDRAL, INTERIOR

whose noble and generous nature endeared him to all who knew him. The Rev. Thaddeus Butler was made secretary and the Rev. John McMullen chancellor. It was the last named who induced the Sisters of the Good Shepherd to take up their beneficent work in Chicago. St. Columbkill's, St. Bridget's, St. James's, the Immaculate Conception, and St. John's parishes were also organized at this time. The refinement and gentleness of Bishop Duggan, his ease and grace of manner, made him socially very popular; while his public spirit was much appreciated by the community at large. In 1862 he went to Rome to be present at the canonization of the Japanese martyrs, and he attended in 1866 the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore. It was about this time that he gave unmistakable signs of the mental aberration to which he was finally to fall a victim. Acting upon the advice of friends, he went to Carlsbad, expecting to recuperate his shattered health, but the effort was vain, and the condition of Bishop Duggan became such that he was removed, 14 April, 1869, to the asylum of the Sisters of Charity in St. Louis. There, without recovering his mental powers, he remained till his death, 27 March, 1899. Bishop Duggan being incapacitated, the Rev. T. J. Halligan took charge of the diocese.

Administrator appointed.—The Right Rev. Thomas Foley was appointed coadjutor and administrator of the practically vacant see, and consecrated titular Bishop of Pergamus, 27 February, 1870. He was born in Baltimore, Maryland, 6 March, 1822. On the completion of his preparatory studies at St. Mary's College, in his native city, and of his theological course at the seminary attached to this college, he was ordained priest by Archbishop Eccleston in the Cathedral of Baltimore, 16 August, 1846. After a short period spent on the missions of Montgomery County, Maryland, and as assistant pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Washington, he was appointed rector of the cathedral. He was made chancellor by Archbishop Kendrick, and attended, in the capacity of secretary and notary, the plenary councils held in that city in 1852 and 1866. He was installed in the pro-Cathedral of the Holy Name, Chicago, 10 March, 1870. Bishop Foley had hardly more than become acquainted with the needs of his charge when he was called upon to witness the devastation of the church property by the great Chicago fire. Seven churches together with their parochial residences and schools, the Alexian Brothers' Hospital, The House of Providence, St. Xavier's Academy and Convent, an orphan asylum, and a select school conducted by the Christian Brothers were swept away. The bishop sustained the disaster with courage, and set himself to the work of reconstruction with commendable energy. St. Mary's cathedral being thus destroyed, the new cathedral of the Holy Name soon appeared on the site of the old church of that name. This structure is one of the impressive church edifices of Chicago. With generous assistance from other dioceses and the exercise of indomitable energy on the part of its priests and laity, Catholic Chicago soon arose from the prostrate state in which it had been left by the fire. At this time many of the religious orders began to assist in the development of the new life which seemed to have been infused into the diocese. The bishop welcomed to his diocese the Franciscans, the Lazarists, the Servites, the Fathers of Saint-Viateur, and the Resurrectionist. Owing to the growth attained by the diocese, Bishop Foley in 1872 recommended that a portion of it be cut off and erected into a new see, and the Diocese of Peoria was created. The period of Bishop Foley's administration was for much of the Diocese of Chicago a new birth. He saw churches, convents, asylums, and schools, the work of years, wiped out in a few hours. He saw these for the most part replaced by structures more commodious. He witnessed the erection of more than twenty-five new churches, and saw in process of construction five new convents and seven academies. He purchased the Soldier's Home at the foot of Thirty-fifth street for an orphan asylum, and St. Mary's church, at Wabash Avenue and Eldridge Court, he bought from the Congregationalists. At his death, on the 19th of February, 1879, there were about three hundred churches in the diocese, and the number of priests had increased from one hundred and forty-two to two hundred and six. On the occasion of his installation he had declared that he came to do honour to the peace of Christ. That his episcopacy had rendered this promised service was universally admitted. Upon his death, after a brief administration of the diocese by the Rev. Dr. John McMullen, who had been the late bishop's vicar-general, Bishop Feehan of Nashville, Tennessee, was promoted to the vacancy.

Created Archdiocese.—Patrick Augustine Feehan was born at Spring Hill, Co. Tipperary, Ireland, on 29 August, 1829. At sixteen years of age he entered Castle Knock College, going from there to Maynooth, where he was appointed to the Dunboyne establishment. In 1852 he departed for America, proceeding to St. Louis, where he was ordained priest 1 November, 1852. Two years later he was appointed successor to Father O'Regan in the Theological Seminary of Carondelet. He was made pastor of St. Michael's church in 1858, and shortly after was transferred to the pastorate of the church of the Immaculate Conception, in both of which charges he ever showed himself the devoted and zealous priest. On the 7th of July, 1865, Father Feehan was chosen to succeed Bishop Whelan of Nashville, Tennessee. This diocese had suffered severely during the Civil War. Under the quiet but energetic administration of Bishop Feehan the demoralization of religion that followed in the wake of battle passed; churches multiplied, convents and parochial schools were reared, while the number of priests increased during his administration from twelve to twenty-seven. During the visitation of his diocese by cholera and yellow fever the labours and self-sacrifices of the bishop were unremitting. On 10 September, 1880, Chicago was raised to the dignity of an archdiocese, and Bishop Feehan was made its first archbishop. The ceremony of his installation took place in the cathedral of the Holy Name in the November following. The archdiocese at this time comprised eighteen counties in the northern part of Illinois and there were one hundred and ninety-four churches and two hundred and four priests. In 1883 the archbishop went to Rome with the other archbishops of the country to prepare the matter to be submitted to the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. In the next year he participated in the deliberations of this council. In December, 1887, the first synod of the Archdiocese of Chicago was convened for the purpose, principally, of promulgating the decrees of the council. At this synod the first irremovable rectors in the archdiocese were appointed.

On 1 November, 1890, Archbishop Feehan commemorated the twenty-fifth anniversary of his elevation to the episcopacy, and the demonstration with which the Catholics of the archdiocese celebrated this event gave touching proof of the love and esteem they felt for their venerable archbishop. In 1899 the archbishop, failing in health, and pressed with the constantly multiplying cares of his charge, asked for an episcopal assistant. In answer to this request the Rev. Alexander McGavick was chosen auxiliary bishop to the diocese and consecrated titular Bishop of Narcopolis, 1 May, 1899. Poor health, however, directly incapacitated him, and the Holy See was again petitioned for the needed aid, and the Rev. Peter James Muldoon was consecrated titular Bishop of Tamassus, 25 July, 1901. His energy and zeal were of valuable assistance to the archbishop, while

upon his personal loyalty the aged prelate could ever rely. Archbishop Feehan died 12 July, 1902. His administration in Chicago saw a development of Catholic life unprecedented in any other period of the city's history. When he was installed there were in the diocese two hundred and four priests, while at his death there were five hundred and thirty-eight. At his advent there were one hundred and ninety-four churches, when he died there were two hundred and ninety-eight. The city of Chicago, when he was promoted to the see, had thirty-four churches, at his passing away there were in the city one hundred and fifty churches. Some idea of the manner in which Catholic education was promoted under this archbishop can be gathered from the list of institutions which sprang up in his time, among them the De La Salle Institute, Saint Cyril's College, St. Vincent's College, St. Viateur's College at Bourbonnais, St. Patrick's Academy, and the Loretto Academy at Joliet.

Second Archbishop.—Bishop James Edward Quigley, of Buffalo, New York, was promoted (8 January, 1903) to the Archbishopric of Chicago, and installed 11 March following. Born at Oshawa, Ontario, 15 October, 1855, he attended St. Joseph's College in Buffalo, from which he was graduated in 1872. In this year he won in a competitive examination for entrance to the Military Academy at West Point, but relinquished military ambition to study for the Church. To this end he entered the seminary of Our Lady of Angels at Niagara Falls. In the following year he went for a time to the University of Innsbruck in the Austrian Tyrol, and thence to Rome, where, having completed his theological course in the college of the Propaganda, he was ordained priest 13 April, 1879. He was appointed rector of St. Vincent's Church, Attica, New York, in 1879, leaving this mission to become rector of St. Joseph's cathedral in Buffalo in 1884. Two years later he became pastor of St. Bridget's church in the same city and while ministering in this parish was appointed Bishop of Buffalo, his consecration taking place 24 February, 1897. The administration of Bishop Quigley in Buffalo was characterized by a clear, far-reaching discernment. His public spirit, too, made him ever a controlling power in the community, and he was particularly alert to the weal of the labouring classes. His mediation in the dock strike of Buffalo in 1899 and his forceful pronouncements on Socialism were especially noteworthy. In Chicago his talent for mastering details and his regard for due procedure brought a new order and system into the government of the archdiocese, while the synod held 14 December, 1905, marked the introduction to the see of a body of beneficent legislation. A diocesan college for ecclesiastical students was opened in 1905, and the measures of previous administrations for the spiritual care of the immense foreign-born and constantly increasing population was continued and broadened.

Statistics.—Ten nationalities other than English-speaking were represented in the archdiocese in 1908. Of the total of 314 churches they had 96 divided as follows: German 33, Polish 21, Bohemian 9, Italian 8, Lithuanian 7, Slovak 6, Croatian 5, French 3, Syrian 2, Ruthenian 2.

Religious orders and congregations having foundations in the archdiocese are: *Men*—Augustinians, Benedictines (St. Procopius Abbey), Benedictines (St. Vincent's Abbey), Carmelites, Franciscans, Fathers and Brothers of the Holy Cross, Jesuits, Lazarists, Fathers of the Precious Blood, Passionists, Redemptorists, Fathers of the Resurrection, Servites, Clerics of St. Viateur, Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle, Alexian Brothers, Brothers of the Christian Schools, Congregation of St. Charles Borromeo, Brothers of Mary, Society of the Divine Word. *Communities of Women*—Sisters of St. Agnes, Benedictine Sisters, Bohemian Benedictine Sisters, Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul (Emmitsburg, Maryland), Sisters of Christian Charity (Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania), Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Dubuque, Iowa), Poor Clares, Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic (Sinsinawa, Wisconsin), Sisters of St. Dominic (Blauvelt, New York), Sisters of St. Dominic (Adrian, Michigan), Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic (St. Catharine, Kentucky), Franciscan Sisters (St. Louis, Missouri), Franciscan Sisters of the Sacred Heart (Joliet, Illinois), Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis (Peoria, Illinois), School Sisters of St. Francis (Milwaukee, Wisconsin), Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis (Joliet, Illinois), Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis of Assisi, M. C. (St. Francis, Wisconsin), Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis (under the protection of St. Cunegunde), Sisters of St. Francis (Lafayette, Indiana), Sisters of St. Francis (Clinton, Iowa), Felician Sisters, O. S. F. (Detroit, Mich.), Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Sisters of the Holy Cross (Notre Dame, Indiana), Sisters of the Holy Family of Nazareth, Sister-Servants of the Holy Heart of Mary (Paris), Hospital Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of St. Joseph (St. Louis, Missouri), Sisters of St. Joseph (Concordia, Kansas), Sisters of St. Joseph (La Grange, Illinois), Little Sisters of the Poor, Little Company of Mary (Rome), Ladies of Loreto (Toronto, Ontario), Sisters of Mercy (Chicago, Illinois), Sisters of Mercy (Oakley Ave., Chicago, Illinois), School Sisters of Notre Dame (Milwaukee, Wisconsin), Sisters of the Congregation of Notre Dame (Montreal), Sisters of the Poor Handmaids of Jesus Christ (Ft. Wayne, Indiana), Sisters of the Precious Blood (O'Fallon, Missouri), Sisters of Providence (St. Mary of the Woods, Indiana), Ladies of the Sacred Heart (Chicago Province), Sisters of Jesus and Mary (Montreal), Daughters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (Buffalo, New York), Polish Sisters of St. Joseph (Stevens Point, Wisconsin), Sisters of the Holy Ghost (Holland), Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart (New York), Sisters of Misericorde, Visitation Nuns, Sisters of the Resurrection, Sisters of St. Mary (St. Louis, Missouri).

Archbishop 1, bishops 2, mitred abbot 1; priests 631: secular 440, of religious orders 191; churches 314: with resident priests, city of Chicago, 176, country 138; missions with churches 35, stations 5, chapels 61; ecclesiastical students 115, seminaries of religious orders 3, students 330; colleges and academies for boys 11, students 2575, training-schools 2, pupils 452; academies for girls 27, students 7585; parishes and missions with parochial schools, city 125, pupils 68,520, outside the city 64, pupils 10,650; orphan asylums 9, orphans 1499; infant asylums 1, inmates 676; industrial and reform schools for boys 2, for girls 2, inmates 710; working boys' homes 1, inmates 350; working girls' homes 1, inmates195; total persons under Catholic care 93,657; hospitals 19, homes for the aged poor 9, inmates 1150, communities nursing sick in their homes 3, Catholic population, about 1,200,000.

Andrews, in *The History of Chicago;* O'Gorman, *A Hist. of the R. C. Church in the U. S.* (New York, 1895); Shea, *Hist. of the Cath. Ch. in the U. S.* (New York, 1904); McGovern, *The Life of Bishop McMullen* (Chicago); Idem, *Souvenir of the Silver Jubilee of the Most Rev. P. H. Feehan; Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1908).

John Webster Melody.

Chichele (or Chicheley), Henry, Archbishop of Canterbury, b. at Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire, England, 1362; d. at Oxford, 12 April, 1443. He was the son of Thomas Chichele, a yeoman, and Agnes, daughter of William Pyncheon. Educated by William of Wykeham at St. John the Baptist's College, Winchester, he passed from there to New College, Oxford. He took the degree of B.C.L. in 1389–90, and the degree of LL.D. in 1396. Llanvar-

chall, in the Diocese of St. Asaph, was his first living, and he held in succession the rectory of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, the archdeaconry of Dorset, together with a prebend of Salisbury (1397), a canonry in the collegiate church of Aberguilly (1400), a canonry of Lichfield (1400), the archdeaconry of Salisbury (1402), the chancellorship of Salisbury, together with the living of Odiham in the Diocese of Winchester (1403), and the livings of Melcombe and Sherston in the Diocese of Salisbury. Following upon these came his appointment by provision to the Bishopric of St. David by Gregory XII, who consecrated him at Lucca (17 June, 1408).

Early in his career he was admitted an advocate in the Court of Arches and for a time acted as the lawyer for Richard Mitford, Bishop of Salisbury. His skill in legal matters attracted the king's notice, and in July, 1405, he was sent with Sir John Cheyne on a mission to Innocent VII. Later in the same year he treated with the King of France as a commissioner of peace, and in 1407 he journeyed again to Italy on an embassy to Gregory XII, then at Siena. It was on this occasion that he received the Bishopric of St. David from the pope, with the king's approval. He was again in Italy at the Council of Pisa (1409), and it was not until May, 1411, that he first visited his diocese and was enthroned. The Diocese of St. David must have seen very little of him, for he went as king's ambassador to France with the Earl of Warwick in 1413, and early in the following year, on the death of Arundel, the king nominated him to the See of Canterbury (19 February, 1414), to which he was elected on the 4th of March. As archbishop he was the king's trusted friend and councillor. He seems to have favoured the policy of war with France, collecting much money for its support; in 1419 and again in 1420 he accompanied Henry V into France. A keen and skilful lawyer, he was active in all legislative matters, particularly with regard to ecclesiastical affairs, and vigorous in searching out and suppressing the Lollards. His loyalty to the pope's policy of opposing the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire has been doubted; the opponents of the Catholic Church have looked upon him as the upholder of the independence of the national Church against the claims of Rome. He certainly displeased Martin V, who slighted him by offering a cardinal's hat and the powers of a legate *a latere* to Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester. The pope again passed him by in 1438, when Kemp, Archbishop of York, was created cardinal and given precedence over him in Parliament in spite of Chichele's appeal against such treatment. On two occasions, in 1421 and 1422, Martin V severely reprimanded Chichele for his weakness in not procuring the abolition of the obnoxious statutes. The pope charged him with hindering the liberties of the Church, and suspended him from the office of legate which pertained to his see. Though he appealed from the pope to the judgment of a future council we find him submitting to the pope's wishes and endeavouring to persuade the Commons to cease withstanding the pope (1428).

Chichele was a munificent benefactor to his birthplace, his university, and his cathedral church. At Higham Ferrers he built and endowed a college for eight priests, four clerks, and six choristers; he founded also a hospital there for twelve poor men. He gave two hundred marks for the relief of poor students at Oxford; this sum was preserved in a chest known as "Chichele's Chest". To New College he gave a similar sum of money. He built the Cistercian College of St. Bernard, now St. John's, Oxford, but his greatest work for his university was the foundation of the College of All Souls for a warden and forty fellows, who were to spend their time in prayer and study. His name is still perpetuated in Oxford, for the one who fills the chair of modern history is known as the "Chichele Professor". The last years of his life were chiefly spent at Oxford superintending his great foundation there. Old age and infirmity prompted him to suggest his resignation to the pope (1442), but before the necessary arrangements could be made he died.

HOOK, *Archbishops of Canterbury* (London, 1860–73), V, 1–129; DUCK, *Life of H. Chichele* (1699); WILKINS, *Concilia*, III; ANSTEY, *Munimenta Academica* (Rolls Series), 291; LE NEVE, *Fasti Eccl. Anglicanæ*; MILMAN, *Latin Christianity*, VIII, 326, 328.

G. E. HIND.

Chichester, ANCIENT CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF (CICESTRENSIS), in England. This see took its rise in consequence of the decree passed at the Council of London in 1075, requiring all bishoprics to be removed from villages to towns. The old see of the South Saxons, which had been founded towards the end of the seventh century by St. Wilfrid of York, had been filled by a long line of bishops whose cathedral church was at Selsea. In consequence of the new decree, Stigand, Bishop of Selsea, transferred the see to Chichester in 1082. This town, called *Regnum* by the Romans, obtained its present name from Cissa, son of Ælle, the Saxon chieftain who landed in 477, the town becoming Cissa's *Ceaster*, or fort (*castrum*), and, in time, Chichester. The most notable of the early bishops was Ralph de Luffa (1091–1123), who built the cathedral; much of the structure as it still exists was his work. In 1108 he was able to consecrate at least a part of it, but in 1114 the first fire occurred, and extensive rebuilding was necessary. The cathedral was completed and consecrated in 1184, but in 1186 it was again greatly damaged by fire. Bishop Seyffrid II (1180–1204), who had completed the building, now undertook its reconstruction, making considerable changes and introducing Early English work into the Norman building, which accounts for the composite character of the nave. His successor, Simon Fitz Robert of Wells (1204–1207), being a favourite of King John, obtained many important privileges for the see, but after his death John kept it vacant for many years. The next bishop was Richard Poore (1215–1217), known as the builder of Salisbury cathedral. After him came Ranulf of Warham (1217–1224) and Ralph Neville, the Chancellor (1224–1244), who was remarkable as a statesman. On his death there was a contest over the appointment to the see, which the pope settled by naming and consecrating Richard of Wych (1245–1253), better known as St. Richard of Chichester, the friend and chancellor of St. Edmund. King Henry III, enraged at this, refused him the temporalities of his see. Having for a time been compelled to live on the alms of his own clergy, St. Richard ultimately succeeded in overcoming the king's anger, and for eight years ruled the see with wisdom and holiness, his last act being to consecrate a church at Dover in honour of his friend and master, St. Edmund. In 1276, during the pontificate of Stephen of Berghsted (1262–1288), he was canonized, and his relics were enshrined above the high altar.

Chichester had another saintly prelate in Gilbert de S. Leophardo (1288–1305), who added to the Lady Chapel. William Rede (1369–1385) was a scholar-bishop who collected the early records of the see; and his namesake, Robert Rede (1397–1415) compiled the earliest register now existing. Bishops succeeded one another rapidly, many being transferred to other sees. Among them Reginald Pecock (1450–1459), famous for his learning, was accused of heresy and resigned his see. His successor, John Arundel (1459–1478), built the rood screen in the cathedral. But the diocese fell into bad condition, as is shown by the register of the next bishop, Edward Storey (1478–1503), a wise administrator who founded the Chiches-

ter grammar school. Robert Sherburne (1508–1536) made some protest against the encroachments of Henry VIII, but being unable to withstand them effectually, resigned the see, and was succeeded by the schismatic Richard Sampson (1536–1543), who in 1538 destroyed the shrine of St. Richard at the king's command. The next bishop, George Day (1543–1557), though he had accepted schismatical institution from Henry VIII, yet proved a good Catholic, on which account he was imprisoned, and replaced by John Scory. Bishop Day regained his see, however, in 1554. He was succeeded by John Christopherson (1557–1559), the last Catholic Bishop of Chichester. After him the notorious William Barlow inaugurated the line of Anglican prelates. There were in the diocese two archdeaconries, Chichester and Lewes, and, according to the valuation made in 1291, which remained the basis of all valuations until the reign of Henry VIII, there were nearly three hundred parishes. Battle Abbey and Lewes Priory were the chief monasteries, and all the chief orders were well represented. One consequence of Sussex being originally so largely in the hands of Norman proprietors was the existence of an unusually large number of small priories dependent on houses in Normandy, such as the Abbey of Fécamp. The bishop had ten episcopal manors, and the Archbishop of Canterbury held the collegiate church of South Malling and twenty-five parishes. The arms of the see were azure, a Presbyter John sitting on a tombstone, in his left hand a book open, his right hand extended, or, with a linen mitre on his head, and in his mouth a sword, all proper.

WALCOTT, *Early Statutes of Chichester Cathedral* in *Archæologia* (1877), XLV, 143–244; DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglic.* (1846), VI, iii, 1159–71; LE NEVE, *Fasti Eccl. Anglicanæ* (1854), I, 235–85; STEPHENS, *Memorials of the South Saxon See and Cathedral Church of Chichester* (London, 1876); IDEM, *Diocesan History of Chichester* (London, 1881); CORLETTE, *Chichester: the Cathedral and See* (London, 1901).

EDWIN BURTON.

Chicoutimi, DIOCESE OF, created, 28 May, 1878, a part of the civil and the ecclesiastical Province of Quebec, which embraces the counties of Charlevoix, Chicoutimi, and Lac St.-Jean, and is situated in the north-eastern section of the Province of Quebec, north of the St. Lawrence River. Charlevoix county was settled by the French in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and Chicoutimi and Lac St.-Jean were founded in the middle of the nineteenth by the settlers from the valley of the St. Lawrence. This mountainous region contains the Saguenay River, the extensive lakes known as the St.-Jean and the Mistassini. Chicoutimi and Lac St.-Jean were centres of an extensive lumber trade earlier in the century; to-day they are better known for their agricultural development and the paper pulp. This vast region has communication with the West through the Canadian Northern Railway, with the interior of the continent and Europe through the Saguenay and the St. Lawrence Rivers. It was served by the Jesuit missionaries till the end of the eighteenth century; by the Oblates until the middle of the nineteenth; since then by secular priests. A small church built by the Jesuits in 1747 at Tadousac is still standing. The see is at Chicoutimi, a town of 7000 inhabitants, situated on the Saguenay. The diocesan seminary comprises a classical college with 200 pupils and the theological school with 28 students. The parishes have increased from 24 in 1878 to 55 in 1907. There are 105 secular and 18 regular priests (Oblates, Trappists, Eudists). The Marist Brothers have 6 colleges, and the Brothers of St. Francis Regis an agricultural Orphan Asylum. There are 340 sisters of the following institutes: Hospitalières, Ursulines, Good Shepherd, Congregation of Notre Dame, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of the Holy Rosary, the Petites-Franciscaines Missionaires de Marie, Sisters of Good Council, Sisters of St. Anthony of Padua, Servants of the Blessed Sacrament. They have charge of an orphan asylum, 3 hospitals, 2 female schools of domestic economy, 7 convents, and many parochial schools. There are 15,000 children in the 310 parochial schools. The population of the diocese is about 65,000 inhabitants of French origin, who, with the exception of about fifty, are all Catholics. The first bishop was Mgr Dominique Racine, consecrated 4 Aug., 1878; d. 28 Jan., 1888. His successors have been Mgr L. N. Bégin, consecrated 28 Oct., 1888; appointed Coadjutor Archbishop of Quebec, 22 Dec., 1891; Mgr M. T. Labrecque, consecrated 22 May, 1892, and Administrator of the Apostolic Prefecture of the Gulf of St. Lawrence from 1872 to 1903.

Rapports sur les Missions du diocèse de Québec (Quebec, 1839–1874); *Relations des Jésuites* (Quebec, 1858); HUARD, *L'Apôtre du Saguenay* (Quebec, 1895); IDEM, *Labrador et Anticosti* (Montreal, 1897); *Le Canada Ecclésiastique* (Montreal, 1908).

V. A. HUARD.

Chieregati (CHIEREGATO), FRANCESCO, papal nuncio, b. at Vicenza, 1479; d. at Bologna, 6 December, 1539. Little is known of his early career. He was sent by Leo X as papal nuncio to England (1515–17), and also filled a similar office in Portugal and in Spain (1519), in which latter country he became acquainted with Cardinal Adrian Florent, Bishop of Tortosa, the Dutch preceptor of Charles VI, and later Pope Adrian VI. One of the latter's first acts, after his entry into Rome, was to make Chieregati, whose learning and virtue the pope esteemed, Bishop of Teramo in the Kingdom of Naples; he then sent him to the Diet of Nuremberg, called for the autumn of 1522. He was commissioned to obtain from the German princes a more energetic pursuit of the war against the Turks in Hungary, which nation was then and long after the bulwark of Christian Europe, also a more vigorous suppression of Lutheranism and the execution of the Edict of Worms against Luther. In two discourses (19 November and 10 December) he urged the princes to co-operate for the expulsion of the Turks from Christian Hungary; on the latter date he also demanded the immediate execution of the Edict of Worms (26 May, 1521), whereby Luther had been put under the ban of the empire, which formal outlawry he had hitherto escaped through the protection of Frederick of Saxony and other friendly princes. Finally, on 3 January, 1523, Chieregati read publicly two important documents, sent after him from Rome. They were a papal Brief (issued on the previous 25 November) to the members of the Diet and an Instruction for Chieregati himself. The former contained an eloquent appeal to the Catholic piety, immemorial religious traditions, and magnanimity of the representatives of the German people, and besought the Diet to quench at once the brand of religious sedition and compel the submission of Luther and his adherents. The personal Instruction, issued probably on the same date, and read to the Diet by Chieregati, is one of the most important documents for the early history of the Protestant Reformation. In it Pope Adrian frankly confesses that the sins of ecclesiastics were the chief cause of the grievous tribulations of the Church, and that in the Roman Curia itself, both head and members, popes and prelates, had been guilty of scandalous abuses. For the text of the Instruction see Raynaldus, "Ann. eccl." (1522), 65; Le Plat, "Monumenta ad hist. Conc. Trid." (Louvain, 1781), II, 144 sqq.; Pallavicino, "Storia del Concilio di Trento" (Rome, 1656), I (2), 4–6; especially Wrede, "Deutsche Reichstagsakten" (Munich, 1893), III, 391; see below, Pastor, and Hergenröther-Kirsch. The reply of the Diet was discouraging; the princes and representatives avoided a satisfactory answer to the pope's urgent requests, proposed the celebration of a general council in some

German city, and renewed in an offensive manner the earlier antipapal complaints of the Germans, the famous "Centum (101) gravamina teutonicæ nationis"; Pastor adds (op. cit. 97) that the failure of Chieregati was in large measure owing to the timidity and selfishness of the great German prelates who were by no means ready to repeat the humble confession of the noble-hearted pope. The latter has often been blamed for his frankness (see remarks of Pallavicino in Hergenröther-Kirsch), but Pastor (p. 94) defends him both from exaggeration of facts and from untimeliness of speech. His unique and heroic admissions were necessary, says this writer, in the interest of a genuine reformation, nor was this remarkable Instruction made public without papal approval. The subsequent history of Chieregati offers like interest.

Pastor, *Gesch. der Päpste* (Freiburg, 1907), IV, pt. II, 88–97; Wensing, *Papst Hadrian* (Vienna, 1880), VI; Morsolin, *Francesco Chieregati* (Vicenza, 1873); Barbarano, *Hist. Eccl. di Vicenza* (ibid, 1760); Portioli, *Quattro documenti d'Inghilterra* (Mantua, 1868); Hergenröther-Kirsch, *Kirchengeschichte* (4th ed., Freiburg, 1907), III, pt. I, 46.

Thomas J. Shahan.

Chieti, Archdiocese of (Theatensis), with the perpetual administration of Vasto. Chieti is the ancient Teate, capital of the Marrucini, and now an important town of the Abruzzi, Central Italy. It is situated on a mountain, at the base of which runs the River Pescara. Though the Marrucini, like the Marsi and other kindred people, were originally enemies of Rome, in 304 B.C. they concluded a league with the Romans, which lasted until the War with the Allies, when Teate became a municipality. In the Gothic War it was captured by Totila; later it fell into the hands of the Lombards, from whom it was captured by Pepin and devastated. The Normans rebuilt the city, which thenceforth belonged to the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. St. Justinus is venerated as the first Bishop of Chieti, and the cathedral is dedicated to him. Several of his successors are also venerated as saints, among them Gribaldus (874), whose portrait is yet visible on the bronze doors of the monastery of St. Clement in the Island of Pescara. Other bishops worthy of notice were: Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, who in 1524 resigned the see, and associated himself with St. Cajetan of Tiene in the foundation of the Theatine Order. Later Caraffa became pope under the name of Paul IV. Since 1525 Chieti has been an archbishopric, but has no suffragans. The archdiocese has a population of 300,500, with 113 parishes, 442 churches and chapels, 170 secular and 58 regular priests, 3 religious houses of men and 17 of women.

Cappelletti, *Le chiese d'Italia*, XXI, 95; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 396–98.

U. Benigni.

Chihuahua, Diocese of, in the north of Mexico, comprises the State of Chihuahua, with a population of about 327,000, mostly Indians and mestisos. The diocese was erected in 1891, and has had two bishops: Jose de J. Ortiz, promoted to the archbishopric of Guadalajara, and Nicolas Perez Gavilan. There are 42 parishes, 64 churches and chapels, and a seminary with 50 seminarists.

Battandier, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1907), 222; Heilprin in *Lippincott's Gazetteer* (Philadelphia, 1907), 402.

J. Montes de Oca y Obregón.

Chilapa, Diocese of, in Mexico, suffragan of the Archdiocese of Mexico, comprises the State of Guerrero, in the south of Mexico. The diocese was created in 1863, since which time it has had three bishops: Ambrosia Serrano, Ramon Ibarra, and Homobono Anaya. The population (all Catholic) is 361,239. There are 64 parishes and 94 priests, The episcopal city of Chilafa, about 125 miles south-west of Mexico had in 1895 a population of 8256.

Battandier, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1907), 222.

J. Montes de Oca y Obregón.

Child-Birth. See Abortion; Pregnancy.

Children of Mary.—The Sodality of Children of Mary Immaculate owes its origin to the manifestation of the Virgin Immaculate of the Miraculous Medal, on which the Church has placed a seal, by appointing the twenty-seventh of November as the feast. This manifestation was made to Sister Catherine Labouré, a novice in the mother-house of the Daughters of Charity in Paris, in 1830. Associations were formed, by way of trial, in various houses, and a rescript of 20 June, 1847, to Very Rev. John Baptist Etienne, Superior General of the Mission, empowered him to erect in each house of the Sisters of Charity a pious confraternity, dedicated to Mary Immaculate, made up of young girls attending their schools or work-rooms. This same rescript also granted to this association, not by affiliation but directly, the same indulgences as are enjoyed by the *Prima Primaria* of the Society of Jesus. Three years later the sovereign pontiff extended a similar favour to the youths educated by the Priests of the Lazarists, and to the little boys under the charge of the Sisters of Charity. The Brief of Pius IX, 19 September, 1876, permitted the admission into this association of young girls not attending the schools or work-rooms of the Sisters of Charity. Leo XIII confirmed these privileges by the Briefs of 21 May, 1897, 2 August, 1897, and 29 April, 1903. The badge adopted by the Children of Mary Immaculate is the miraculous medal, suspended from a blue ribbon. The statistics of 1897 gave one hundred thousand living members throughout the world, four hundred thousand having been registered from the date of the first canonical erection, in Paris, 19 July, 1847. From the same date to 1908, forty thousand have been registered in the institutions of the Daughters of Charity in the United States alone.

Aladel, *Miraculous Medal*, tr. P. S. (Baltimore, 1880); Chevalier, *Circular to Children of Mary* (Paris, 1897); Milon, *Annals Cong. Mission*, XII, 22; Mott, *Annals Cong. Mission*, XII, 189.

Frances Gildart Ruffin.

Children of Mary of the Sacred Heart, the.—A Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, founded by the Venerable Mother Barat of the Society of the Sacred Heart, in the Paris school about 1818, almost simultaneously with the convent itself. Father Varin drew up its rules. It had from the first, its laws, feasts, privileges and duties, its directors, president, and other dignitaries. The most fervent among the elder girls were enrolled. The principal end which the members proposed to themselves, was to love and serve the Immaculate Heart of Mary, by imitating her virtues, above all her fortitude and spotless purity. The lily was the first emblem of the sodalists, and "Semper Fidelis" their motto. In 1824 their medal was struck, and from an essay by one of them, Rose de Joigny, the inscription on it, "Cor meum jungatur vobis", was chosen. The miraculous fresco of Mater Admirabilis at the Trinità dei Monti in Rome is the sensible representation of the spirit of the sodality. By thus placing the ideal of true womanhood before the future wives and mothers of the next generation, Mother Barat sought to lay the foundation of many noble Christian homes.

This beginning led to a work of wider scope and even greater importance. As years advanced, Mother Barat longed to do something more towards securing a higher tone among women. She wrote in 1831: "How rare it is to meet a valiant woman! It must be so, because Holy Writ says: 'Far and from the uttermost coasts is the price thereof'; Let us labour then to form some at any cost. They will form others and good will come of it."

When Mother Barat visited Lyons in 1832, the mistress general of the school had lately established an association composed originally of the former pupils of the Sacred Heart, but afterwards joined by other

ladies. The work was in its infancy, yet Mother Barat saw what it might lead to, and resolved to develop it. Father Druilhet, S. J., then drew up the rules by which the Children of Mary of the Sacred Heart are still governed, and Mother Barat placed the association under the patronage of the archbishop. A little later she obtained for it the authorization of Rome, and constituted it on a like basis for all houses of the Society. Mother Barat wrote on that occasion: "Your mission is a very high one, and I do not fear to call it an apostolate, for you are to act as apostles in the midst of a perverse world. You must lead into the right path those who are wandering from it, encourage those kept back by human respect, and stop the downward course of those in danger." To be apostles in the world these Children of Mary are expected by their rules to practise many virtues, but it is still the lily of Mary's spotlessness which must shine pre-eminent, hence their love for her Immaculate Conception. Their devotion to the Heart of Jesus prompts the making of vestments and other altar requirements for poor churches and distant missions. Their zeal takes many other forms:—supporting orphans, visiting hospitals, helping the poor in their homes, opening work-rooms and guiding reading-circles for young girls, providing for the maintenance of youthful aspirants to the priesthood:—in a word, all the interests of God and Holy Church are theirs.

Few large cities of continental Europe are without one such sodality connected with some convent of the Sacred Heart. From New York to San Francisco, Halifax to Buenos Ayres, they exist in both Americas. Algiers and Cairo in Africa, Melbourne, Sydney and Wellington in Australasia have theirs, active and flourishing. Bishops and pastors find them efficient helpers, and the sovereign pontiffs have appealed to them, never in vain. Many members have led lives of eminent usefulness, some have risen to unusual distinction in the practice of virtue, whilst not a few have died in the odour of sanctity. Monseigneur Baunard well sums up their character: "A place of honour is here due those thousands upon thousands of women and maidens, Children of Mary, whose association, now spread throughout France, was born of the desire to serve her and imitate her virtues. . . . A vast secular association of Christian perseverance, it has Mary Immaculate for model and patroness, spiritual exercises for means, charity and mutual support for resource, and sanctification of self and others for aim, the glory of the adorable Heart of Jesus for final end. Associations imitated from this type and bearing the same names, are founded everywhere, and prosper to-day throughout the Catholic Church" (Un siècle de l'Eglise de France, Paris, 1902).

Lady Georgiana Fullerton, herself a president of one of these sodalities, thus writes concerning them: "What struck us as eminently, if not peculiarly, distinctive of this institute, is the intense desire, and we might almost say the special gift, of imparting to those they educate, and those they influence, the spirit of active apostleship in the world, which is limited to no particular sphere of action, but spreads itself in every place and throughout every social circle, where those inspired with it and trained to it may be thrown. It was the ardent thought of Mother Barat, and the thought which she was continually placing before her community, to follow souls through life, and by means of congregations for the rich and for the poor, never to lose sight of the children educated in their schools. This thought and this desire led to the foundation of those associations of the Children of Mary of the Sacred Heart, which have won so many commendations and encouragements from successive pontiffs."

BAUNARD, *Un Siècle de l'Eglise de France* (Paris, 1902); IDEM, *Vie de Madame Barat* (Paris, 1877); GOUPY, *Sommaire du Règlement des Enfants de Marie* (Paris); *Règlement des Enfants de Marie du dehors* (Paris, for private circulation); *Life of the Ven. Mother Barat* (Roehampton, 1900); *Life of Madame Barat*, tr. FULLERTON (Roehampton, 1876); *Vie de Madame Goetz* (Roehampton, 1895, for private circulation); *Vie de Madame du Rousier* (Paris, for private circulation); *Vie de Madame Perdrau* (Roehampton, for private circulation).

ALICE POWER.

Chile, (also written CHILI), a comparatively narrow strip of coast-land in South America between the Pacific Ocean on the west and the Andes Mountains on the east, including the watershed. It extends from 17° 30′ S. lat. to the extremity of South America (Cape Horn), about 57° S. lat., thus including Tierra del Fuego and the islands of Navarino, Hoste, and smaller isles to the south, besides, in the west, the islands of Chiloé, Wellington, with their surroundings, and farther out in the Pacific, Juan Fernández. The surface of the country, including the main islands, is calculated at about 290,000 sq. miles. Chile is approximately 2600 miles long, while the width varies between 185 and 100 miles. Ascent from the Pacific shore to the eastern crests is therefore very abrupt, the highest mountain peaks rising to over 22,000 feet in the Aconcagua. The whole chain and its ramifications are dotted with more than forty volcanoes, some of which are active. Northern Chile, including the recently occupied Peruvian province of Tacna and the Bolivian province of Tarapacá, etc., are arid along the coast, and the soil is alkaline; south of these provinces fertile valleys abound; the timbered southern extremity is cold, and glaciers reach the seashore. The eastern shores of the Strait of Magellan are barren. The agricultural sections of the republic lie almost exclusively in the temperate zone and are very productive in cereals, fruit, and grapes: in short, all alimentary products characteristic of temperate regions. Chile has gold, silver, copper, iron, nitrates, borates, and coal; all of these minerals are worked by the people of the country as well as by foreign enterprise. The country is therefore progressing rapidly, owing chiefly to the character of its inhabitants, who distinguish themselves by energy and intense patriotism. The gold production of Chile from 1544 to August 1894, has been stated at about 9,917,000 ounces. Chile has, in its southern and central sections, a number of rivers, some of which are partly navigable, at least for smaller craft. The most important of these, from south to north, are the Cautin or Imperial, the Biobio, and further north, the Maule, Rapel, and Maipó. The streams are short and descend from mountain lakes, of which there are a great number. The southern coast is remarkably indented and the Strait of Magellan, with countless islands and islets, terminates the mainland about 53° S. lat. The north of Chile (Tacna, Tarapacá, Antofagasta and Northern Atacama) is very dry, and rains are scarce. The climate of the coast, further south, is usually from seven to eight degrees cooler than that of corresponding latitudes on the Atlantic. Variations are abrupt, storms frequent, not seldom violent, and rain falls in great quantities. Towards the extremity of the continent and in Tierra del Fuego the rains are still heavier, the climate colder, approaching Arctic conditions, with heavy snowfalls. Tempests increase in violence towards the south, along the coast.

POPULATION.—According to the census of 1903, the population of Chile numbered 3,205,992 souls, most of whom are Catholics. Of these, however, 15 per cent were only estimated. In 1895 it included 72,812 foreign residents; Italians, Germans, and English being the most numerous. Since 1835 the population had increased threefold. It is the most homogeneous of any country in South America, the Northern Indians having completely disappeared as such. In the South, the Araucanians continue to enjoy a sort of autonomy under military surveillance; their number is variously stated, but is probably more than 20,000, while some put it as high as 60,000. The

number of Patagonian aborigines is inconsiderable, and Tierra del Fuego has about 4000 inhabitants.

GOVERNMENT.—The form of government is republican. The legislative power is vested in Congress, consisting of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. The latter are elected directly in the provinces, for a term of three years, one deputy for every 30,000 inhabitants or fraction thereof, not less than 15,000. Senators also are elected directly by the people, one senator for three deputies, or one senator for two deputies, two if the number of inhabitants does not permit three for the province. The senators' term of office is six years, at the end of which they may be re-elected. The president, who is the chief executive, is chosen by indirect suffrage, that is, by electors chosen by the people. For judicial purposes the territory is divided into six sections, at the head of each of which is a Court of Appeals. The Supreme Court is held at the capital, Santiago, and has the superintendence and direction of all inferior courts. In addition to the provincial appellate tribunals, there are, in some of the districts, special judges of criminal and commercial affairs. Chile consists of twenty-three provinces and the Territory of Magallanes. Each province is subdivided into departments, each department into subdelegations, which in turn are composed of districts. At the head of each province stands an intendant, who is directly dependent on the president; the departments have their governors, under whom are the subdelegates, who control the inspectors of each district. The municipal governments of the provincial capitals are presided over by the intendants, those of subdelegations by the subdelegate. All citizens are equal before the law and eligible to public offices, except in special cases. Residence at all points, association, and education are free, as also the press. The courts decide all cases of abuse of the liberty of the press. The great majority of the population being of Spanish descent, Spanish is the national language, but foreigners enjoy all reasonable liberties. In 1850 the establishment of a specifically German colony was begun at Valdivia, and the development of that province is largely due to German settlers. German immigrants are numerous throughout Chile, and their business standing is quite high. The English also have a good share in larger mining operations and they control to some extent the Chilian lines of steamers on the Pacific. There are private institutes of education founded and supported exclusively by foreigners. The Chilian army and navy are the best in South America. The army has, since the war with Bolivia and Peru, been specially trained by officers obtained from Germany. The number of the regular troops is fixed annually by Congress.

THE CATHEDRAL, SANTIAGO DE CHILE

The metric system obtains in the republic. There are three gold coins: the condor (20 Chilian pesos, a peso is equivalent to 36½ cents); the doblón (10 pesos), and the escudo (5 pesos); but paper money and silver are the usual currency. The smallest coins (one and two cents or centavos) contain 95 per cent of copper and 5 per cent of nickel. Imports rose, from 1885 to 1905 inclusive, from 44,000,000 to over 188,000,000 Chilian pesos; exports during the same period, from 51,000,000 to 265,000,000 pesos. The nitrate exports in 1903 alone amounted to 140,000,000. The exports are chiefly to England and Germany. The chief commercial port is Valparaiso, established 1543; it now has a population of 150,000. In 1903, there were 11,080 miles of telegraph lines in operation and in 1906, 2,875 miles of railroads. On 1 January, 1904, the foreign national debt of Chile amounted to 16,449,960 pounds sterling, and the home debt to 103,815,821 Chilian pesos. Sixty millions of the latter were represented by paper money in circulation.

EDUCATION.—The cost of supporting public education is paid by the government which, in 1903, spent

4,146,574 pesos for the purpose. Instruction is free and is divided into primary, secondary, and professional or superior. Primary instruction is supervised by a body of instructors headed by an inspector-general. In 1903, there were 1,961 primary schools with 166,928 pupils and 3608 teachers. Besides, there were 506 private institutions of primary education, and the private secondary schools were frequented by 11,184 students. Normal schools for men and for women also exist. The national institute and the lyceums (11 male and 4 female), and likewise the university at Santiago, the highest institution of learning, are under the immediate control of the Council of Public Instruction. Licences to practise law, medicine, and engineering are issued by the university. Furthermore, there are the agricultural institute and schools of agriculture and mining, a school of arts and crafts, academy of painting, pedagogic institute, conservatory of music, and military and naval schools. The Council of Technical Instruction at Santiago superintends the agricultural institute, school of arts and crafts, and the professional school for girls. Public libraries and scientific societies of a rather high order flourish, and museums exist as well as a botanical garden, astronomical and meteorological observatories, and a hydrographic bureau.

Religion.—While the State religion is Catholic, still the Church has not enjoyed entire peace. In 1768 the Jesuits, who had begun missionary work among the Araucanians (q. v.) at the beginning of the seventeenth or end of the sixteenth century, were expelled. They were re-admitted, however, in 1843. The State confiscated the Church property in 1824, and fixed a salary for the clergy. Tithes and most of the religious houses were abolished. In 1883 ecclesiastical tribunals were placed under lay supervision, and in 1884 civil marriage was introduced, and is the only form acknowledged by law. A conflict arose, in 1883, between Chile and Rome concerning the right of nomination to vacant sees; this difficulty was satisfactorily adjusted in 1888. Diplomatic relations are maintained with the Holy See, an internuncio residing permanently at Santiago.

Chile constitutes one ecclesiastical province, comprising the Archdiocese of Santiago; the suffragan sees of Concepción, San Carlos de Ancud (Chiloé), and Serena; and the Vicariates Apostolic of Tarapacá and Antofagasta, both dependent on the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. In Southern Chile there are Indian missions conducted by the Franciscan Recollects, the Capuchins, and the Salesians. There are numerous schools and colleges in the State conducted by the religious, but even in the public schools religious instruction is compulsory. (For further religious statistics, see articles Santiago de Chile; Concepción; Ancud; Serena; Antofagasta; Tarapacá.)

History.—Previous to 1535 very little is known of the conditions of the Indians of Chile. Several, and possibly numerous tribes like the Quillotanos and Promaucas or Purumaucas, held the northern sections of the present republic. They, at least the former, may have been of Peruvian stock, but they have completely disappeared and hardly anything is known about their idioms. The word *Chile* is variously explained, but there is no certain etymology. Southern Chile (Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego omitted) appears to have been held by Indians of Araucanian stock, the warlike people which now bears that name and is organized into a loose confederacy of tribes, forming the most considerable cluster. The first Spanish expedition to Chile was commanded by Diego de Almagro the Elder about 1535 and 1536. It penetrated into Northern Chile from Bolivia, across the Atacama region, and reached as far as the Río Claro among the Purumaucas. After an indecisive engagement with that tribe, Almagro retraced his steps to Cuzco in Peru, there to meet his death. It was only in 1540 that a permanent conquest was begun, led by Pedro de Valdivia. Valdivia was more successful than his predecessor. He occupied the country as far as about 38° S. lat., and came in contact with the Araucanians, who destroyed him with his entire force on 1 January, 1554. The Indians north of the Araucanians had been subjected in the years previous, although not without much resistance and repeated uprisings against the Spanish invaders. Valdivia had founded at least seven Spanish settlements, such as Serena, Concepción, Angol, Imperial, etc. An Indian war of unequalled duration and fierceness followed. It lasted with short interruptions for more than two centuries and was brought to a close only after 1773 by a treaty of peace in which the Araucanians negotiated with the Spanish officers as an independent and foreign power. According to the treaty the Araucanians maintained the integrity of their territory, and were to be represented at Santiago by one of their chiefs in the quality of an envoy. During the past century, these conditions were gradually changed, and the Araucanian territory is now merely the Indian reservation of Chile.

The protracted resistance of the Araucanians has no parallel in the history of America. The Iroquois held their own for not quite two centuries, but their position, between rival European colonies (first France and England, then England and the United States) was much more favourable. They always had a civilized power to fall back upon, whereas the Araucanians were isolated. The feeble attempts made in the seventeenth century by Dutch and English corsairs to establish relations with them had no permanent results. As already mentioned they displayed a remarkable aptitude for improvement in the art of war, whereas in the arts of peace they advanced but little. During that protracted warfare the Spanish colonies in Southern Chile were often in a most critical position, for the Spanish arms sometimes suffered disastrous reverses. The old settlement of Imperial had to be definitively abandoned in 1600. In the same year Angol (founded 1553) suffered the same fate. Tucapel was still more short-lived. The Araucanians repeatedly destroyed Concepción. In several engagements in the open field the Indians also obtained considerable successes, their horsemen encountering the Spanish cavalry successfully. In 1563 the governor, Pedro de Villagran, was defeated and killed by the Araucanians. Some of the Spanish leaders, however, like García Hurtado de Mendoza, obtained signal victories on various occasions. This state of things was not favourable to a steady development of the Spanish colony in Chile. Dependent on the Vice-Royalty of Lima, and frequently molested by English and Dutch filibusters, communication with the outer world was difficult and occasionally interrupted. Left mostly to their own resources, the Chilian Spaniards developed into a hardy and energetic race, proud of having maintained themselves in spite of adversity.

Spain was unable to take care of its colonies in the first decade of the nineteenth century. A provisional government (*junta gubernativa*) was installed in 1810. Attacked by the Spanish authorities in Peru, Chile had to resort to arms, but its army, led by the brave General Bernardo O'Higgins was defeated at Rancagua in 1814, and Spanish authority was restored for a while. At the battle of Chacabuco, however, (12 February, 1817), and the subsequent action of Maipo (5 April), the Chilians definitively achieved their independence, which was formally declared, 12 February, 1818, and recognized by Spain in 1846. The island of Chiloé alone held out for Spain until 1826. Since then Chile has had its internal troubles, though not as many as other South American republics. The worst was in 1891. Then the people rose against the attempt of Balmaceda to establish a dictatorial power.


SOUTH AMERICA
SHOWING THE ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCES, DIOCESES, VICARIATES AND PREFECTURES APOSTOLIC, ABBEY "NULLIUS" OF SANTAREM DO PARA AND THE VARIOUS MISSION-FIELDS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF BOTH THE PROPOGANDA FIDEI AND THE "SACRA CONGREGATIONE."
Seat of Archbishopric
Seat of Bishopric
" " Vicariate Apostolic
" " Prefecture Apostolic
Capitals of Countries in South America
Capitals of States in Brazil
Cables
Indian tribes in ITALICS
Scale of English Statute Miles
0 250 500 1000
Scale of Kilometers
0 250 500 1000 1500
N. B.—Owing to the small space which the United States of Colombia and Ecuador occupy on this map, only the boundaries of their Ecclesiastical Provinces are shown. See Articles Ecuador and United States of Colombia for maps giving boundaries of Dioceses.
Papal Line of Demarcation
370 Leagues West of the Azores according to the Treaty
of Tordesillas, June 7, 1494 sanctioned by
Pope Julius II, January 24, 1506
To Demerara
Mouths of the Orinoco
Mouths of the Amazon
Equator
CARIBBEAN SEA
VENEZUELA
COLOMBIA
ECUADOR
PERU
BRAZIL
GUIANA
Caracas
Bogota
Quito
Lima
Manaos
Para
Belem
Georgetown
Paramaribo
Cayenne
Surinam
Trinidad
Port of Spain
Barbados, Br.
Martinique (Fr.)
Guadeloupe (Fr.)
Antigua (Br.)
Barbuda (Br.)
Dominica (Br.)
Santa Lucia
Grenada, Br.
Curacao
Jamaica
Kingston
Santiago de Cuba
Havana
Merida
Maracaibo
Cartagena
Panama
Guayaquil
Iquitos
Nauta
Callao
Arequipa
Cuzco
Pernambuco
Maceio
Aracaju
Parahyba
Natal
Fortaleza
Sobral
Caxias
Therezina
Carolina
Barra
Jacobina
Nazareth
Cachoeira
San Salvador de Bahia
Diamantino
Matto Grosso
Cuyaba
Galapagos Islands
Same Scale as Main Map

ARGENTINA

	Seat of
1 Ecclesiastical Province "Sanctissimae Trinitatis de Buenos Ayres"	Archbishopric, Bishopric.
2 Diocese of SSma Assunzione, or Paraguay	Asuncion.
3 Diocese of Cordoba	Cordoba.
4 Diocese of San Juan de Cuyo	San Juan.
5 Diocese of La Plata	La Plata.
6 Diocese of Paraná	Paraná.
7 Diocese of Salta	Salta.
8 Diocese of Santa Fé	Santa Fé.
9 Diocese of Tucuman	Tucuman.
10 Vic. Apost. of N. Patagonia	Carmen de Patagones, or Viedma.
11 Prefecture Apost. of S. Patagonia	Punta Arenas.

BOLIVIA

1 Ecclesiastical Province of La Plata, or Charcas	Sucre.
2 Diocese of Cochabamba	Cochabamba.
3 Diocese of Santa Cruz de La Sierra	San. Cruz de La Sierra.
4 Diocese of La Paz	La Paz.

BRAZIL

I 1 Ecclesiastical Province Sancti Salvatoris in Brasilia	San Salvador de Bahia de Todos os Santos.
2 Diocese of Alagoas	Maceio.
3 Diocese of Fortaleza (Ceará)	Fortaleza.
4 Diocese of Olinda	Olinda.
5 Diocese of Parahyba	Parahyba.
II. 1 Eccl. Prov. of Belem do Para	Para (Belem).
2 Diocese Sancti Ludovici de Maragnano	S. Luiz de Maranhão.
3 Diocese of Amazonas, or Manaos	Manaos.
4 Diocese of Piauhy	Therezina.
5 Abbey, and Prelatura "Nullius" Santarem do Pará	Santarem.
III. 1 Eccl. Prov. of Marianna	Marianna.
2 Diocese of Diamantina	Diamantina.
3 Diocese of Pouso Alegre	Pouso Alegre.
4 Diocese of Goyaz	Uberaba (in Minas Geraes).
IV. 1 Eccl. Prov. Sancti Sebastiani Flumnas Januarii	Rio de Janeiro.
2 Diocese of Curityba	Curityba.
3 Diocese Sancti Pauli in Brasilia	São Paulo.
4 Diocese of Petropolis	Petropolis.
5 Diocese of São Pedro do Rio Grande do Sul	Porto Alegre.
6 Diocese of Espirito Santo	Victoria.
7 Diocese of Cuyabá	Cuyabá.

CHILE

1 Eccl. Prov. Sancti Jacobi de Chile	Santiago.
2 Diocese Sanctissimae Conceptionis de Chile	Conception.
3 Diocese Sancti Caroli Ancudiae de Chiloe	S. Carlos de Ancud.
4 Diocese of Serena	La Serena.
5 Vic. Apost. of Tarapaca	Tarapaca.
6 Pref. Apost. of Araucania	
7 Vic. Apost. under the jurisdiction of the "Sacra Congregatione" Antofagasta	Antofagasta.

UNITED STATES OF COLOMBIA

I. 1 Eccl. Prov. Sanctae Fidei de Bogotá	Bogotá.
2 Diocese of Ibagué	Ibagué.
3 Diocese of Nueva Pamplona	Pamplona.
4 Diocese of Socorro	Socorro.
5 Diocese of Tunja	Tunja.
II. 1 Eccl. Prov. of Cartagena	Cartagena.
2 Diocese of Santa Marta	Santa Marta.
3 Diocese of Panama	Panama.

U. S. OF COLOMBIA (Continued)

III. 1 Eccl. Prov. of Medellin	Medellin.
2 Diocese of Antioquia	Antioquia.
3 Diocese of Manizales	Manizales.
IV. 1 Eccl. Prov. of Popayan	Popayan.
2 Diocese of Garzon	Garzon.
3 Diocese of Pasto	Pasto.

UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE "SACRA CONGREGATIONE"

A. Vic. Apost. of Casanare	Casanare.
B. Vic. Apost. of Goajira	
C. Pref. Apost. Caqueta	
D. Pref. Apost Piani di S. Martino	
E. Pref. Apost. Intendenza Orientale	

N. B. Of the above the first two are situated in the Territories of the same name, the last in the disputed Territory bordering on Ecuador.

ISLAND OF CURAÇAO

Vic. Apost. of Curaçao — Willemstad.

ECUADOR

1 Eccl. Prov. of Quito	Quito.
2 Diocese of Cuenca	Cuenca.
3 Diocese of Ibarra	Ibarra.
4 Diocese of Loja	Loja.
5 Diocese of Guayaquil	Guayaquil.
6 Diocese of Portoviejo	Portoviejo.
7 Diocese of Bolivarum	Riobamba.

ECUADOR (Continued)

VICARIATES APOSTOLIC UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE "SACRA CONGREGATIONE"

A. Canelos and Macas	Seat of Vicariates in towns of same name.
B. Mendez and Gualaquiza	
C. Napo	
D. Zamora	

All the above situated in the "Provincia del Oriente."

THE THREE GUIANAS

1 Vic. Apost. of British Guiana, or Demerara	Georgetown.
2 Vic. Apost. of Dutch Guiana, or Surinam	Paramaribo.
3 Pref. Apost. of French Guiana or Cayenne (W. jurisdiction over Brazilian Guayana)	Cayenne.

PERU

1 Eccl. Prov. of Lima	Lima.
2 Diocese of Arequipa	Arequipa.
3 Diocese of Chachapoyas	Chachapoyas.
4 Diocese of Cuzco	Cuzco.
5 Diocese of Huamangana or Ayacucho	Ayacucho.
6 Diocese of Huanuco	Huanuco.
7 Diocese of Huaraz	Huaraz.
8 Diocese of Puno	Puno.
9 Diocese of Trujillo	Trujillo.
10 Pref. Apost. of Amazonas	These three Prefectures are situated along the Rivers of the same name.
11 Pref. Apost. of Ucayali	
12 Pref. Apost. of Urubamba	

ISLAND OF TRINIDAD

1 Eccl. Prov. of Port of Spain	Port of Spain.
2 Diocese of Roseau, or Charlottetown (Island of Dominica)	Roseau.

URUGUAY

1 Eccl. Prov. of Montevideo	Montevideo.
2 Diocese of Melo	Melo.
3 Diocese of Salto	Salto.

VENEZUELA

1 Eccl. Prov. of Santiago de Venezuela	Caracas.
2 Diocese of Barquisimeto	Barquisimeto.
3 Diocese of Santo Tomas de Guayana	Ciudad Bolivar.
4 Diocese of Calabozo	Calabozo.
5 Diocese of Merida	Merida.
6 Diocese of Zulia	Maracaibo.

Strait of Magellan
Magalhães' Passage
Oct. 21-Nov. 28, 1520

THE MATTHEWS NORTHRUP WORKS, BUFFALO, N.Y

Longitude 110 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 from Greenwich

COPYRIGHT, 1908, BY ROBERT APPLETON CO

The bloody engagement at La Placilla, in August of that year, ensured the triumph of the constitutional party. Since then, there have been no internal troubles. Chile has had several foreign wars. In 1839 the Chilian army was called to the aid of the Bolivian and Peruvian opponents of the "Protector" Santa Cruz, who attempted to enforce a union between Peru and Bolivia. The Chilians and their allies from Peru achieved a complete victory at Yungay, January, 1839, and the Chilian flag was displayed in Northern Peru. In 1866 a difficulty arose with Spain that brought about the bombardment of Valparaiso by a Spanish squadron. Finally war broke out between Chile and Bolivia, afterwards also with Peru, in the course of which the Chilian forces destroyed the Peruvian navy, penetrated victoriously as near Central Bolivia as Puno, occupied the whole of the Peruvian coast after severe campaigning, and even reached Cajamarca in Northern Peru. As a result of this long and serious contest (in which Lima was taken after several bloody engagements) Chile obtained possession of the maritime provinces of Bolivia and the Peruvian department of Tacna. A truce, which has not yet been converted into a formal treaty of peace, was made in 1884, putting an end to these hostilities.

For works on the anthropology of Chile, see article ARAUCANIANS. The natural history (and also the anthropology) of Chile has been the subject of exhaustive treatment by CLAUDIO GAY, *Historia Física y Política de Chile* (Paris and Santiago 1844–1854). In the *Verhandlungen des deutschen wissenschaftlichen Vereins* (Santiago), much valuable material is found, especially by PHILIPPI and R. LENZ. The very numerous official publications of the Chilian Government afford a great wealth of statistics, condensed in the publications of the BUREAU OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS, at Washington; in the work of ADOLFO ORTUZAR, *Le Chili de nos jours*, in *Annuaire national* (Paris, 1906), of ESPINOXA, *Geografía descriptiva de la República de Chile* (Santiago, 1897), of ENRIQUE DE SILVA, *Ensayo de una bibliografía histórica y geográfica de Chile* (Santiago, 1902), and of several others. For the history of Chile the two very important collections, *Historiadores primitivos de Chile*, begun by BARROS ARANA, and the *Documentos inéditos para la historia de Chile*, must be consulted, since they contain most, if not all, of the older literature on the country and its inhabitants. To these must be added BARROS ARANA, *Historia general de Chile* (Santiago, 1884–1885); also, *Documentos inéditos del Archivo de Indias; La Provincia Eclesiástica Chilena* (Freiburg, 1895).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

Chiliasm, Chiliasts. See MILLENNIUM.

Chimalpain, DOMINGO (SAN ANTON Y MUÑON), a Mexican Indian of the second half of the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries, who received a liberal education in the colleges for Indians of Mexico City under the direction of the clergy. His family having acquired some wealth, he undertook the investigation of the antiquities of his race, and wrote several works in Spanish and Nahuatl, one of which was published by Bustamante as the chronicle of Gomara, of which it appears to be either a copy or a paraphrase. He is credited with the following books, although it is not yet certain how far the attribution of authorship is correct: "Historia mexicana antigua"; "Crónica de México desde el año 1068 hasta el de 1597"; "Apuntamientos de sucesos desde 1064 hasta 1521"; "Relaciones originales de los Reinos de Aculhuacan, Mexico, &c."; "Relación de la Conquista de México por los Españoles".

BOTURINI, *Idea &c.* (Madrid, 1746); LEÓN Y PINELO, *Epítome &c.* (Madrid, 1733–1738); CLAVIGERO, *Storia del Messico* (Cesena, 1780); BERISTAIN, *Biblioteca &c.* (Amecameca, 1883); BRINTON, *Aboriginal Authors;* AUGUSTÍN DE VETANCURT, *Teatro mexicano* (Mexico, 1698 and 1870).

AD. F. BANDELIER.

China.—The Chinese Empire, the largest political division of Eastern Asia, extends from 18° 10′ to 53° 45′ N. lat., and from 73° 47′ to 134° 25′ E. long. It includes China proper or the Eighteen Provinces (Shi-pa-sheng), theoretically a subject territory of Manchuria, the cradle of the present dynasty, and the dependencies: Mongolia, Ili (or Sin-kiang), and Tibet. Its boundaries are on the north, Siberia; west, Russian Turkestan; south, British India; south-east, Burma and Tong-king; east, the Pacific Ocean; north-east, Korea. This article is concerned only with China proper.

AREA AND POPULATION.—Roughly speaking, the Eighteen Provinces occupy nearly one-third of the surface of the empire. The area of China proper is estimated in round numbers at 2,000,000 square miles; Père Richard gives 1,532,800 square miles. The length is 1860, the breadth 1520, miles. According to the official trade returns for 1906, the estimated population of China was 438,214,000, which includes that of Feng-tien (Manchurian province, 16,000,000). The "Almanach de Gotha" (1904) and the "Statesman's Year-Book" (1905) give for the Eighteen Provinces 319,510,000 and 407,335,305 respectively, but the Hon. W. W. Rockhill in a careful study (Smithson. Miscel. Col., quart. issue 47, part III) gives so low a figure as 270,000,000. The population at various epochs is as follows: in 1390, 60,545,812; in 1500, 53,281,153; in 1619, 60,692,856; time of Macartney, 333,000,000; in 1842, 419,600,000; in 1894, 421,800,000.

NAMES.—The Chinese called their empire *Chung Kwo* (Middle Kingdom), a name first applied to Ho-nan, the country of the Chou dynasty; a Chinaman is designated *Chung-kwo-jen* or man of the Middle Kingdom; in diplomacy China is *Ta-ts'ing Kwo* (the great empire of Ts'ing, the present dynasty), as it was formerly *Ta Ming Kwo* (the great empire of Ming). In literature it is called *T'ien Hia* (Under Heaven), *Sze Hai* [the four (surrounding) seas], *Chung Hwa Kwo* (the Middle Flowery Kingdom); some names refer to celebrated dynasties, *Hwa Hia* (glorious Hia), *Han-jen* or *Han-tze* (men or sons of Han), *T'ang-jen* or *T'ang-shan* (men or mountains of T'ang).

The Arabs called China *Sin, Chin, Mahachin, Machin.* The *Sinæ* and *Seres* of Ptolemy and other classic writers probably represent the Chinese. In the Middle Ages, Europeans made a distinction between Northern (Cathay) and Southern (Manzi) China. It is probable that the name China, from the Ts'in dynasty (third century B. C.), reached the West by way of Burma and India.

PHYSICAL FEATURES.—*Coast and Islands.*—The Pacific Ocean bears several names; to the south it is called Nan-hai, or South (China) Sea, farther up the coast, Tung-hai, or Eastern Sea, and Hwang-hai, or Yellow Sea. The coast forms a semicircle, the islands of the Che-kiang province (123° E. long. Greenwich), extending farthest east; to the north is the Gulf of Chi-li and Shan-tung Peninsula, to the south the Gulf of Tong-king, the Island of Hai-nan, and Lei-chou Peninsula. There are also the Gulf of Liao-tung, Miao-tao Islands, the Chusan Archipelago, with Ting-hai and the celebrated pilgrimage of P'u-tu, the islands of Amoy, Sam-sa, Hai-t'an, Kin-men, T'ung-shan, Tai-wan or Formosa (now Japanese); Nan-hai, Mirs Bay (Ta-p'ong-hai), Hiang-kiang (Hong-Kong), Lappa, and Kwang-chou Bays; the islands of Namoa, Hong-Kong, Lan-tao, Lamma Archipelago, the Ladrones (Lao-wan-chan), the Chw'an Islands (Shang-chw'an, also called Sancian or St. John's, where St. Francis Xavier died in 1552), Hia-ch'wan, and the Paracels (Ts'i-chou).

The first beacon light was kindled at the mouth of the Yang-tze in 1855; the first lighthouse was erected on the island of Kung-tung, near Che-fu, in 1867. In 1907 the coast and ports of China had 116 lighthouses, 5 lightships, 24 lightboats, 137 buoys, 110 beacons, 392 in all.

Rivers.—The chief river is the Yang-tze, called simply Ta-kiang (Great River) or Kiang (River); as far as the Sze-ch'wan bend it is called Kin-sha-kiang; its general course is from west to east and its length about 4000 miles. It is navigable from the

ocean to I-ch'ang and semi-navigable, on account of the rapids, from I-ch'ang to P'ing-shan-hien. In the province of Sze-ch'wan its tributaries, on the left, are the Ya-lung-kiang, the Min-kiang (Ch'eng-tu River), and the Kia-ling-kiang; on the right the Ho-kiang and the Wu-kiang; in Hu-pe it receives on the left the Han-kiang; in Kiang-su it crosses the Grand Canal; near its mouth it receives the Hwang-pu or Shanghai River; at its estuary it is divided into two branches by Chung-ming Island; it waters the cities of Chin-kiang, Nan-king, Wu-hu, Ngan-king, Kiu-kiang, Han-kou, I-ch'ang, Ch'ung-k'ing, Sui-fu, and P'ing-shan.

Mention should be made of the following rivers: north of the Yang-tze the Liao-ho which rises in the Great K'ingan, north-east of Dolon-nor, and waters Southern Manchuria; the Pei-ho (Hai-ho) which flows through T'ien-tsin; at its mouth is Taku, formerly with forts at the entrance; the Hwang-ho (Yellow River) or simply the Ho, which is nearly as long as the Yang-tze, and is the scourge of China on account of its floods; in its middle course it forms a large bend, where it runs down between the provinces of Shen-si and Shan-si, encircling regions of the Ordos country; it receives on the right its principal tributary, the large river Wei, and on the left the Fen-ho; at one time it ran into the Yellow Sea, south of the Shan-tung Peninsula, but now it follows the course of the Ts'i-ho and runs north of the peninsula; the basin of the Ho is considered the cradle of China.

South of the Yang-tze are: the Ts'ien-tang-kiang; the Hang-chou River, celebrated on account of its bore; the Min-kiang, formed by the Kien-k'i, the Shao-wu-k'i, and the Ning-hwa-k'i; the Fu-chou River. The Si-kiang (West River) from Yun-nan receives on the right the Yu-kiang, already increased by the influx of the Tso-kiang, the Nan-ning River; on the left the Liu-kiang, the Kwei-kiang, the Pei (North) kiang; just this side of Chao-k'ing-fu, the Si-kiang divides into a number of branches; the north branch which waters Canton is called Chu-kiang or Pearl River and flows into the sea through the Hu-men, called also the *Bocca Tigris* or the Bogue, into which also empties from the east the Tung-kiang. The Grand or Imperial Canal, called the Yu-ho or Yun-ho, was begun, it is said, during the sixth century B. C., and was finished only in A. D. 1283 under the Mongol dynasty; it runs from T'ien-tsin to Hang-chou, crossing the Yang-tze at Chin-kiang and is the watercourse of the Great Plain.

Lakes.—The chief lakes are the T'ung-ting in the Hu-nan province and the P'o-yang in Kiang-si, both south of the Yang-tze; the former fed by the Siang, Yuan, and Su, connects with the Yang-tze by the Yo-chou Canal; the latter is fed by the Kan-kiang. Mention should also be made of the Ta-hu near Su-chou (Kiang-su), and the Si-hu, near Hang-chou (Che-kiang).

Mountains.—The two chief mountain ranges of China, offshoots of the highlands of Tibet, are the Eastern Kwen-lun and the Nan-shan. The Eastern Kwen-lun include the A-la-shan and the Kan-su mountains; the Ts'in-ling, between the Hwang-ho and the Yang-tze; the Min-shan, and the Kiu-lung. The Nan-shan or Nan-ling extend from Yun-nan, Kwei-chou, and Kwang-si, between the Yang-tze and the Si-kiang, to Kwang-tung and Fu-kien, their last spurs appearing in the Chusan Archipelago. Mention should also be made of the O-mi-shan, i. e. Mount O-mi (in Sze-ch'wan), the Wu-t'ai-shan (north Shan-si), and the Dokerla, near Aten-tze, all celebrated pilgrim resorts. The Great Plain of China extends from T'ien-tsin to Hang-chou, forming part of the provinces of Chi-li, Ho-nan, Ngan-hwei, Kiang-su, and western Shan-tung; it may be considered the valley of the Grand Canal. A certain deposit called *loess* or *hwang-t'u* (yellow earth) covers a great part of Kan-su, Shen-si and particularly Shan-si; this tertiary formation is characterized by its tendency to split vertically and by the numerous clefts caused by erosion; the caves in this deposit are easily deepened and often serve as dwellings for the inhabitants; it is exceedingly fertile, for which reason the Shan-si province has been called the "granary of the empire".

Political Geography.—The territorial divisions of the Chinese Empire have varied greatly at different times. Under the Emperor Yu the Great and the Hia dynasty, the capital was Yang-hia (in Ho-nan), and China was divided into nine *chou:* K'e, Ts'ing, Yen, Su, Yu, Yung, Leang, King, and Yang. Under the Shang, the capital was Po, near modern Kwei-tê-fu (Ho-nan), and the division remained the same. Under the Chou (1122–660 B. C.) the capitals were successively Hao (Ch'ang-ngan) and Lo-yang (781 B. C.), and there were still nine *chou:* You, Ping, Yen, Ch'ing, Ch'e, Yung, Yu, Ching, Yang. During the period covered by the "Spring and Autumn Annals" of Confucius (781–519 B. C.) the capital was Lo-yang, and there were the following kingdoms: Chou (1122–249), Loo (1121–248), Wei (1077–413), Ts'ai (1106–446), Tsin (1106–376), Ts'aou (1051-486), Ch'eng (805–374), Woo (1290–472), Yen (863–221), Ch'en (853–478), Sung (1077–285), Ts'e (1076–220), Ts'u (1077–222), Ts'in (908–245). Under the Ts'in dynasty (220–204 B. C.) China was divided into 36 *kiun.* Under the Han dynasty (206 B. C.–A. D. 25) the capital was Ch'ang-ngan; there were 103 principalities, 241 marquisates, 32 *tao* or provinces, 1314 *hien.* Under the Eastern Han dynasty (A. D. 25–220), there were 13 *chou* and the capital was Lo-yang. The capitals of China were in turn or at the same time Lo-yang (Wei dynasty), Ch'eng-tu (Shu of Sze-ch'wan), Kien-kang, or Nan-king (Wu), Hang-chou (Southern Sung, 420–477), Ta-tung (Northern Wei, 386–532), Ch'ang-ngan (Sui, 581–618), Lo-yang (T'ang, 618–907), K'ai-feng and Hang-chou (Sung, 960–1126), Peking, called Yen-king under the Kin, and Cambaluc under the Yuan. During the Mongol period China was divided into ten sheng or provinces; under the Ming dynasty there were fifteen sheng, Kan-su having been taken from Shen-si, Kiang-nan being divided into Kiang-su and Ngan-hwei, and Hu-kwang into Hu-pe and Hu-nan. There are now eighteen provinces. At one time Formosa formed one province; Kiang-hwai, or Northern Kiang-su, was temporarily detached from Kiang-su (1905).

The Eighteen Provinces (*Shi-pa-sheng*) consist of:—(1) Chi-li (meaning direct rule), in which is Peking (Shun-t'ien-fu), the capital of the empire. The capital is Pao-ting; principal places: Sien-hwa, Cheng-te (Shehol), Yung-p'ing, T'ien-tsin, Ho-kien, Cheng-ting; mention should also be made of Shan-hai-kwan, the most important pass through the Great Wall, Dolon-nor (Lama-miao), the old summer residence of the Mongol emperors; the population is 29,400,000.—(2) Shan-tung (east of the mountain, the Heng-shan); capital, Tsi-nan; principal places: Tsi-ning-chou; Ts'ing-chou-fu, Chou-ts'un, Lai-chou, Teng-chou, the treaty port Che-fu, the British establishment Wei-hai-wei, the German port Ts'ing-tao (Kiao-chou); the T'ai-shan is a celebrated place of pilgrimage. Confucius and Mencius were born in this province; population, 38,000,000.—(3) Shan-si (west of the mountain); capital, T'ai-yuan-fu; principal products. coal and iron; principal mountain, Wu-t'ai-shan; principal cities: Kwei-hwa-ch'eng (also called *Ku-ku-choto* or blue city), Ta-tung, P'ing-yang-fu, P'ing-ting-chou; the population of Shan-si, Shen-si, Kan-su, Ho-nan, and Kwei-chou is estimated at 55,000,000.—(4) Ho-nan [south of the river (the Hwang-ho)]; capital, K'ai-feng; near Ho-nan-fu is the sacred mountain Sung, to the west of which is situated the Lung-men defile, whose banks are

adorned with ancient sculptures.—(5) Kiang-su [first syllables of Kiang-ning (Nan-king) and Su-chou]; capital, Su-chou; principal city, Kiang-ning (Nan-king), formerly capital of the empire, and now residence of the viceroy of the Liang-kiang or Two Kiangs; chief cities: Shanghai, the most important trading mart of China, and Yang-chou, on the Grand Canal; population, 23,980,000.—(6) Ngan-hwei (first syllables of Ngan-k'ing and Hwei-chou); capital, Ngan-k'ing, on the left bank of the Yang-tze; principal places: Wu-hu, a treaty port, Hwei-chou, Feng-yang, the birth-place of the Mings; population, 36,000,000.—(7) Kiang-si (west of the Kiang); capital, Nan-ch'ang, on the Kan-kiang, south of the celebrated P'o-yang lake; principal places: Kiu-kiang, a treaty port, Yao-chou, King-te-chen, the centre of the manufacture of porcelain, with 160,000 workmen; population, 24,534,000.—(8) Che-kiang (crooked river); capital, Hang-chou, on the left bank of the Ts'ien-t'ang, near the celebrated Lake Si-hu; principal places: Hu-chou, Shao-hing, Ning-po, Ting-hai, Lan-k'i-hien, Kin-hwa; population, 11,800,000.—(9) Fu-kien (first syllables of Fu-chou and of Kien-ning); capital, Fu-chou, on the left bank of the Min; principal places: Ts'ean-chou, Amoy (Hia-men), Chang-chou, T'ung-ngan, Yen-p'ing, Kien-ning, Ch'ung-ngan, Lien-kiang, Fu-ning; population, 20,000,000.—(10) Hu-pe (north of the lake, Tung-t'ing); capital, Wu-ch'ang, on the right bank of the Yang-tze at the mouth of the Han-ho; opposite, on the right bank of the Han, is Han-yang, on the left, Han-kou; other important places: I-ch'ang, Sha-shi, Siang-yang; population, 34,000,000.—(11) Hu-nan (south of the lake); capital, Ch'ang-sha, on the right bank of the Siang-kiang; principal places: Heng-chou, Siang-t'an, Siang-yin, Yo-chou, and the great market-city, Ch'ang-te; population, 22,000,000.—(12) Kwang-tung (east of the Kwang); capital, Kwang-chou (Canton) after 1664, when it superseded Chao-k'ing-fu; principal places: Chao-chou, Fa-chan, Swatow, Pak-hoi, Kiung-chou (Hai-nan); population, 32,000,000.—(13) Kwang-si (west of the Kwang); capital, Kwei-lin, on the Kwei-kiang; principal places: Wu-chou on the Si-kiang, Nan-ning on the Yu-kiang, Lung-chou on the Tso-kiang, Liu-chou on the Liu-kiang, Po-se; population, 8,000,000.—(14) Yun-nan (south of the clouds); capital, Yun-nan-fu; principal places: Ta-li-fu, capital of the Mohammedan rebels, Tung-ch'wan, Chao-t'ung, Meng-tze, Sze-mao, Aten-tze, Momein (Teng-yueh); this province has a large foreign population, chiefly Minchia, Lolos, Miao-tze, etc.; population, 8,000,000.—(15) Kwei-chou (precious region); capital, Kwei-yang; principal places: Tsun-i-fu, Pi-tsieh-hien, Ngan-shun, Hing-i-fu.—(16) Shen-si (west of the Shen T'ung-kwan Pass), capital Si-ngan-fu near the Wei-ho, where the imperial court repaired during the Boxer rebellion (1900); principal places: Han-chung, Hing-ngan.—(17) Kan-su (first syllables of Kan-chou and Su-chou); capital, Lan-chou, on the right bank of the Hwang-ho; principal places: Si-ning; to the south-west the celebrated monastery Gum-bum, Ning-hia, Liang-chou, Kan-chou, Su-chou.—(18) Sze-ch'wan (four rivers, i. e. Yang-tze, Min, Ch'ung, and Kia-ling); capital, Ch'eng-tu, in a large and rich plain, well irrigated; principal places: Ta-tsien-lu, Ya-chou, Kia-ting, Su-chou or Sui-fu, Sh'un-k'ing, Wan, Ling-yuen, capital of Kien-ch'ang, the Lolo region, Li-tang, and Ba-tang; population, 79,500,000; estimated in 1904 by A. Hosie at 45,000,000.

The following abbreviations are used in the customs, postal, and telegraphic services: An., Ngan-hwei; Che., Che-kiang; Chi., Chi-li; Fu., Fu-kien; Hei., Hei-lung-kiang (Manchuria); Ho., Ho-nan; Hun., Hu-nan; Hup., Hu-pe; Kan., Kan-su; Ki., Kiang-si; King., Sheng-king; Kir., Kirin (Manchuria); Ku., Kiang-su; Kwei., Kwei-chou; Man., Manchuria; Sha., Shan-si; She., Shen-si; Sht., Shan-tung; Si., Kwang-si; Sin., Sin-kiang; Sze., Sze-ch'wan; Tung., Kwang-tung; Yun., Yun-nan.

ETHNOGRAPHY.—It would be a great mistake to think that the Chinese people are all of one race. The ordinary Chinaman is of middle size, strongly built, with a round, full face, high cheek bones, a short, depressed nose, thick lips, and fine teeth. His eyes are black and often oblique, his complexion varying between pale white and dark brown, his forehead shaven, and his coarse black hair hanging down his back in a plait; his beard is black and scanty, his feet small. The true Chinaman, that is to say, the native of the central provinces, from the banks of the Hwang-ho and lower Yang-tze, differs greatly from his countrymen of the maritime provinces of Kwang-tung and Fu-kien. Not only are there racial differences between the various types of Chinese, but still further differences arise from the various peoples living on the borders as well as in the provinces. On the north the Tatars, Manchus, and Mongols, on the west the Tibetans are important groups. The Chinese call the non-Chinese tribes "barbarians" or Yi, Fan, and Man; the term Yi was used to designate Europeans and was prohibited by Article 51 of the British Treaty of T'ien tsin (1858); Fan-lao or Fan-jen according to S. W. Williams was used at Canton for foreigners; the general names Man and Mantze are employed more particularly in the West and the South and include such non-Chinese tribes as the Yao, Chwang, Tho, Lolo, or Y-kia, Chung-kia, Si-fan, Miao tribes, etc. dispersed throughout Sze-ch'wan and Yun-nan, while the Hakkas reside in Kwang-tung. There are also savage tribes in Formosa, on the western slope of the central range of mountains.

The queue (*pien-tze*) worn by the Chinese and so characteristic of the race, was imported by Manchu conquerors in 1627. To compress the feet of the females is far from being a universal custom, and has no connexion with position or fortune. Manchu ladies (i. e. those of the imperial family) and most of the southern women do not treat their feet in this unnatural way; there are no trustworthy data as to the origin of this torture, which goes back, some say, to 583 A. D. A few years ago some European ladies started an anti foot-binding movement under the name of *Tien Tsu Hwei*, which seems to have met with a fair amount of success. Some Chinese, especially scholars, wear extraordinarily long nails, which are intended to show that their owners are above manual labour. Sometimes they sheathe their nails with brass or silver.

GOVERNMENT.—Since the beginning of the fifteenth century the seat of the government has been Peking (northern court), its name being Shun-tien-fu in the Chi-li province; the southern court (Nan-king) was Kiang-ning in the Kiang-su province, the capital of the empire in the beginning of the Ming dynasty. The emperor is styled Hwang-ti (emperor); or Hwang-shang, Wan-sui Yeh, T'ien-tze (son of Heaven), T'ien-wang (heavenly prince); the empress is styled Hwang-heu or Chung-kung; where there are two empresses they are designated Tung-kung and Si-kung (respectively eastern and western), according to the part of the palace they live in. The heir-apparent is the Hwang-t'ai-tze; the hereditary imperial nobility include: Ts'in-wang, prince of the first order; Kiun-wang, of the second order; Pei-leh (Bei-leh) of the third order; Pei-tze, of the fourth order; Fung-ngen Chen Kwo-kung, duke of the first order; Fung-ngen Fu Kwo-kung, of the second order; Pu-ju, Pa-fen Chen Kwo-kung, of the third order; Pu-ju Pa-fen Fu Kwo-kung, of the fourth order; Chen Kwo Tsiang-kiun, Fu Kwo Tsiang-kiun, Fung Kwo Tsiang-kiun, and Fung-ngen Tsiang-kiun, generalissimos of the first, second, third, and fourth classes respectively.

The Tsung-shi are the imperial clansmen, descendants of Hien Tsu (1583-1615), the founder of the Manchu dynasty, and are distinguished by their yellow girdles; all affairs relating to the imperial family are treated by the Tsung-jen-fu, the Imperial Clan Court. There are eight princely families with perpetual inheritance: Li T'sin-wang, Prince of Li; Jui T'sin-wang, Prince of Jui; Yu Ts'in-wang, Prince of Yu; Su Ts'in-wang Prince of Su; Cheng Ts'in-wang, Prince of Cheng; Chwang Ts'in-wang, Prince of Chwang; Shun-ch'êng Kiun-wang, Prince of Shun-ch'êng; K'e-k'in Kiun-wang, Prince of K'e-kin. I Ts'in-wang, Prince of I, not included in the eight, is also perpetual.

The central government includes: (1) the Kiun-ki Ch'u, Council of State, created by Yung Chêng in April, 1732, including a few ministers and sixty secretaries, Chang-king; (2) the Nei-ko or Grand Secretariat, including four grand secretaries, Ta-hio-she or Chung T'ang, two Manchus, and two Chinese, each designated by one of the pavilions of the Imperial Palace: Wen Hwa-tien, Wu Ying-tien, T'i Jen-ko, Tung-ko; under the Ming dynasty, the Chung T'ang were called Ko-lao; this was the title of the celebrated Paul Siu (Siu Kwang-k'i); two assistant grand secretaries styled Hie-pan Ta-hio-she; (3) the ministerial boards or Liu Pu, which, prior to 1906, numbered six: Li Pu, Board of Civil Appointments; Hu Pu, Board of Revenue; Li Pu, Board of Rites; Ping Pu, Board of War; Hing Pu, Board of Justice; Kung Pu, Board of Public Works. The Yo Pu or Board of State Music is a dependency of the Board of Rites. Some of these boards or ministries have been remodelled, and new ones created since 1906, and they now include, besides the Wai-wu Pu, the following boards: Li Pu, the Board of Civil Office; the Min-cheng Pu, Board of Home Affairs; the Tu-chi Pu, Board of Finance; Hio Pu, Board of Education, or of Public Instruction; Fa Pu, Board of Justice; the Lu-kiun Pu, Ministry of War; Nung-kung-shang Pu, Board of Agriculture, Works, and Commerce; the Yu-chw'an Pu, Board of Posts and Communications, including steam navigation, posts, and telegraphs; Li Pu, Board of Rites; Siun-king Pu, Board of Public Safety. Previous to 1906 each board had two presidents (Shang-shu), Manchu and Chinese, two senior vice-presidents (Tso She Lang), and two junior vice-presidents (Yeo She Lang); there are now one president and two vice-presidents. The Tsung-li Ko Kwo-she-wu Yamen, commonly called Tsung-li Yamen, the Foreign Office, was created by Hien Fung, 20 January, 1861, after the war with France and England; previously foreign affairs had been dealt with by the Li Fan-yuan, board for the administration of vassal countries, controlling Mongolia, Tibet, etc. and formerly Russia; the Li Fan-yuan has now become a ministry of colonies; the Tsung-li Yamen was replaced (24 July, 1901) by the Wai-wu Pu. The Court of Censors or Censorate (Tu Ch'a Yuan) has two presidents (Tu Yu-she), four vice-presidents, twenty-four supervising censors (Liu-k'o), divided into six boards, and thirty-eight censors (Yu-che), distributed over fifteen Tao or circuits. The Han-lin Yuan, college of academicians, has two presidents (Chang-yuan Hio-she). There are also the Kwo Tze Kien or imperial college, and K'in-t'ien Kien, or board of astronomy, etc.

PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION.—There are eighteen provinces (Shi-pa-sheng); these sheng are divided into Tao (circuits), Fu (Prefectures), T'ing (independent sub-prefectures), Chou, and Hien; independent chou are called Chi-li Chou. The Eighteen Provinces, together with Sin-kiang, are under eight governors-general or viceroys (Tsung-tu or Che-t'ai) and twelve governors, three of whom are independent. The eight viceroyalties are the Chi-li, Liang-kiang (including Kiang-su, Ngan-hwei, and Kiang-si), Min-che (Fu-kien, Che-kiang), Liang-hou (Hu-pe, Hu-nan), Liang-kwang (Kwang-tung, Kwang-si), Yun-kwei (Yun-nan, Kwei-chou), Shen-kan (Shen-si, Kan-su), and Sze-ch'wan. Each province is presided over by a governor (Siun-fu, Fu-t'ai) except Chi-li, Fu-kien, Kan-su, Sze-ch'wan, Kwang-tung, Yun-nan, and Kan-su; there is one in Sin-kiang; the Fu-t'ai of Shan-tung, Shan-si, and Ho-nan are not under a governor-general but are directly under Peking. Immediately after the governor are the high provincial treasurer (Pu-cheng She-sze or Fan-t'ai), the high provincial judge (Ngan-ch'a She-sze or Nieh-t'ai), the salt controller (Yen-yun She-sze), and the grain intendant (Liang-tao); these various officials constitute each provincial government under the collective name of Tu-fu Sze-tao. Next in order come the Fen-siun Tao: the intendant of a circuit (Tao-t'ai —98 in all), the prefect of a Fu (Che-fu—181), the T'ung-che (170); the T'ung-p'an (141); the Che-chou (140); the Che Hien, district magistrate (1290); there is a Hio-cheng (Hio-yuan, Hio-t'ai), or provincial director of instruction in each province, who presides at the prefectural examinations.

The Chinese functionaries known to Europeans as Mandarin (from *mandar*, command) are called Kwan by the Chinese; there are nine ranks of kwan, divided into civil and military officials, who are distinguished by the button worn on the official hat, by the square embroidered badge on the breast and back of official robes (a bird for the civil, a quadruped for the military), and by the clasp of the girdle.

INSIGNIA OF OFFICIAL RANK

RANK	BUTTON	EMBROIDERY		CLASPS
		CIVIL	MILITARY	
1	Ruby or transparent red stone	Crane	Unicorn	Jade set in rubies
2	Red coral	Golden Pheasant	Lion	Gold set in rubies
3	Sapphire	Peacock	Leopard	Chased gold
4	Lapis lazuli	Wild Goose	Tiger	Chased gold with silver button
5	Crystal	Silver Pheasant	Black Bear	Plain gold with silver button
6	Opaque white	Egret	Tiger Cat	Mother of pearl
7	Plain gold	Mandarin Duck	Mottled Bear	Silver
8	Chased gold	Quail	Seal	Clear horn
9	Silver	Longtailed jay	Rhinoceros	Buffalo horn

A provincial official down to Tao-t'ai inclusive is styled Ta-jen (great man); from Che Fu to Che Hien, the name is Ta Lao-ye (great old father); for the rest Lao-ye (old father). Various forms of distinction are awarded for public services; the principal is the Ling-che (the feather), of which there are three grades corresponding to degrees of distinction: the three-eyed, the two-eyed, and the one-eyed peacock feather (K'ung Tsio-ling) and the crow feather (Lan-ling, blue feather). The chief distinction for military men is the Hing-kwa or Hwang-ma-kwa (yellow riding jacket). There are nine degrees of nobility, either transmissible to a certain number of ancestors or descendants (she-si), or hereditary forever (she-si-wang): Kung (duke), Hou (marquis), Pe (earl—together designated as Ch'ao P'in), Tze (viscount), Nan (baron), K'ing-ch'e Tu-yu, K'i-tu-yu, Yun-k'i-yu, Ngen-k'i-yu. The translations sometimes given the first five titles are indicated in parentheses. The residence of a mandarin holding a Seal is called a *Yamen;* that of a mandarin without a Seal, a *Kung-su.*

EDUCATION.—Formerly Chinese children, after being taught to read and write, had to learn such elementary books as the "San-tze-king" (Three-

Character Classic), the "Pe-kia-sing" (Hundred Family Names), and the "Ts'ien-tze-wen" (One Thousand-Character Classic); later they studied the "Sze Shu", or "Four Classical Books". Memory was developed at the expense of the critical faculty, science being almost entirely neglected. A good calligraphy and a thorough knowledge of the Confucian classics were the main requisites for passing an examination, in which an essay on texts selected from these classics, and called *wen-chang*, played a considerable part. The wen-chang, suppressed in 1898 during the short period of reform, has been definitely abolished. The civil officers were recruited from those who passed the three examinations: Hiang-she (provincial), held triennially in the autumn; Hwai-she (metropolitan), held at Peking, in the spring; Tien-she, the palace examination. The student (T'ung-sheng) took in succession the three degrees: Siu-ts'ai, Ku-jen, and Tsin-she; at the last examination the first four competitors received the titles of Chwang Yuan, Pang Yen, T'an Hwa, and Ch'wan Lu.

After the war with Russia China felt the necessity of a thorough change; Confucianism was no longer a sufficient weapon against Western enterprise. Elementary, higher primary, middle, higher, and special schools were established on foreign principles. A university and a technical school were opened at Peking, while young students were sent abroad, especially to Japan. It must be admitted that the latter brought back from the Empire of the Rising Sun an entirely new spirit. They have been responsible, to a great extent, for the reorganization of the secret societies, which aim not only at reform, but also at the overthrow of the present dynasty. By an imperial decree which was dated 2 Sept., 1905, and went into effect at the beginning of 1906, the former programme and methods of examination were abolished, and a new system of education inaugurated. This includes the study of the Chinese language, literature, and composition, the various sciences studied in the West, history, geography, foreign languages, especially Japanese, gymnastic exercises and drills, and in the higher grades the study of political economy, and civil and international law. As a natural consequence new degrees corresponding to B.A., M.A., LL.D., etc. were created. It is evident that the Chinese attitude of mind is undergoing a great change through contact with Western ideas and learning; what is less evident is that the deeper layers of the nation have not been reached.

PHILOSOPHY.—Chinese philosophy, at least in what is fundamental, is embodied in the religious books, or rather in the classical works called "King". Confucius was more of a collector than a creator; he was a moral teacher, imbued with traditions which he had studied and mastered, and of which he was the ideal representative, but he was no inventor. The man who stamped Chinese philosophy with his strong personality, or rather his genius, was the philosopher Chu Hi (A. D. 1130–1200), born in Fu-kien during the Sung dynasty. He had a retreat for intervals of meditation at the White Deer Grotto in the hills near P'o-yang Lake. The "Book of Changes" (Y-king) begins with the *T'ai-ki*, the Great Absolute; according to Chu Hi there was in the beginning the primordial principle, the abstract monad called the "absolute nothing", *Wu-ki*. When moving, the Great Absolute produced by the congealing of its breath the *Yang*, the great male principle; when it finally rested it produced the *Yin*, or the great female principle; after this great division what was above was heaven, beneath was earth, and during the subsequent evolutions and movement were created in turn, the sun and the moon, the stars and the planets, water and fire, men and animals, vegetables and minerals, etc. Four laws regulate the present movement of the two principles: (1) *Hi*, the breath of nature, governed not by arbitrary, but by fixed inscrutable, laws; (2) *Li*, the laws of nature; (3) *So*, the numbers or numerical proportions of the universe; (4) *Ying*, the appearance of forms of nature.

This philosophical system is represented by diagrams. Sometimes the three powers of nature (*San-tsai*), i. e. *T'ien* (Heaven), *Ti* △ (Earth), *Jen* (Man), are indicated by a triangle △. The two primitive principles are shown, the first by a straight line ——— which corresponds to *Yang*, the male principle, heaven, light, etc.; the second by a broken line — — which corresponds to *Yin*, the female principle, earth, darkness, etc. Combinations of these lines give the following four figures:—

(1) (2) (3) (4)



(1) *T'ai Yang*, corresponding to sun, heat, eyes, etc.; (2) The *T'ai Yin* corresponding to the moon, cold, ears, etc.; (3) The *Shao Yang* corresponding to the stars, daylight, the nose, etc.; (4) The *Shao Yin* corresponding to the planets, night, the mouth, etc. A new combination of these figures was revealed to Fu-hi (2852–2738 B. C.), by a dragon-horse which rose from the Yellow River and presented to the gaze of the emperor a scroll upon its back inscribed with mystic diagrams which, being arranged, consisted of eight trigrams or symbols called *Pa-kwa*:—

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8)



(1) Corresponds to Heaven and the pure male principle, being entirely composed of whole lines; (2) vapours, watery exhalations, lakes; (3) fire, heat, light; (4) thunder; (5) wind; (6) water; (7) mountains; (8) earth and the pure female principle, being entirely composed of broken lines. An octagonal arrangement devised by the philosophers of the Sung dynasty gives the figures called *Sien-tien*:—

SIEN-TIEN

Shen-nung, the second of the Five Emperors, is held to have multiplied by eight the original *Kwa* of Fu-hi, forming sixty-four hexagrams. This number multiplied by 6 gives 384, the maximum to which the calculations can be carried practically, though it is stated that a series of 16,777,216 different forms can be obtained. The two principles forming the *Tai-ki* were sometimes represented by two opposite semicircles in a circle, the two portions of the circle in dark and clear respectively; later on a dark disk was inserted in the clear portions and a clear disk in the dark portions.

DIAGRAMS REPRESENTING THE TAI-KI

The male and female principles may also be represented by a circle and a square; for instance at Peking the Temple of Heaven is circular while the Temple of Earth is square; the common coin called *cash* being round with a square hole in the centre is a perfect symbol of Heaven and Earth.

CLASSICS.—The doctrine of Confucius and his school is contained in the classical books called "King". Five of the classics of the highest grade

include: (1) The "Y-king" (Book of Changes) with 24,107 characters; (2) the "Shu-king" (Book of History) in fifty-eight chapters with 25,700 characters, extends from Emperors Yao and Shun to Ping Wang of the Chou dynasty (720 B. C.); (3) the "She-king" (Book of Odes) with 39,234 characters, a collection of popular poetry in use in the petty states of China, collected and arranged by Confucius; (4) the "Li-ki" (Book of Rites) in forty-nine chapters (including the "Ta-hio" and the "Chung-yung", 99,010 characters); (5) the "Ch'un-ts'ew" (Spring and Autumn), or the annals of Lu, the native State of Confucius, from 722 to 484 B. C. The "Yo-king" (Book of Music) was lost. Next came the lesser "King": (1) the "Sze-shu" (Four Books), "Ta-hio" (Great Study), "Chung-yung" (Invariable Medium), "Lun-yu" (miscellaneous conversations between Confucius and his disciples), and "Meng-tze", the conversations of the sage Mencius (34,685 characters; with the commentary 209,749); (2) the two rituals, "I-li" and "Chou-li" (45,806 characters); (3) the "Hiao-king" (Book of Filial Piety with 1903 characters); (4) the three ancient commentators of the "Ch'un-ts'ew": "Tso-shi", "Kung-yang", and "Ku-liang"; (5) the "Eul-ya" (Literary Exposition), a dictionary of terms used in the classical writings of the same period. It must be borne in mind that Confucius was an administrator, a statesman, in a word, a practical man, as well as a moralist, but entirely devoid of originality.

The most distinguished followers of Confucius (b. 551; d. 479 B. C.) were Tsang-shen (506 B. C.), and Meng-tze (Mencius, 372–289 B. C.). The rival of Confucius was Lao-tze or Lao-kiun, a far deeper philosopher, author of the "Tao-teh-king" and of the "Kan-ying-pien", with his disciples, Kang-sang-tze (570–43 B. C.), Li-tze (500 B. C.), and Wen-tze (500 B. C.). The heterodox philosophers were Meh-ti (450 B. C.) and Yang-chu (450 B. C.); the Taoists, Chwang-tze (330 B. C.) and Hwai-nan-tze (second century B. C.). Mention should also be made of Wang-ch'ung, author of the "Lun-hêng" (first century A. D.), Han-yu or Han Wen-Kung (A. D. 768–824), and finally, under the Sung, the reformer Wang Ngan-shi (1021–86) and the illustrious Chu-hi (A. D. 1130–1200).

State Religions.—The three state religions of China (*San-kiao* or three doctrines) are Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism.—Confucianism or *Ju-kiao* (a name adopted by the disciples of Chu-hi in A. D. 1150) is the religion of the *literati;* from the moral principles taken from the books arranged by Confucius a state religion has been created; the trinity (*San-ts'ai*), Heaven, Earth, and Man, is represented by the emperor, *T'ien-tze*, Son of Heaven, the high-priest of the cult, who pays his homage to heaven at the winter solstice at midnight and to earth at the summer solstice. The state worship includes three grades of sacrifices, the victims being things, though persons are not excluded: (1) the great sacrifices offered only to *T'ien* (Heaven), *Ti*, (Earth), *Tai Miao* (great temple of ancestors) and *Shieh-tsi* (gods of the land and grain); (2) the medium sacrifices, an homage to the sun, the moon, the names of the emperors and kings of foreign dynasties, Confucius, the ancient patrons of agriculture and silk, the gods of heaven, earth, and the cyclic year; (3) the inferior sacrifices (*Kiun-sze*, crowd of sacrifices), offered to the patron of medicine, the spirits of celebrated men, the clouds, rain, wind, and thunder, the five celebrated mountains, the four seas, four rivers, etc. The supreme ruler of heaven is Shang-ti. There is no priesthood in Confucianism.

Taoism or *Tao-kiao* was invented by the disciples of Lao-tze, but the lofty theories of this philosopher have degenerated into the grossest superstitions, alchemy, astrology, and the worship of a Pantheon of idols, the highest of which is Yu-hwang Shang-ti; the chief of the Taoists resides at Lung-hu-shan (Kiang-si); most of the hierarchy are extremely ignorant.

Buddhism or *Fo-kiao*, the religion of Fo (Buddha) comes from India; it is said to have reached China in 221 or 219 B. C., but this is hardly probable. The first certain fact regarding Chinese Buddhism is that it was orally taught in the year 2 B. C. to an ambassador of the Emperor Ngai by the *Ta Yue-chi* or Indo-Scythians; it was officially recognized by the Emperor Ming-ti (A. D. 61). The search for manuscripts in India led pilgrims like Fa-hian and Sung-yun (*Fo-kwo-ki*), Hwei-shin, the celebrated Hiuan-tsang (seventh century), I-tsing, Wang Hiuan-ts'e, Wu-k'ung, and others to undertake long voyages which have thrown great light on the geography of Northern India and Central Asia. In spite of their exertions and of the numerous manuscripts they brought home,



The Pi-Yung-Kung or Hall of Classics, Peking

it was not until 1410 that the Chinese procured a complete copy of the Buddhist canon; some of the Buddhist sanctuaries are famous places of pilgrimage: the island of P'u-tu (Chu-san), the Wu T'ai-shan (Shan-si); the Omei-shan (Sze-chw'an), the Dokerla (Yun-nan). The Buddhist priests gather in monasteries; the superiors of a district or prefecture are called *Seng-lu-sze;* they are selected from the leading abbots (*fang-chang*); besides the superiors (*Seng-kang, Seng-cheng, Seng-hwei*), there are preceptors, preachers, expositors, and clerks. Buddhism, with its numerous monks, is the most popular religion of China, though a member of one sect very often borrows practices from the other cults and, if an official, will invariably perform the ceremonies of Confucianism. Whatever be the importance of these three religions, they are insignificant as compared with the real, national religion of all the Chinese—ancestor-worship.

Ancestor-worship originated in filial piety which, being of paramount importance in the eyes of the Chinese, is the object of a special book, the "Hiao-king". Filial piety, however, is not a natural spontaneous feeling, but a well-defined duty, embracing the obligations towards the emperor, princes, officials, parents, and these vary according to the classes and the people. In every house there is a tablet, if not a room; a rich family has a separate building; this is the hall of ancestors; the tablets are called *p'ai-wei* and the temples *tze-t'ang*. During the period called *tsing-ming*, in the first part of April, a general worship of

ancestors takes place in the form of libations, and the burning of candles, paper, and incense; this cult was prohibited the Christians by a Bull of 1742.

Another great and popular superstition is *Fung-shui* (wind and water). To describe this is impossible, though it is the daily guide in a Chinaman's life. It is a system of geomancy founded on the "Y-king", systematized in the twelfth century; the date of a marriage, the proper place for a burial ground, a lucky site for a building, etc., the settlement of all these questions depends on the laws of *Fung-shui* laid down by the professors, who, besides a knowledge of Buddhist and Taoist doctrines, had some superficial ideas regarding natural science, medicine, and astronomy.

MISSIONS.—*Ancient Christian.*—The introduction of Christianity into China has been ascribed not only to the Apostle of India, St. Thomas, but also to St. Bartholomew. In the third century, Arnobius, in "Adversus Gentes", speaks of the *Seres*, with the Persians and the Medes, as among the nations reached by "that new power which has arisen from the works wrought by the Lord and his Apostles". Though there is evidence that Christianity existed in Mesopotamia and Persia during the fourth century, as evidenced by the persecutions which began in 345 under Sapor (309-379), there is no proof that it spread to China. After the condemnation of Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, at the Council of Ephesus (431) and his banishment, his disciples spread his errors through Asia. They seem to have reached China in the seventh century, according to the Si-ngan-fu inscription. It should be added that, according to Ebedjesus, some thought that Achæus, Archbishop of Seleucia, had created a metropolitan see in China in 411, while others said that the metropolitans of China dated only from Saliba Zacha, patriarch of the Nestorians from 714 to 728. According to Pauthier, the T'ang Emperor, Hiuan T'sung issued in 745 an edict wherein it was stated that the temples of the religion from Ta Ts'in being known popularly as Persian temples, it was ordered that, this being inaccurate, thenceforward the latter name should be changed to Ta Ts'in temples.

Si-ngan-fu Inscription.—In the year 1625, the Jesuits at Peking were informed that a slab referring to the Christian religion had been found not long before, possibly in 1623, at Ch'ang-ngan (Si-ngan-fu). Father Nicolas Trigault was sent to inspect the stone, which had been discovered at Cheu-che, some distance from Ch'ang-ngan. It was one of the monuments called by Chinese antiquaries *pei*. The French traveller, Grenard, who visited Si-ngan-fu a few years ago gives the following measurements: height 7 ft. 9 ins., width 2 ft. 9 ins., thickness 10 ins. At the top a cross is incised, under which nine large characters in three columns form the heading, which reads as follows: "Monument commemorating the introduction and propagation of the noble law of Ta Ts'in in the Middle Kingdom". According to the text of the inscription, Olopen arrived from Ta Ts'in at Ch'ang-ngan in the ninth year of the period Chang-kwan (635); Emperor T'ai Tsung sent his minister, Duke Fang Huan-ling, to receive him and conduct him to the palace; the Scriptures were translated, and the emperor becoming convinced of the correctness and truth of Olopen's religion, gave special orders for its propagation, and in the seventh month of the twelfth year of Chang-kwan (638), in the autumn, issued a proclamation; a Ta Ts'in monastery was built, etc. The conclusion of the inscription runs as follows: "Erected in the second year of the period Kien-chung (781) of the great T'ang dynasty, the year star being in Tso-yo, on the seventh day of the first month, being Sunday". The inscription consists of 1780 characters; in addition to the Chinese characters, at the foot and on the sides, the stele also exhibits a series of data in the Syriac language, in Estrangelo characters. Sir Henry Yule (Marco Polo, II, 27) thinks that Olopen is only a Chinese form for *rabban*, a monk, while Prof. Hirth makes Olopen stand for Ruben, or Rupen. It appears from a paper by J. Takakusu (Ts'ung-pao, VII, 589-591) that Adam (*King-tsing*), who erected the monument under Te-tsung, under the same emperor, translated, with a Buddhist, a Buddhist Sûtrâ, the "Saṭpâramitâ", from a Hu text.

The question of the authenticity of the inscription has been formerly often raised, but to-day no one can doubt the genuineness of this most important document for the history of the propagation of the Faith in the Far East; we fully agree with A. Wylie, who writes: "If the Nestorian tablet can be proved a forgery, there are few existing memorials of bygone dynasties which can withstand the same style of arguments." This inscription is generally considered as emanating from Nestorians; but this is supported only by circumstantial evidence, for it must be remarked that nothing in it is characteristic of Nestorianism.

Nestorians.—The Nestorians were successful in converting the Keraits to Christianity at the beginning of the eleventh century, as related by the Christian historian, Bar Hebræus. The Keraits remained Christians till the time of Jenghiz Khan, as is attested by Rashiduddin; their head is spoken of by Rubruck and Marco Polo as Ung Khan (Wang Khan), identified with Prester John; when Wang Khan was defeated by Jenghiz, his niece, Sorhabtani, married Tuli, the fourth son of the conqueror, and became the mother of Kublai. When Kublai removed his capital to Peking, he founded in 1289 the chief Christian consistory, under the name of *Ch'ung-fu-tze;* the priests of the Nestorian sect were known as *Erkeun* (Ye-li Ko-wen), but this term was later applied to Christians in general, who were called by the Mohammedans *Tersa* (transcribed *Tie-sie*). The last name, however, disappeared with the removal of the capital to Peking. Mar Sergius, a Nestorian, and other Christians are mentioned in a description of Chin-kiang-fu. The Nestorians had a number of bishoprics throughout Asia and two archbishoprics, one at Cambaluc (Peking), one at Tangut (Tanchet); there is even a record of a Chinese Nestorian, Mar Jabalaha (b. 1245), a pupil of another Nestorian, Rabban Sauma (b. in Peking), being appointed Patriarch of Persia when Denha died, though he was unacquainted with the Syriac tongue. This is a proof of the influence of the Mongols of China. Buddhism, however, prevailed at court, and two of the Nestorian churches were converted into heathen temples. The prosperity of the Nestorians in China continued throughout the Mongol period. We may judge of their numbers and influence by the fact that Friar Odoric, about 1324, found three Nestorian churches in the city of Yang-chou, but soon afterwards they fell into decay. Evidence of their existence was found by the Jesuits at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Medieval Catholic Missions.—The great religious crusade in Asia during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries dates from the Council of Lyons, held in 1245 by Pope Innocent IV. The interests of Christendom were threatened by the Mongolian conquest, and it became necessary to send ambassadors to the Tatar chief to find out his intentions. Two mendicant orders, the Franciscans and Dominicans, who had been instituted at the beginning of the thirteenth century, were ready to furnish the agents for the mission. John of Plano Carpini, a Franciscan, accompanied by Friar Stephen of Bohemia, left Lyons on 16 April, 1245, and was joined at Breslau by Friar Benedict, a Pole. They went by way of Moscow and Kieff, and in February, 1246, reached

the camp of Batu, grandson of Jenghiz, on the Volga; thence they went to Karakorum to the court of Kuyuk Khan. On 13 November they began their return voyage with the Mongol chief's reply to the papal letter and reached Avignon in 1247. As a reward Carpini was appointed Archbishop of Antivari. Four Dominican friars, Anselm of Lombardy, Simon of Saint-Quentin, Alberic, and Alexander, joined at Tiflis by Andrew of Longjumeau and Guichard of Cremona, were sent on a mission to the Mongol general, Baiju, in Persia, but were badly received and dismissed on 25 July, 1247, with a haughty letter for the pope. St. Louis, King of France, sent the Franciscan, Willlam of Rubruck (known as Rubruquis), to the court of Mangu Khan, successor of Kuyuk; he returned to his convent at Acre (1255), where he wrote an account of his voyage. Speaking of Carpini and Rubruck, Yule says (Cathay, I, p. CXXIII): "These were the first so far as I know, to bring to Western Europe the revived knowledge of a great and civilized nation lying in the extreme east upon the shores of the ocean. To this kingdom they give the name, now first heard in Europe, of Cathay." Though the first missionaries were sent to the court of Kublai by Nicholas III (1277-80), the real founder of the mission of Cambaluc was John of Montecorvino, a Franciscan friar (b. at Salerno, 1247), sent by Nicholas IV. Giovanni probably reached the Mongol capital before the death of the Great Khan. In 1307 Clement V sent seven friars having the rank of bishop, who were to consecrate Montecorvino as Archbishop of Cambaluc and Primate of the Far East; only Andrew of Perugia, Gerard, and Peregrinus reached China in 1308 and consecrated Montecorvino; a bishopric was erected at Zaitun in Fu-kien, which was occupied in turn by Gerard (d. 1313), Peregrinus (d. 1322), and Andrew of Perugia; Montecorvino died in 1333 and was succeeded by Nicholas, a Paris theologian, who arrived in China with twenty-six friars and six lay brothers. A mission was also created at Ili-baluc in Central Asia with Richard of Burgundy as its bishop, but it was destroyed. In 1362 the fifth Bishop of Zaitun, James of Florence, was massacred. In 1370 William of Prato, professor of the University of Paris, was appointed to the See of Peking. An Apostolic legate, Francisco di Podio, with twelve companions, was sent out in 1371, but they were never heard from; all the Christian missions disappeared in the turmoil which followed the fall of the Mongols and the accession of the Ming dynasty (1368).

TEMPLE OF HEAVEN, PEKIN

Modern Missions.—If the Dominican friar, Gaspar da Cruz, was actually the first modern missionary to China where, however, he stayed but a short time, the Jesuits under Matteo Ricci were the first to give a solid basis to the missions in the Celestial Empire. They spread through the Kwang-tung province to the central provinces, Nan-king, Shanghai, Hang-chou, endeavouring to reach Peking. In 1602 the Jesuit, Benedict de Goës, started from Agra in an attempt to reach Peking by land. He arrived at the frontier town of Su-chou, where he died, 18 March, 1606, from the fatigue of his long journey. The Jesuits soon found eager competitors in the Dominicans and the Franciscans, who arrived in 1633, but were expelled from China four years later.

In August, 1635, Lei, Prefect of Kiang-chou, in Shan-si, issued a proclamation which was in reality an apology for the Christian religion, praising Kao (Father Alfonso Vagnoni, b. in the Diocese of Turin, 1566; d. at Kiang-chou, 19 April, 1640). In July, 1641, Tsuo, Sub-prefect of Kien-ning-hien in Fu-kien mentions Aleni as a master eminent among the learned men of the West, and speaks in high terms of the Christian religion. The conquest of China by the Manchus (1644) was the cause of great suffering to the Church. The celebrated Jesuit, Johann Adam Schall von Bell, head of the Board of Mathematics, was thrown into prison, but he soon regained favour under the first Manchu emperor, Shun-che. In 1664, during the minority of K'ang-hi, Yang Kwei-sien, a Mohammedan astronomer, in charge of the Board of Mathematics, accused Schall, then old and paralyzed, of hostility to Chinese traditions, and obtained against him a sentence of death (15 April, 1665), which was not carried out; when K'ang-hi took the power in hand, the errors of Yang were discovered, thanks to the Belgian Father, Ferdinand Verbiest, who was appointed in Yang's place head of the Board of Mathematics. It was Verbiest and not Schall who cast the astronomical instruments of the Peking observatory, some of which date from the Mongol period. The arrival of the priests of the Missions Étrangères of Paris and of the French Jesuits sent by Louis XIV to Peking gave a new impetus to the Christian missions.

In March, 1692, Ku Pa-tai, President of the Board of Rites and some of his colleagues addressed to the emperor a note to the effect that as Europeans were not guilty of any breach of the laws, it seemed unfair to prohibit their religion; that it would be proper therefore to let churches subsist and to allow persons bearing perfumes and other offerings freedom to enter them. An imperial decree approved of this note, and copies were sent to all the provincial governors. The Jesuits, as astronomers or interpreters, were in high favour at Court and the question of rites which was disadvantageous to other missionaries, did not impair their credit during the reign of K'ang-hi. Matters were different under Yung Cheng, son and successor of K'ang-hi, who in 1724 issued an edict exiling to Canton all missionaries with the exception of those occupying various offices at Court; in 1736, an edict of K'ien Lung, son and successor of Yung Cheng, prohibited the preaching of Christian doctrine under penalty of death. On 25 June, 1746, a cruel persecution broke out in Fu-kien during which the vicar Apostolic, Bishop Sanz, and four other Spanish Dominicans, Serrano, Alcobar, Royo, and Diaz were martyred. The Jesuits Attimis and Henriquez were put to death at Su-chou on 12 Sept., 1748. A great change was made in the Christian Church at Peking, the Jesuits being replaced by the Lazarists.

During the Kia K'ing period (1796–1820), persecution was very severe. A decree was issued 4 Sept., 1811, prescribing a search for foreign preachers. There were but seven Europeans residing at Court, Ferreira (Fu Wen-kao); Riberio (Li Hung-chen); Serra (Kao Sheu-kien), all Portuguese Lazarists in charge of the observatory; Nan Mi-te, interpreter of the Privy Council; Cajetan Pires (Pei Ho-yuan), a mathematician, and two other missionaries too old to be sent home. Monsignor Dufresse, Bishop of Tabraca and Vicar Apostolic of Sze-ch'wan, was beheaded 14 Sept., 1825; Father Clet, a French Lazarist, was strangled at Wu-ch'ang (Hu-pe), 18 Feb., 1820. On 11 Sept., 1840, Father Jean-Gabriel Perboyre, a Lazarist, was martyred at

Wu-ch'ang. Brighter days were looked for after the signing of a treaty at Wham-poa (1844) by the French ambassador, Théodose de Lagrené, expectations which were fulfilled after the Peking Convention of 1860.

In an edict of 20 Feb., 1846, Tao-kwang ordered that the establishments belonging formerly to Christians be restored to their owners and that henceforward officers searching for and arresting harmless Christians should be tried. The edict was not sent to all the governors, and the same year the missionaries, Huc and Gabet, were arrested at Lhassa and the Franciscan Father Navarro in Hu-pe, and all taken under escort to Canton and Macao; it was not till the war of 1860 that the churches of Peking were surrendered to Bishop Mouly. The murder of Auguste Chapdelaine (Missions Etrangères de Paris) at Si-lin-hien, in Kwang-si on 29 Feb., 1856, was the pretext chosen by France to join England in a military action against China. Special privileges were awarded to missions by Art. XIII of the French Treaty of T'ien-tsin (1858) and Art. VI of the French Peking Convention (1860). The old churches of the capital were restored to the Lazarists, and passports for inland transit or sojourn issued to twenty-eight missionaries. Korea, already ill-famed on account of the massacre of Monsignor Imbert and Fathers Chastan and Maubant on 21 Sept., 1839, was the scene of a terrible persecution in 1866; Bishop Berneux, with Fathers de Bretenières, Beaulieu, and Dorie (8 March), Pourthié and Petitnicolas (11 March), the coadjutor Bishop Daveluy, and Fathers Aumaître and Huin (30 March) were all decapitated. Of the flourishing establishment of the Missions Etrangères de Paris, there were left only Fathers Ridel, later on vicar Apostolic, Féron, and Calais. This led to an intervention of France in Korea which did not, however, achieve any great degree of success. Things were going from bad to worse in China. In Kwang-tung Fathers Verchère (1867), Dejean (1868), Delavay (1868), were persecuted; in Sze-ch'wan, Fathers Mabileau (29 Aug., 1865) and Rigaud (2 Jan., 1869) were murdered at Yeu-yang-chou, near Kwei-chou, and Fathers Gilles and Lebrun were ill-treated (1869–70); anti-foreign placards were posted up in Hu-nan (1869); the French Minister, Count de Rochechouart, was nearly murdered at T'ai-yuan, in the Shan-si province (1869). Finally came the massacre of T'ien-tsin, 21 June, 1870. Fontanier, the French Consul, Simon, his chancellor, Thomassin, the interpreter and his wife, the Lazarist Father Chevrier and the Cantonese priest Hu, Challemaison, a merchant, and his wife, ten Sisters of St. Vincent of Paul, Bassoff and Protopopoff, Russian merchants, and the wife of the latter—in all twenty-one persons, were put to death with great barbarity.

The Franco-Prussian War prevented France from taking any energetic action in China, but a special mission, headed by the High Commissioner, Ch'ung Hou, was sent to Paris to apologize. The lack of retaliation on the part of France encouraged Prince Kung to send to the foreign ministers at Peking (1871) a memorandum relating to missions and regulations to be applied to Christian missionaries. This circular note met with a protest not only from the French Minister, Rochechouart (14 Nov., 1871), but also from Mr. Wade, British Minister. The murder of the German missionaries, Nies and Henle (1 Nov., 1897), in the Shan-tung province led to the occupation of Kiao-chou by the Germans. On 14 Oct., 1898, Chanès was murdered at Pak-tung (Kwang-tung); Victorin Delbrouck, a Belgian, was killed in Hu-pe (11 Dec., 1898); satisfaction was given by the Chinese for these crimes, which had been perpetrated in the face of two imperial decrees of the same year, dated 12 July and 6 October. The Boxer rebellion brought sad days for the missions. The list of martyrs is lengthy. The following bishops were put to death: Fantosati of Northern Hu-nan, Grassi and Fogolla of Shan-si, Italian Franciscans; Guillon, Missions Etrangères of Manchuria, Hamer (Dutch) of Kan-su (burnt to death), and the Franciscans, Ceseda and Joseph (Hu-nan); Facchini, Saccani, Balat, and Egide (Shan-si); Ebert (Hu-pe); the Jesuits, Andlauer, Isoré, Denn, and Mangin (Chi-li); the Lazarists d'Addosio, Garrigues, Doré, Chavanne (Peking); Emonet, Viaud, Agnius, Bayart, Bourgeois, Leray, le Guével, Georjon, Souvignet, of Manchuria, all of the Missions Etrangères of Paris; Segers, Heirman, Mallet, Jaspers, Zylmans, Abbeloos, Dobbe, of Mongolia, all of the Congregation of Scheut.

Mention should be made of the fact that in 1895, the French Minister Gérard made an agreement with the *Tsung-li Yamen* that all passages in the official codes disadvantageous to the Christian religion should be erased. The Berthemy Convention, finally settled by M. Gérard (spoken of below), and the reorganization of the protectorates and the hierarchy, treated of hereafter, are the chief events of the last few years.

THE QUESTION OF RITES.—Father Ricci, the first superior of the Jesuits in China, had remarkable success in his work of evangelizing because of the great tolerance he showed the cult rendered by the Chinese to Heaven, to Confucius, and to ancestors. Indeed, mandarins being obliged to honour officially Heaven and Confucius on certain days, it would have been difficult to convert any of them if they had not been allowed to carry out the functions of their office. Ancestor worship is, practically, the principal religion of China. Ricci's successor, Longobardi, was of a different mind and finally in 1628, when Emmanuel Diaz (Junior) was vice-provincial, a meeting was called to study the question, but no decision was reached. Affairs reached a crisis when the Dominican, Moralez, and the Franciscan, Santa Maria, arrived in China (1633). Excess of zeal, ignorance of local customs, or some other reason was the cause of the expulsion of Dominicans and Franciscans (1637). In addition to different views about the religion of the Chinese there was another cause of discord between the Jesuits and the Dominicans. The former were protected by Portugal and their protectors were at Macao. The latter were Spaniards, and they looked for support to Manila. In 1639, Moralez addressed to Diaz Senior, then Visitor of the Jesuit mission, a memorandum in twelve articles regarding Chinese practices. Diaz having delayed his answer, Moralez went to Rome and on 12 Sept., 1645, obtained from Innocent X a decree condemning the Jesuits. The Jesuits thereupon dispatched to Rome Martin Martini, who after a stormy voyage, was carried to the Norwegian coast and was obliged to cross Holland and Germany to Italy. He succeeded in having a contradictory decree issued by Alexander VII (23 March, 1656). Then followed a new memorandum of Moralez to the Sacred Congregation (1661), and a new decree of Clement IX against the Jesuits (20 Nov., 1669). Moralez died (1664) but his successor as Prefect of the Dominicans in China, Domingo Fernandez Navarrette, published his "Tratados historicos"; the Dominicans, however, found an adversary among themselves. The Chinese Dominican, Gregorio Lopez, Bishop of Basilea and Vicar Apostolic of Nan-king, sent the Sacred Congregation a memoir in favour of the Jesuits.

New elements were brought into the discussion when French Jesuits and priests of the Missions Etrangères arrived in China. The publication in Paris, in 1682, of a work entitled "La Morale pratique des Jésuites", a bitter criticism of the Jesuits, acted as a firebrand. Père Le Tellier answered with "Défense des Nouveaux Chrétiens" (1687), which was later censured at Rome (23 May, 1694). On 26 March, 1693, Charles Maigrot, of the Missions Etran-

gères, Vicar Apostolic of Fu-kien, and later titular Bishop of Conon, issued a mandate condemning the Chinese Rites. Following the example of the Dominicans, the Missions Etrangères sent to Rome Louis de Quemener, who presented the pope with Maigrot's mandate (1696). Nicolas Charmot, Maigrot's envoy, obtained a Brief from Innocent XII (15 Jan., 1697) and a decree from the Holy Office (3 July, 1697). The works of the Jesuit Father Le Comte, "Mémoires sur la Chine" and "Lettre à Mgr le Duc du Maine sur les cérémonies de la Chine", added fuel to the flame and were censured by the Faculty of Theology of Paris (18 Oct., 1700), together with the "Hist. de l'édit de l'Empereur de la Chine" by Père Le Gobien, S. J. Finally, the Holy Office published a decree prohibiting the Chinese ceremonies (20 Nov., 1704). This was approved by Clement XI who appointed as *legatus a latere* Charles Thomas de Tournon, Patriarch of Antioch, to carry the decree to China. Tournon arrived at Canton 8 April and was received at Peking by the Emperor K'ang-hi, who was favourable to the Jesuits (31 Dec., 1705). After various controversies in which Maigrot and the Jesuit Visdelou sided with the legate, K'ang-hi, who found the Jesuits better informed about China than their adversaries, ordered Tournon to leave Peking (28 Aug., 1705) and banished Maigrot (17 Dec., 1705). Tournon issued a mandate at Nan-king (25 Jan., 1707). When he arrived at Macao he was thrown into a prison where he died (8 June, 1710) immediately after being named a cardinal. On 19 March, 1715, Clement XI issued the Bull "Ex illâ die". A new legate, Mezzabarba, Patriarch of Alexandria, was sent to China. He arrived at Macao (26 Sept., 1720), went to Peking and was received by the emperor, who refused to accede to his demands. Finally, the whole knotty question was settled (11 July, 1742) by a Bull of Benedict XIV "Ex quo singulari" condemning the Chinese ceremonies and choosing the expression *T'ien-chu* which was to be used exclusively to designate God. Missionaries to China had to take an oath not to discuss at any time the terms of the Bull. The bitterness of this celebrated quarrel was greatly increased by various causes: the rivalry of Portugal and France for the protectorate of the missions, the disputes between Jansenists and Jesuits, and the Bull "Unigenitus"; while the final decision was delayed as much by the question of episcopal sees in China as by the rites themselves. Rome having spoken, no more can be said here on the question, but it may be noted that the Bull "Ex quo singulari" was a terrible blow to the missions in China; there are fewer Christians than formerly and none among the higher classes, as were the princes and mandarins of the court of K'ang-hi.

Creation of Vicariates Apostolic.—In 1577 Gregory XIII created for China, Japan, and the Far Eastern Islands, the Diocese of Macao, which was divided in 1587 into two dioceses, Macao and Funay (Japan). On 9 Sept., 1659, Alexander VII erected from the territory included within the Diocese of Macao, two vicariates Apostolic, one including besides Tong-king, the Chinese provinces of Yun-nan, Kwei-chou, Hu-kwang (now Hu-pe and Hu-nan), Sze-ch'wan, Kwang-si, and Laos, the other including, in addition to Cochin-China, the Chinese provinces of Che-kiang, Fu-kien, Kwang-tung, Kiang-si, and the Island of Hai-nan. In 1690, Alexander VIII, to satisfy the Portuguese, created the Diocese of Peking, including Chi-li, Shan-tung, Shan-si, Shen-si, Ho-nan, Liao-tung, Korea, and Tatary, and the Diocese of Nan-king, both dioceses being under the Archbishop of Goa. By a Bull of 15 Oct., 1696, Innocent XII erected the vicariates Apostolic of Shen-si and Shan-si by taking part of the territory included in the Diocese of Peking (Chi-li, Shan-tung, Liao-tung, Korea, and Tatary), and limited the Diocese of Nan-king to Kiang-nan and Ho-nan. The following vicariates were created out of the Diocese of Nan-king (1696): Hu-kwang, Fu-kien, Che-kiang, Kiang-si, Yun-nan, Sze-ch'wan, Kwei-chou; in 1737 these last two provinces were joined into one vicariate, to which Yun-nan was added in 1781. In 1840 Yun-nan was again detached, and in 1846 Kwei-chou became independent. In 1858 Sze-ch'wan was subdivided into Eastern and Western Sze-ch'wan. In 1860 Eastern Sze-ch'wan, with part of Western Sze-ch'wan, was divided into the Vicariates Apostolic of Southern Sze-ch'wan and Eastern Sze-ch'wan. In 1790 Fu-kien, Che-kiang, and Kiang-si were combined into one vicariate, but in 1838 divided into the vicariates of Fu-kien and Che-kiang Kiang-si. In 1883 Amoy was separated from Fu-kien; in 1846 Kiang-si was separated from Che-kiang; in 1879 the vicariates of Northern and Southern Kiang-si were erected; in 1885 the Vicariate of Eastern Kiang-si was created. In 1762 Hu-kwang was amalgamated with Shan-si and Shen-si but separated in 1838. Out of Hu-kwang were formed in 1856 the vicariates of Hu-nan and Hu-pe; in 1879 Hu-nan was divided into the vicariates of Northern and Southern Hu-nan; in 1876 Hu-pe was divided into Eastern, Western, and Northern Hu-pe. In 1843 Shen-si and Shan-si were separated; in 1885 Shen-si was divided into two vicariates, and in 1890 Shan-si was divided in a similar manner.

A Pagoda at Peking

From the Diocese of Peking, Korea was detached in 1831, Liao-tung, Manchuria, etc., in 1838, and Shan-tung in 1839; in 1856 the Diocese of Peking was divided into three vicariates: Northern, South-Western, and South-Eastern Chi-li; from the last named, Eastern Chi-li was separated in 1899. In 1883 Shan-tung was divided into Northern and Southern Shan-tung; Eastern Shan-tung was detached in 1894. In 1840 the vicariates of Mongolia and Kan-su were separated from Manchuria and later subdivided; in 1843 Hong-Kong was taken from Macao; at first a prefecture, it was erected into a vicariate in 1874; the two provinces of Kwang-tung and Kwang-si were detached from Macao in 1856 and formed into a prefecture, but were erected into separate prefectures in 1878. In 1856 Ho-nan was detached from the Diocese of Nan-king, and erected into a vicariate which was later subdivided.

Religious Orders.—*The Society of Jesus.*—The Jesuits are the true founders of the missions in China. St. Francis Xavier, after evangelizing India and Japan, died in December, 1552, on the Island of Shang-ch'wan (Saint John's), before he could reach Macao or Canton. His successors, Alessandro Valignani (d. 20 Jan., 1606), Michele Ruggieri (d. 11 May, 1607), and Francisco Pasio (d. 30 Aug., 1612) did not penetrate beyond these two places and Chao-k'ing in the same province. Matteo Ricci had the honour

of being the pioneer missionary at Peking; he was born at Macerata, Italy, 6 Oct., 1552, and arrived at Macao in 1583, meeting there Ruggieri. From Chao-k'ing Father Ricci went to Nan-ch'ang in the Kiang-si province (1588), thence to Nan-king (1595); he visited Peking twice (1595 and 1598), where he finally settled, leaving Nan-king for the last time 18 May, 1600. He left behind him Lazzaro Cattaneo and João da Rocha, who in 1603 baptized, under the name of Paul, the celebrated Siu Kwang-k'i. The latter on going to Peking showed himself a stanch supporter of Ricci, who died 11 May, 1610. Ricci was the first superior of the Peking mission. His two successors, Nicolò Longobardi (1610) and João da Rocha (1622) held the same office; Emmanuel Diaz (Junior) was the first vice-provincial. Ricci under the Chinese name of Li Ma-teu, wrote many works still appreciated by the Chinese, among them "T'ien-chu Shi-yi" (the true doctrine of God), published in 1601, translated into Manchu, Korean, Japanese, and French; "Ki-ho Yuan-pun", the first six books of Euclid, etc. The following are the names of some of the best known members of this mission: Emmanuel Diaz Junior (Yang Ma-no), b. in Portugal, 1574; arrived in China, 1610; d. at Hang-chou, 4 March, 1659; author of "T'ang-king Kiao-pei-sung-cheng-ts'iuen", a translation of the celebrated inscription of Si-ngan-fu. Nicolas Trigault (Kiu Ni-ko), b. at Douai, 3 March, 1577; arrived in China, 1610; d. at Hang-chou, 14 Nov., 1628; author of the life of Ricci (De Christianâ Expeditione apud Sinas, 1615), a dictionary (Si-ju-eul-mu-tze), and a translation of Æsop's Fables (Hwang-yi). Giulio Aleni (Ngai Ju-lio), b. at Brescia, 1582; arrived in China, 1613; d. at Fu-chou, 3 Aug., 1649; author of no less than twenty-five works in Chinese, including a life of Christ. Johann Adam Schall von Bell (T'ang Jo-wang), b. at Cologne, 1591; arrived in China, 1622; d. at Peking, 15 Aug., 1666; a celebrated mathematician. Luigi Buglio (Li Lei-sse), b. at Mineo (Sicily) 26 Jan., 1606; arrived in China, 1637; d. at Peking, 7 Oct., 1682; author of twenty-one works in Chinese, of which a "Missale romanum" (Mi-sa King-tien, 1670), a "Breviarium romanum" (Ji-k'o Kai-yao, 1674), a "Manuale ad Sacramenta ministranda" (Sheng-sse-li-tien, 1675), still remain. Gabriel de Magalhaens (Ngan Wen-sse), b. at Pedrogão, 1611; arrived in China, 1640; d. at Peking, 6 May, 1677; author of a good description of China which was translated into English (1688). Martino Martini (Wei Kwang-kwo), b. at Trent, 1614; arrived in China, 1643; d. at Hang-chou, 6 June, 1661; who published in 1655 the first good atlas of China. Ignacio da Costa (Kouo Na-tsio), b. at Fayal, Azores, 1599; arrived in China, 1634; d. at Canton, May, 1666; the translator, with Intorcetta, of the "Lun-yu" and "Ta-hio" of Confucius (1662). Prospero Intorcetta (In To-che), b. at Piazza, Sicily, 28 August, 1628; arrived in China, 1659; d. at Hang-chou, 3 Oct., 1696. Philippe Couplet (Pe Ing-li), b. at Mechlin, 31 May, 1622; arrived in China in 1659; died at sea, 16 May, 1693; he made known to Europeans the works of Confucius (1672). Albert Dorville and Johann Grüber, who visited Tibet. Ferdinand Verbiest (Nan Hwai-jen), b. at Pitthem, 9 Oct., 1623; arrived in China, 1659; d. at Peking, 29 Jan., 1688; a great astronomer, who cast some of the instruments of the Peking observatory and guns for the war against the Eleuths. François Noël (Wei Fang-tsi), b. at Hesdrud (Hainault), 18 Aug., 1651; arrived in China in 1687; d. at Lille, 17 Sept., 1729; astronomer and translator of the Confucian classics. Ignaz Kögler (Tai Tsin-hien), b. at Landsberg, 11 May, 1680; arrived in China, 30 Aug., 1716; d. at Peking, 29 March, 1746. Augustin von Hallerstein, b. at Laibach, 2 Aug., 1703; arrived in China in 1738; d. 29 Oct., 1774. The two last named were mathematicians.

Most of the Jesuits of this mission were Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, German, Swiss, or Belgian; but few were French. In 1685, however, Louis XIV, King of France, sent six French Jesuits to the Far East; Guy Tachard remained in Siam, but Jean de Fontaney, Joachim Bouvet, Louis Le Comte, Jean-François Gerbillon, and Claude de Visdelou, who reached China, 23 July, 1687, laid the foundation of the celebrated French Peking mission, which lasted till the suppression of the Society. Their mission under the protectorate of the French king was distinct from the mission of the other Jesuits, who were known in a general manner as "Portuguese", to distinguish them from their French brethren. The superiors of the French mission were: Jean de Fontaney (1687), Gerbillon (1699), Dentrecolles (1706), Julien-Placide Hervieu (1719), Joseph Labbe (1736), Hervieu, a second time (1740), Valentin Châlier (1745), Jean Sylvain de Neuvialle (1747), Louis-Marie Du Gad (1752), Neuvialle, a second time (1757), Joseph-Louis Le Febvre (1762), Jean-Baptiste de la Roche (1769), and François Bourgeois.

The following are the names of the most remarkable among these French Jesuits: Jean-François Gerbillon (Chang Ch'eng), b. at Verdun, 21 Jan., 1654; arrived in China, 1687; d. at Peking, 22 March, 1707. Having been superior of the house at Peking he was appointed, 3 Nov., 1700, superior of all the French Jesuits in China. He was the interpreter for the treaty signed with Russia at Nerchinsk in 1689, and the author of a Manchu grammar. Claude de Visdelou (Liu-in), b. 12 Aug., 1656, in Brittany; d. at Pondicherry, 11 Nov., 1737. He arrived in China in 1687. He left the Society, was appointed Vicar Apostolic of Kwei-chou and Bishop of Claudiopolis (12 Feb., 1708). His very valuable "Histoire de la Tartarie" was published as an appendix to B. d'Herbelot's "Bibliothèque orientale" (1780). Joachim Bouvet (Pe-tsin), b. at Mans, 18 July, 1656; arrived in China in 1687; d. at Peking, 28 June, 1730; a man of great activity. François-Xavier Dentrecolles (In Hong-siu), b. at Lyons, 5 Feb., 1663; arrived in China in 1698; d. 2 July, 1741; author of various papers of scientific value. Joseph-Marie de Prémare (Ma Jo-shi), b. at Hâvre-de-Grâce, 17 July, 1666; arrived in China in 1698; d. at Macao, 17 Sept., 1736; author of the well-known "Notitia Linguæ Sinicæ", published at Malacca in 1831 at the expense of Lord Kingsborough. Dominique Parrenin (Pa To-ming), b. at Russey, 14 Sept., 1665; arrived in China in 1698; d. at Peking, 29 Sept., 1741; a learned and influential man, author of the Chinese lives of St. Aloysius Gonzaga (Tsi-mei-pien) and St. Stanislaus Kostka (Te-hing-p'u). Antoine Gaubil (Sung Kiun-yung), b. at Gaillac, 14 July, 1689; arrived in China in 1722; d. at Peking, 24 July, 1759; remarkable as astronomer, historian, and geographer. Pierre d'Incarville (T'ang), b. 21 Aug., 1706; arrived in China in 1740; d. at Peking, 12 May, 1757; well known as a botanist. Joseph-Marie-Anne de Moyria de Mailla (Fung Pin-cheng), b. at Moirans (Isère), 16 Dec., 1669; arrived in China in 1703; d. at Peking, 28 June, 1748; translator into French of the huge Chinese historical work "T'ung-kien-kang-mu" (ed. Grosier, 13 vols. 4to, Paris, 1777–1785). Jean-Joseph-Marie Amiot (Tsien Teh-ming), b. at Toulon, 1718; arrived in China in 1750; d. at Peking, 9 Oct., 1793; the most active contributor to the "Mémoires concernant les Chinois" and a regular correspondent of the French Minister Bertin.

Numerous and important works were compiled or written by these hard-working missionaries. Among these are: (1) Maps of China. This labour was undertaken by order of the Emperor K'ang-hi and executed between 1708 and 1718, under the direction of Father

Jartoux, by Bouvet, Cardoso, Bonjour (Augustinian), Mailla, Hinderer, de Tartre, and especially Fridelli and Régis. They were the basis of d'Anville's celebrated maps issued between 1729 and 1734. (2) "Description géographique de la Chine" by J. B. Du Halde (Paris, 1735), compiled from materials sent by twenty-seven missionaries in China. (3) "Lettres édifiantes et curieuses", a collection of letters from missionaries in all parts of the world, begun in 1702 by Charles Le Gobien, and after his death by Du Halde, Patouillet, and Maréchal (34 vols., 1703–76). This work was reprinted in 1780–83 by Yves-Mathurin-Marie de Querbeuf. There have been numerous editions and translations since. (4) "Mémoires concernant l'histoire, les sciences . . . des Chinois" (Paris, 1776–1814), containing a mass of information sent mainly by Amiot and Cibot, and edited by Brotier, Bréquigny, and others; the last volume, containing the end of the history of the T'ang dynasty, was edited by Silvestre de Sacy. (5) Sixteen plates drawn by order of Emperor K'ien-lung to commemorate his conquests in Central Asia. The artists at Peking were Jean-Denis Attiret (d. 8 Dec., 1768), Jean Damascène, Giuseppe Castiglioni, Ignaz Sichelbarth, all Jesuits except Damascène, an Augustinian. The plates were engraved at Paris under the direction of C. N. Cochin. Besides Attiret there was another Jesuit painter at the imperial court, Giuseppe Panzi (b. at Cremona, 2 May, 1734).

The Jesuits had four churches at Peking: The Northern or French church (*Pe-t'ang*), the Southern or Portuguese church (*Nan-t'ang*), the Western church (*Si-t'ang*), and the Eastern church (*Tung-t'ang*), the old house of Adam Schall. The two beautiful cemeteries of the Jesuits outside the walls of Peking, one Portuguese (Sha-la-eul or Têng-kong-cha-lan), the other French (Ch'eng-fu-sse), were destroyed by the Boxers in 1900. The Jesuits had residences in the provinces of Chi-li, Shan-si, Shen-si, Shan-tung, Ho-nan, Sze-ch'wan, Hu-kwang, Kiang-si, Kiang-nan, Che-kiang, Fu-kien, Kwang-tung, and Kwang-si. The Jesuits, on their suppression in 1773, were replaced at Peking by the Lazarists. The Jesuit Archbishop of Nan-king, Xavier von Laimbeckhoven, an Austrian, died 22 May, 1787, near Su-chou. There were but few fathers at Peking when the news of the suppression of the Society reached the Chinese capital in Sept., 1774. Hallerstein and Benoît died of grief; the last member, Louis de Poirot, died before October, 1815.

In 1841, Luigi de Besi, Vicar Apostolic of Shan-tung and Ho-nan, was also placed temporarily in charge of the Diocese of Nan-king. The work was too heavy for one man, and Monsignor de Besi wrote to the General of the Jesuits (18 Sept., 1841), asking him that some missionaries be sent to help him as soon as possible. The Christians of Kiang-nan had already applied to the general, the Very Rev. Father Roothaan (25 April, 1832), to the Queen of Portugal (1838), and to Pope Gregory XVI (1840). At last two Jesuits, Claude Gotteland (b. in Savoy, 12 June, 1803; d. at Shanghai, 17 July, 1856) and Eugène-Martin-François Estève (b. at Paris, 26 March, 1807; d. at Zi-ka-wei, 1 July, 1848), arrived at Shanghai, 12 June, 1842. Soon afterwards they were joined by Benjamin Brueyre (b. 20 May, 1810; d. at Hien-hien, 24 Feb., 1880), who had remained in the Chusan Islands, then held by the British. Monsignor de Besi had as successors Monsignor Maresca (d. 1855), and Monsignor Spelta, transferred in 1856 to Hu-pe. The diocese was left in charge of the French Jesuit, André Borgniet (b. 14 Feb., 1811; d. 31 July, 1862, at Hien-hien), who was finally consecrated titular Bishop of Berisa and appointed vicar Apostolic, 2 October, 1859. The mission of Kiang-nan suffered much during the T'ai-p'ing rebellion when Fathers Luigi Massa and Victor Wuillaume were massacred.

An important magnetic and meteorological observatory has been erected in the neighbourhood of Shanghai, at the village of Zi-ka-wei, so called in the local dialect on account of the proximity of the tomb of the celebrated convert Paul Siu, under the direction of Fathers Augustin Colombel (1873–74), Henri Le Lec (1875–76), Marc Dechevrens (1877–87), Bernard Ooms (1888, 1891), Stanislas Chevalier (1889–97), Louis Froc (1888). Here are published valuable bulletins and memoirs which render the greatest service to navigators by forecasts of the weather, special study being made of typhoons. A yearly calendar full of useful data is also issued. An astronomical observatory was established at Zo-se (Che-shan) in 1899 by Father de Beaurepaire. Since 1901 annals have been published; in 1897–98 the director, Stanislas Chevalier, surveyed the Upper Yang-tze from I-ch'ang to P'ing-shan-hien and published a fine folio atlas of the great river, consisting of sixty-four sheets (1899) Under the direction of Pierre Heude (b. at Fougères, Brittany, 25 June, 1836; d. at Zi-ka-wei, 3 Jan., 1902), a museum of natural history was started, in connexion with which were issued "Mémoires concernant l'histoire naturelle de l'empire chinois" which are of great interest. Mention should also be made of the valuable series of monographs (twenty-five up to 1908) printed under the general heading "Variétés sinologiques"; in this work Henri Havret took the leading part after 1892. These monographs treat of various provinces, of examinations, of the Grand Canal, of landed property, of the Jews, etc. It may be added that Fathers Couvreur, Debesse, and Petillon published good guides or dictionaries of the Chinese language, and Angelo Zottoli compiled the "Cursus Litteraturæ sinicæ". The Jesuits of this mission belong to the province of France. Since 1903, a quarterly under the title of "Relations de Chine" has been issued at the head-quarters in Paris.

THE SECCHI METEOROGRAPH IN THE OBSERVATORY AT ZI-KA-WEI

In 1856 part of the Chi-li province was also entrusted to the care of the Jesuits, and Adrien Languillat (b. 28 Sept., 1808; d. at Zi-ka-wei, 29 Nov., 1878) was consecrated 22 March, 1857, Bishop of Sergiopolis, and was the first Vicar Apostolic of South-Eastern Chi-li. This mission suffered greatly during the Boxer rebellion. Some of its members have distinguished themselves by their publications: e. g. Séraphin Couvreur (b. 14 Jan., 1835), who compiled large dictionaries and made translations of the Chinese classics; Leo Wieger (b. 9 July, 1856), author of "Rudiments de la langue chinoise". The Jesuits of this mission belong to the province of Champagne, the head-quarters being at Amiens. Since November, 1898, they have edited a periodical entitled "Chine, Ceylan, Madagascar."

Dominicans.—The first missionary to arrive in China in modern times was the Portuguese Dominican, Gaspar da Cruz (1555), whose successors were expelled by the mandarins, the latters' fears having

been aroused. Gaspar da Cruz wrote a book entitled "Tractado . . . da China" (1569). The Dominican mission was created in 1631 and 1633 in the Fu-kien province by Angelo Coqui and Thomas Serra. The well-known Dominican, Juan Bautista de Moralez (b. at Ecija, Spain, 1597; d. in Fu-kien, 17 Sept., 1664), who took an energetic part in the question of the Rites, arrived in 1637. In 1747 the Dominican Bishop Sanz, of Maurocastrum, was martyred with Fathers Alcobar, Royo, Diaz, and Bishop Francisco Serrano. Francisco Varo (Wan Tsi-kwo), who arrived in China in 1654, published the "Arte de la lengua mandarina" (Canton, 1703), which was the basis of Fourmont's "Grammatica Duplex". Beginning in 1866, the Dominicans printed for many years at Manila "El Correo Sino-Annamita", which embodied the letters from their missionaries in China, Formosa, and Tong-king. The Dominicans have but two vicariates in China: Fu-kien and Amoy (the latter embracing Formosa), the Philippine Islands being the centre of their activity.

Franciscans.—In 1579, Pedro d'Alfaro, Guardian of the province of St. Joseph, in the Philippine Islands, with Giovanni Battista of Pesaro, Sebastian de Baera (or of Saint Francis), and Agustín de Tordesillas, made a stay of seven months in China, but the first Franciscan with a special mission to China was Antonio de Santa Maria (Li, b. at Baltanas, Palencia, Spain; died at Canton, 13 May, 1669), who was sent to China in May, 1633, and took an active part in the discussion over the Rites. Among the most remarkable of these friars, should be mentioned Basilio Brollo, better known as Basile de Glemona (Ye T'sung-hien, b. at Gemona, Italy, 25 March, 1648; d. in the Shen-si province, 13 August, 1703), who went to China in 1680, became Vicar Apostolic of Shen-si in 1700; compiler of the Chinese-Latin dictionary "Han-se-tze-yi", copied by De Guignes in his great work published in Paris in 1813, by order of Napoleon I. Also Carlo Orazio Castorano (eighteenth century), author of many works. Most of the Franciscans of China are Italian, though Eastern Shantung was made a separate vicariate Apostolic in 1894, for French Friars Minor.

Augustinians.—In 1577 two Spanish Augustinians, Pedro Martin de Herrada and Geronimo Marin, came to Fu-kien, where they remained but four months and sixteen days. The first general work on China was written by the Augustinian Juan Gonzalez de Mendoça (Rome, 1585) and translated into most languages. It was not till 1680 that Alvaro de Benevente arrived in China; he was consecrated titular Bishop of Ascalon and placed at the head of the newly created Vicariate of Kiang-si (1699), with his residence at Kan-chou. He died suddenly at Macao in 1705 and was not replaced, the Vicars Apostolic of Fu-kien taking charge also of Kiang-si and Che-kiang. The Augustinians had been absent from China for some time, when, in 1879, they sent from Manila Elias Suarez and Agustín Villanueva to take charge of part of Hu-nan, which on 19 Sept. was erected into a vicariate under Saturnin de la Torre.

Société des Missions Etrangères.—The creation in 1622 of the *Sacra Congregatio de Propagandâ Fide* made it possible to centralize the work of missions in order that their wants might be studied and their field of action broadened. No apostle was more eager than Alexandre de Rhodes, S. J. (b. at Avignon, 15 March, 1591; d. at Ispahan, 5 Nov., 1660) in appealing to Rome to make known the want of priests for the numerous missions. He had thoroughly studied the question and travelled extensively in China, Cochin-China, Tong-king, and Persia. Pope Innocent X wished to consecrate Père de Rhodes bishop, but through modesty the missionary declined this honour. His reward was to consist in the success of the cause he so warmly advocated. On 7 August, 1651, Propaganda begged the pope to appoint a patriarch, two or three archbishops, and twelve bishops to the various churches of Eastern Asia. By a Brief of 17 August, 1658, Alexander VII nominated François Pallu, Canon of St. Martin of Tours, and titular Bishop of Heliopolis, and Pierre de la Motte Lambert, titular Bishop of Berytus, to take charge of the missions of China and the neighbouring countries, with the power of choosing a third vicar Apostolic. Their choice fell on Cotolendi, vicar of Sainte-Madeleine at Aix-en-Provence. The vicars Apostolic asked Propaganda for authority to found a seminary for the conversion of infidels and the training of missionaries. Jean Duval, in religion Dom Bernard of St. Teresa, a Barefooted Carmelite, Vicar Apostolic of Persia and titular Bishop of Babylon, donated a suitable site in Paris (16 March, 1663), and the directors took possession 27 Oct., 1664. This was the beginning of the Société des Missions Etrangères. The first superiors were Vincent de Meurs of Tréguier (1664–68) and Michel Gazil of Tours (1668–70). The first directors were Michel Gazil (d. 14 Jan., 1697), and Armand Poitevin (d. 1682). Pierre de la Motte Lambert and Jacques de Bourges were the first missionaries who left Paris. The first departure from the Paris seminary took place 8 Nov., 1665. The missionaries embarked at La Rochelle, 14 March, 1666. The Missions Etrangères had priests at Nan-king (Cotolendi died on the journey; Laneau, who resided at Siam); in the province of Fu-kien (Pallu, 1679-84; Charles Maigrot, 1697-1707); in the province of Sze-ch'wan (Artus de Lyonne, 1697-1713); in the province of Yun-nan (Philibert le Blanc, 1697; Enjobert de Martillat, 1727-52). Notwithstanding the hostility of Portugal, the Missions Etrangères continued to flourish, and to-day they are spread over a great portion of the Chinese Empire, besides having missions in Japan, Tong-king, Cochin-China, Cambodia, Siam, Malacca, Burma, and India. There is a procurator at Hong-Kong and one at Shanghai, and a sanatorium (Béthanie) at Hong-Kong. In the island of Hong-Kong the society conducts a printing office at Pokfulum, called "Imprimerie de Nazareth", where books are issued not only in French and Latin, but also in Chinese, Annamite, Japanese, Korean, Cambodian, Bahnar, Malay, and Tibetan. The priests of the Missions Etrangères have made a special study of languages and have published the following dictionaries: Pigneaux and Taberd, "Dict. Anamito-Latinum" (Serampore, 1833); Taberd, "Dict. Latino-Anamiticum" (Serampore, 1838); "Vocabulaire Cochinchinois" (1838); Theurel, "Dict. Anamitico-Latinum" (Ninh-phu, 1877); Ravier, "Dict. Latino-Anamiticum" (Ninh-phu, 1880); Pallegoix, "Dict. linguæ Thai" (Paris, 1854); "Dict. coréen-français" (Yokohama, 1880); "Dict. chinois-français" (dialect of Western China, Hong-Kong, 1893); Dourisboure, "Dict. bahnar-français" (Hong-Kong, 1889); Desgodins, "Dict. thibétain-latin-français" (Hong-Kong, 1899).

Lazarists (*Cong. Missionis*).—The first Lazarists were sent to China by Propaganda: Luigi Antonio Appiani (Pie), Johann Mullener (Mo) in 1699, T. Pedrini (Te) in 1710. Appiani (b. at Dogliani, 22 March, 1663; d. 29 Aug., 1732), was vice-visitor in China. Mullener (b. at Bremen, 4 Oct., 1673; d. 17 Dec., 1742), titular Bishop of Myriopolis, was the second Vicar Apostolic of Sze-ch'wan. Pedrini (born at Fermo, Italy; d. at Peking, 10 Dec., 1746) took a very active part in the discussion over the Rites. However it was not until they replaced the Jesuits at Peking, that the Lazarists got a firm footing in China. When the Society of Jesus was suppressed by Clement XIV, the offer of the succession was declined by the Missions Etrangères of Paris, and was finally accepted, though not without reluctance, by the Lazarists, and con-

firmed by a Roman decree of 7 Dec., 1783, approved of by King Louis XVI of France at Versailles, 25 Jan., 1784. The superior general, Antoine Jacquier, chose for the new missions Nicolas-Joseph Raux (b. at Ohain, Hainault, 14 April, 1754; d. 16 Nov., 1801), Jean-Joseph Ghislain (b. at Salles, Diocese of Cambrai, 5 May, 1751; d. 12 Aug., 1812), and Brother Charles Portis. They arrived at Canton, 29 August, 1784. Peking, however, had to be abandoned during the greater part of the nineteenth century, and was finally recovered after the war of 1860, by Bishop Joseph-Martial Mouly (b. at Figeac, 2 Aug., 1807; d. 4 Dec., 1868), Vicar Apostolic of Northern Chi-li. Monsignor Alphonse-Pierre Favier, a Lazarist, titular Bishop of Pentacomia (b. 22 Sept., 1837), Vicar Apostolic of Peking during the Boxer rebellion, was one of the successors of Bishop Mouly. Among the remarkable Lazarists of China mention may be made of Joachim-Affonso Gonçalves (b. in Portugal, 23 March, 1781; d. 3 Oct., 1844), a great sinologist, author of "Arte China" and several grammars and dictionaries, and the celebrated naturalist Armand David (b. at Espalette, 7 Sept., 1826; d. in Paris, 10 Nov., 1900). The well-known traveller in Tibet, Evariste-Régis Huc (b. at Caylus, 1 June, 1813; d. March, 1860), was also a Lazarist. In the vicariates administered by the Lazarists are a number of Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, who are devoted nurses in the hospitals. The Lazarists also have charge of the Work of the Holy Childhood, for the redemption of forsaken native children, with headquarters at Ting-hai (Chusan Island). The Lazarists have a procurator at Shanghai. Since 1832 they have published the "Annales de la Congrégation de la Mission". The head-quarters of the mission are at Paris.

The Belgian Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary (*Imm. Cord. B. M. V. de Scheutveld*).—This congregation was established at Brussels by a retired military chaplain, Théophile Verbist (b. at Antwerp, 1823; d. in Mongolia, 24 Feb., 1868). His first companion was Van Segvelt, and he was soon joined by François Vranckx and Verlinden, and later by Jacques Bax and Ferdinand Hamer, who were afterwards vicars Apostolic. The Belgian missions extend over Mongolia, Kan-su, and Central Asia. In February, 1889, this congregation established the periodical "Missions en Chine et au Congo", published at Brussels in both French and Flemish. The headquarters of the missions are at Scheutveld near Brussels.

Foreign Missions of Milan (*Sem. Mediol. Miss. Ext.*). —A new seminary was established at Milan, 31 July, 1850, by Monsignor A. Ramazzotti, later Bishop of Pavia, and Patriarch of Venice, with the help of Fathers Reina, Mazzucconi, Salerio, Ripamonti, and Giuseppe Marinoni (b. at Milan, 11 Oct., 1810; d. 27 Jan., 1891). The last named was the real founder of the order and its first director. The head-quarters are at Milan.

Priests of Steyl (*Sem. Steylen. pro Miss. Ext. Soc. Verbi Divini*).—This congregation was founded in 1875 by Arnold Janssen, a priest of the Diocese of Münster (Westphalia), chaplain of the Ursuline sisters at Kempen (Rhenish Prussia), and editor of the "Kleiner Herz Jesu Bote", at Steyl (Holland), near Tegelen and Venloo. The new German congregation obtained from the Franciscans the cession of part of Shan-tung of which Johann Baptist Anzer was appointed pro-vicar, 2 Jan., 1882, and vicar Apostolic, 22 Dec., 1885. When Bishop Anzer of Telepta died (24 Nov., 1903), he was replaced by Bishop Henninghaus. This mission is under German protectorate, with head-quarters at Steyl.

The Seminary of Sts. Peter and Paul (*Sem. SS. Apost. Petri et Pauli de Urbe*), founded in Rome by Pius IX in 1874, has a small mission in Southern Shen-si.

PROTECTORATE.—The partition of the newly-found lands by the Holy See, at the end of the fifteenth century, assigned Asia to Portugal, which had the control of missionaries in China, by a Bull of Nicholas V (8 Jan., 1454). The first blow struck at this protectorate was the creation of the *Sacra Congregatio de Propagandâ Fide*, by Gregory XV, 22 June, 1622, and the appointment of two French vicars Apostolic in 1658. The next was the sending of five Jesuits to China, in 1685, by Louis XIV, who pledged himself to protect his subjects. The rivalry of Portugal and France in this mission field was no slight factor in the failure of the special mission of Cardinal de Tournon. Lazarists took the place of Jesuits at Peking, with the agreement of France. When the Portuguese bishop, Gaetao Pires, died at Peking, 2 Nov., 1838, his country did not name a successor, and the place was taken by the French Lazarists



CATHEDRAL OF SAINT-SAUVEUR, PEKING

and their bishop, Mouly. The French ambassador, Th. de Lagrené, signed a treaty at Whampoa, 24 Oct., 1844, in which it is stipulated (art. XXIII) that the French shall have the right to establish churches, hospitals, schools, and cemeteries. Again in art. XIII of the French Treaty of T'ien-tsin, it was stipulated that protection should be granted to missionaries travelling with regular passports in the interior of China, and that all edicts against the Christian religion should be abrogated. By art. VI of the French Peking Convention of 1860, it was agreed that all the buildings confiscated by the Chinese should be restored to the Christians through the French Legation at Peking. The four churches of the capital (or their sites) were then surrendered to the French ambassador, Baron Gros, who issued passports to twenty-eight missionaries of various congregations and nationalities. Portugal did not protest or interfere, leaving France undisturbed in the exercise of her protectorate over all the missions in China.

On 20 February, 1865, M. Berthemy, the French Minister at Peking, had a correspondence with the Tsung-li Yamen, with regard to the purchase of lands and houses by French missionaries. The question was definitely settled by M. Gérard, 14 April, 1895, and the agreement is known as the "Berthemy Convention". In 1885 an attempt was made to send a papal nuncio or legate to Peking, but when France observed that it would interfere with her protectorate, Rome did not insist. In 1890–91, after lengthy negotiations with the Holy See and the German Bishop Anzer of Shan-tung, the German Government succeeded in having German missions placed under its protectorate. Of course France could not object to the protection given by a sovereign to his own subjects. Arrangements have also been made with Italy for the protection of Italian subjects, but the

matter is not so simple in this case on account of the relations between the Italian Government and the Holy See. These claims have no practical effect on the protectorate of France, which, with the Missions Etrangères of Paris, the Lazarists, and the French Jesuits, has the lion's share in this immense field of evangelization.

HIERARCHY.—An important imperial decree of 15 March, 1899, established on an official basis the relations between the Catholic clergy and the local authorities of China; the bishops were placed on an equal footing with the viceroys and the governors, the vicars-general ranked with the treasurers, provincial judges, and *Tao-t'ai*, priests with prefects. This decree was signed at the suggestion of Bishop Favier of Peking, but its wisdom has been much disputed.

PRESENT STATE OF THE CATHOLIC MISSIONS.—On 27 April, 1879, the pope gave his approval to a resolution of Propaganda dividing the Chinese Empire into five ecclesiastical regions.

First Region, including the following vicariates Apostolic: In the Chi-li province: (1) South-Eastern Chi-li, erected 1856; under the care of the Jesuits, residence, Chang-kia-chwang, in the prefecture of Hokien; Vicar Apostolic Henri Maquet, appointed titular Bishop of Amathus in 1901; 49 priests, 20 native priests, 62,454 Christians, 8036 catechumens, 332 churches and chapels. (2) Northern Chi-li, erected 1856; under the Lazarists; residence, Peking; vicar Apostolic, Stanislas Jarlin, appointed titular Bishop of Pharbætus in 1900; 43 priests, 54 native priests, 105,170 Christians, 20,000 catechumens, 456 churches and chapels. (3) South-Western Chi-li, erected 1856; under the Lazarists; residence, Cheng-ting; vicar Apostolic, Monsignor Brugnière, titular Bishop of Cina (d. 1907); 19 priests, 22 native priests, 44,500 Christians, 6530 catechumens, 344 churches or chapels. (4) Eastern Chi-li, erected 23 Dec., 1899; under the Lazarists; residence, Yung-p'ing; vicar Apostolic, Ernest Francis Geurts, appointed titular Bishop of Rhinocolura in 1900; 9 priests, 1 native priest, 5823 Christians, 1000 catechumens, 25 churches and chapels. In the Ho-nan Province: (5) Northern Ho-nan, erected 1869; under the priests of the Seminary of Foreign Missions of Milan; residence, Wei-hwei; vicar Apostolic, Giovanni Menicatti, appointed titular Bishop of Tanis in 1903; 12 priests, 2 native priests, 5432 Christians, 3827 catechumens, 70 churches and chapels. In Manchuria: (6) Southern Manchuria, erected 1898; under the priests of the Seminary of Foreign Missions of Paris; residence, Mukden; vicar Apostolic, Félix-Marie Choulet, appointed titular Bishop of Zela in 1901; 32 priests, 8 native priests, 20,628 Christians, 6950 catechumens, 90 churches and chapels. (7) Northern Manchuria, erected 10 May, 1898, under priests of the Seminary of Foreign Missions of Paris; residence, Kirin; vicar Apostolic, Pierre-Marie Lalouyer, appointed titular Bishop of Raphaneæ in 1898; 25 priests, 8 native priests, 15,823 Christians, 8725 catechumens, 93 churches and chapels. In Mongolia: (8) Eastern Mongolia, erected 21 Dec., 1883; priests of Scheutveld, Brussels; residence, Sung-tsoei-tze; vicar Apostolic, Conrad Abels, appointed titular Bishop of Lagania in 1897; 39 priests, 9 native priests, 17,466 Christians, 7100 catechumens, 47 churches and chapels. (9) Central Mongolia, erected 21 Dec., 1883; priests of Scheutveld; residence, Si-wan-tze; vicar Apostolic, Jerome Van Aertselaer, appointed titular Bishop of Zarai in 1898; 47 priests, 23 native priests, 23,776 Christians, 6244 catechumens, 125 churches and chapels. (10) South-Western Mongolia, erected 21 Dec., 1883; priests of Scheutveld; residence, San-tao-ho-tze; vicar Apostolic, Alphonse Bermyn, appointed titular Bishop of Stratonicea, in 1901; 47 priests, 1 native priest, 11,430 Christians, 4094 catechumens, 37 churches and chapels.

Second Region, including the following vicariates Apostolic: (1) Northern Kan-su, erected 21 May, 1878; priests of Scheutveld; residence, Liang-chou; vicar Apostolic, Ubert Otto, appointed titular Bishop of Assur in 1891; 20 priests, 1 native priest, 2702 Christians, 233 catechumens, 23 churches and chapels. (2) Southern Kan-su (Pref. Ap.), erected 28 April, 1905; priests of Scheutveld; residence, Ts'in-chou; prefect Apostolic, Evrard Terlaak; 12 priests, 3 native priests, 1106 Christians, 626 catechumens, 13 churches and chapels. (3) I-li or Kuldja (Mission), erected 1 Oct., 1888; priests of Scheutveld; residence, I-li; superior of the mission, Jean-Baptiste Steeneman; 6 priests, 300 Christians, 2 churches and chapels. (4) Northern Shen-si, erected 1844; Franciscans; residence, Kao-lin-hien, near Si-ngan-fu; vicar Apostolic, Athanasius Goette, appointed titular Bishop of Lampa in 1905; 14 priests, 26 native priests, 24,100 Christians, 5000 catechumens, 203 churches and chapels. (5) Southern Shen-si, erected 6 July, 1887; priests from the Seminary of Sts. Peter and Paul, Rome; residence, Ku-lu-pa; vicar Apostolic, Pio Giuseppe Passerini, appointed titular Bishop of Achantus in 1895; 16 priests, 2 native priests, 11,489 Christians, 6305 catechumens, 56 churches and chapels. (6) Northern Shan-si, erected 3 Feb., 1844; Franciscans; residence, T'ai-yuan; vicar Apostolic, Agapito Augusto Fiorentini, appointed titular Bishop of Rusaddir in 1902; 15 priests, 16 native priests, 18,200 Christians, 7302 catechumens, 174 churches and chapels. (7) Southern Shan-si, erected 17 June, 1890; Franciscans; residence, Lu-ngan, vicar Apostolic, Albert Oderic Timmer, appointed titular Bishop of Drusipara in 1901; 26 priests, 6 native priests, 14,316 Christians, 7926 catechumens, 133 churches and chapels. (8) Northern Shan-tung, erected 1839; Franciscans; residence, Tsi-nan; vicar Apostolic, Ephrem Giesen, appointed Bishop of Paltus in 1902; 26 priests, 19 native priests, 23,568 Christians, 15,735 catechumens, 187 churches and chapels. (9) Eastern Shan-tung, created 16 Feb., 1894; Franciscans; residence, Che-fu; vicar Apostolic, Cäsar Schang, appointed titular Bishop of Vaga in 1894; 26 priests, 5 native priests, 9900 Christians, 1500 catechumens, 153 churches and chapels. (10) Southern Shan-tung, erected 22 Dec., 1885; priests of Steyl; residence, Yen-chou; vicar Apostolic, August Henninghaus, appointed titular Bishop of Hypæpa in 1904; 46 priests, 12 native priests, 35,301 Christians, 36,367 catechumens, 131 churches and chapels.

Third Region, including the following vicariates Apostolic: (1) Che-kiang, erected 1696; re-established 1845; Lazarists; residence, Ning-po; vicar Apostolic, Paul-Marie Reynaud, appointed titular Bishop of Fussola in 1884; 30 priests, 16 native priests, 25,126 Christians, 8633 catechumens, 153 churches and chapels. (2) Southern Ho-nan, erected 28 Aug., 1882; priests from the Seminary of Milan; residence, Nan-yang; vicar Apostolic, Angelo Cattaneo, appointed titular Bishop of Hippus in 1905; 13 priests, 13 native priests, 12,000 Christians, 6000 catechumens, 83 churches and chapels. (3) Western Ho-nan (Pref. Ap.), erected 22 Jan., 1906; Congregation of St. Francis Xavier of Parma; residence, Siang-ch'eng; prefect Apostolic, Lodovico Calza; 8 priests, 1055 Christians, 2000 catechumens, 8 churches and chapels. (4) Southern Hu-nan, erected 1856; Franciscans; residence, Sean-sa-van, near Heng-chou; vicar Apostolic, Pellegrino Luigi Mondaini, appointed titular Bishop of Synaus in 1902; 15 priests, 6 native priests, 6499 Christians, 1000 catechumens, 22 churches and chapels. (5) Northern Hu-nan, erected 19 Sept., 1879; Augustinians; residence, She-men, near Li-chu; vicar Apostolic, Lodovico Perez y Perez, appointed titular Bishop of Corycus in 1896; 24 priests, 2 native priests, 2677 Christians, 3317 catechumens, 32 churches and chapels. (6) North-Western Hu-pe,

erected 1870; Franciscans; residence, Lao-ho-k'ou; vicar Apostolic Fabiano Landi, appointed titular Bishop of Tænarum in 1904; 16 priests, 14 native priests, 17,211 Christians, 9400 catechumens, 75 churches and chapels. (7) South-Western Hu-pe, erected 1870; Franciscans; residence, I-ch'ang; vicar Apostolic, Modestus Everaerts, appointed titular Bishop of Tadama in 1904; 20 priests, 8 native priests, 10,546 Christians, 6384 catechumens, 75 churches and chapels. (8) Eastern Hu-pe, erected 1870; Franciscans; residence, Wu-ch'ang; vicar Apostolic, Epifanio Carlassare, appointed titular Bishop of Madaura in 1884; 23 priests, 18 native priests, 24,792 Christians, 20,000 catechumens, 105 churches and chapels. (9) Kiang-nan or Nan-king, erected 1660; re-established 1856; Jesuits; residence, Shanghai; vicar Apostolic, Prosper Paris, appointed titular Bishop of Silandus in 1900; 131 priests, 60 native priests, 164,088 Christians, 95,013 catechumens, 984 churches and chapels. (10) Northern Kiang-si, erected 1845; Lazarists; residence, Kiu-kiang; vicar Apostolic, Paul-Louis Ferrant, appointed titular Bishop of Barbalissus in 1898; 18 priests, 4 native priests, 11,397 Christians, 8861 catechumens, 110 churches and chapels. (11) Southern Kiang-si, erected 1879; Lazarists; residence, Ki-ngan; vicar Apostolic, Auguste Coqset, appointed Bishop of Cardica in 1887; 15 priests, 6 native priests, 8637 Christians, 2932 catechumens, 43 churches and chapels. (12) Eastern Kiang-si, erected 14 Aug., 1885; Lazarists; residence, Fu-chou; vicar Apostolic, Casimir Vic, appointed titular Bishop of Metellopolis in 1885; 21 priests, 10 native priests, 16,295 Christians, 3500 catechumens, 56 churches and chapels.

Fourth Region, including the following vicariates Apostolic: (1) Kwei-chou, erected 1708; re-established 1847; priests of the Seminary for Foreign Missions of Paris; residence, Kwei-yang; vicar Apostolic, François-Mathurin Guichard, appointed titular Bishop of Torone in 1884; 49 priests, 17 native priests, 24,018 Christians, 22,825 catechumens, 106 churches and chapels. (2) North-Western Sze-ch'wan, erected 1680; priests of the Paris seminary; residence, Ch'eng-tu; vicar Apostolic, Marie-Julien Dunand, appointed titular Bishop of Caloe in 1893; 39 priests, 45 native priests, 40,000 Christians, 8,672 catechumens, 105 churches and chapels. (3) Eastern Sze-ch'wan, erected 1860; priests of the Paris seminary; residence, Ch'ung-k'ing; vicar Apostolic, Célestin-Félix Chouvellon, appointed titular Bishop of Dansara in 1891; 48 priests, 41 native priests, 34,800 Christians, 17,000 catechumens, 103 churches and chapels. (4) Southern Sze-ch'wan, erected 1860; priests of the Paris seminary; residence, Sui-fu; vicar Apostolic, Marc Chatagnon, appointed titular Bishop of Chersonesus in 1887; 46 priests, 14 native priests, 26,000 Christians, 6000 catechumens, 40 churches and chapels. (5) Yun-nan, erected 1702; re-established 1843; priests of the Paris seminary; residence, Yun-nan; 29 priests, 13 native priests, 10,390 Christians, 13,097 catechumens, 71 churches and chapels. (6) Tibet, erected 1846; priests of the Paris seminary; residence, Ta-tsien-lu (Sze-ch'wan); vicar Apostolic, Pierre-Philippe Giraudeau, appointed titular Bishop of Thynias in 1901; 15 priests, 1 native priest, 2050 Christians, 1000 catechumens, 14 churches and chapels.

Fifth Region, including the following vicariates Apostolic: (1) Fu-kien, erected 1696; Dominicans; residence, Fu-chou; vicar Apostolic, Salvator Masot, appointed titular Bishop of Avara in 1884; 37 priests, 16 native priests, 44,799 Christians, 25,806 catechumens, 116 churches and chapels. (2) Amoy, erected 3 Dec., 1883; Dominicans; residence, Amoy; vicar Apostolic, Isidoro Clemente Gutierrez, appointed titular Bishop of Augila in 1900; 18 priests, 1 native priest, 4242 Christians, 4773 catechumens, 57 churches and chapels. (3) Hong-Kong, erected 1874; priests from the Seminary of Milan; vicar Apostolic, Domenico Pozzoni, appointed titular Bishop of Tavia in 1905; 12 priests, 10 native priests, 14,195 Christians, 1000 catechumens, 73 churches and chapels. (4) Kwang-tung (Pref. Ap.), erected 1850; priests from the Seminary of Paris; residence, Canton; prefect Apostolic, Jean-Marie Mérel, appointed titular Bishop of Orcistus in 1901; 67 priests, 15 native priests, 56,355 Christians, 480 churches and chapels. (5) Kwang-si (Pref. Ap.), erected 6 Aug., 1875; priests of the Seminary of Paris; residence, Nan-ning; prefect Apostolic, Joseph-Marie Lavest, appointed titular Bishop of Sophene in 1900; 28 priests, 4 native priests, 3610 Christians, 4312 catechumens, 47 churches and chapels.

CHURCH AT CHANG-KIA-CHWANG

In the head-quarters (*procures*) of the various missions twenty-three priests officiate in eight chapels and churches. There are six foreign and five native Trappists. Macao is the seat of a diocese. There are 38 vicariates Apostolic; 4 prefectures Apostolic, 1 mission (I-li), 1 diocese (Macao), with 1280 foreign and 577 native priests for 1,014,266 Christians. Mention should also be made of the Marist Brothers (*Maristæ*) and many sisters, both foreign and native: Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, of St. Joseph, of Providence of Portieux, of the Third Order of St. Francis, of Canossa, of St. Paul of Chartres; Servants of the Holy Ghost, Daughters of Purgatory, etc.; in the Vicariate of Kiang-nan there are 32 Carmelite Sisters (one house); 91 (33 native) Helpers of the Souls in Purgatory (3 houses); 31 Sisters of Charity; 9 Little Sisters of the Poor, and 173 Chinese girls. There is at Hong-Kong a Procurator General of Propaganda for Chinese and Indo-Chinese missions.

MANICHÆANS.—The Manichæans were called by the Chinese *Mo-ni*, a transcription of *Mâni;* they are mentioned as early as 631, and were intimately connected with the Uigurs, who suffered a crushing defeat, 13 Feb., 843. No doubt as a result of this defeat, in the edict of 845, prohibiting all foreign religions, the Mo-ni are not mentioned. Probably it is the language of the Mo-ni, not that of the Nestorians or of the Mohammedans that is mentioned in the Kara-Balgasun inscription of the first half of the ninth century. However, a passage of the Chinese work, "Fo-tsu-t'ung-ki", mentions the Mo-ni as "still existing in the Three Mountains", on the right bank of the Yang-tze above Nan-king.

PROTESTANT MISSIONS.—The first Protestant (*Ye-*

su-kiao)worker among the Chinese was Joshua Marshman, though he did not go to China, his labours being carried on in Bengal, at Serampore, where he died 7 Dec., 1837. The actual founder of the Protestant Missions to the Chinese was Robert Morrison (Ma Li-sun), born of Scottish parents at Buller's Green, in Northumberland, 5 Jan., 1782; he entered the London Missionary Society in 1805, commenced the study of Chinese in London with a Chinaman, Yong Sam-tak, and on 31 Jan., 1807 he embarked for China via America. On 4 Sept., he reached Macao, whence he proceeded to Canton, where he died, 1 Aug., 1834. He published many works in Chinese and English, the best known of which are "A Dictionary of the Chinese Language", published at Macao at the press of the East India Co. (1815-23). Morrison was followed by William Milne (b. 1785; d. 2 June, 1822), principal of the Anglo-Chinese College of Malacca and Walter Henry Medhurst (b. 29 April, 1796; d. 24 Jan., 1857). In 1827 Karl Friedrich Gützlaff (b. at Pyritz, Prussia, 8 July, 1803; d. at Hong-Kong, 9 Aug.. 1851) was sent to China by the Nederlandsch Zendelinggenootschap. On 19 Feb., 1830, Elijah Coleman Bridgman (b. 22 April, 1801, at Belchertown, Mass.; d. 2 Nov., 1861) arrived, the first agent of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Then came (1834) William Dean, for the American Baptist Missionary Union; Henry Lockwood (1835) for the Board of Foreign Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States; G. Tradescant Lay (1836), for the British and Foreign Bible Society; Edward B. Squire (1836) for the Church Missionary Society. In 1847 the German missions of Basle and the Rhine sent representatives. The China Inland Mission which is still in full vigour was started in 1862 by James Meadows. During the last few years American and Scandinavian missions have greatly increased.

Among the more noteworthy of Protestant missionaries not already named, the following may be mentioned; Americans: David Abeel (b. New Brunswick, N. J., 12 June, 1804; d. 4 Sept., 1846); S. W. Bonney (b. 8 March, 1815, at New Canaan, Conn.; d. 27 July, 1864); William Jones Boone (d. 17 July, 1864), the first missionary bishop; Justus Doolittle (b. 23 June, 1824; d. 15 June, 1880); W. A. P. Martin, late President of the Peking University; Peter Parker (b. 1804; d. 10 Jan., 1888), at one time American Minister to China; Samuel Wells Williams (b. at Utica, N. Y., 22 Sept., 1812; d. 16 Feb., 1884, at New Haven), the greatest of American sinologists, at one time U. S. Chargé d'Affaires at Peking and towards the end of his life, Professor of Chinese at Yale University. British: Carstairs Douglas (b. 27 Dec., 1820; d. at Amoy, 20 July, 1877); Joseph Edkins (d. 23 April, 1905), the author of innumerable books and papers on China; Griffith John (b. 1831); James Legge (b. at Huntly, Aberdeenshire, 20 Dec., 1815; d. 29 Nov., 1897), the great scholar, and translator of the Chinese classics; Arthur Evans Moule (arrived in China in 1861); J. Hudson Taylor (b. 21 May, 1832; d. 3 June, 1905), who gave a great impulse to the China Inland Mission; Alexander Wylie (b. 6 April, 1815; d. 6 Feb., 1887), bibliographer and historian; the German, Ernst Faber (b. 25 April, 1839; d. 26 Sept., 1899); the Swede, Th. Hamberg (d. 13 May, 1854).

Medical missions, including the establishment of general and ophthalmic hospitals have no doubt greatly helped to develop Protestant missions. These were at first established at the treaty ports only, but now they have spread into the interior of the country, mainly through the medium of the China Inland Mission.

The Protestant missions suffered greatly during the Boxer rebellion (1899-1900), losing 188 members (100 Englishmen, 56 Swedes, 32 Americans): in Shan-si and beyond (159), Chi-li (17), Che-kiang (11), and Shan-tung (1). These provinces belonged mainly to the China Inland Mission, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, the American Board, etc. At various times no less than 111 societies have had representatives in China, more than half having begun their work between 1887 and 1907. In 1876 there were 29 societies working in China, which by 1906 had risen to 82. The question of Rites has been raised among the Protestant missionaries under the name of the "Term Question", because of the lack of unity in the choice of a term to express the Deity: *Shin, T'ien-shin, T'ien-chu*, etc. being proposed. *Shang-ti* seems to meet the approval of the majority. The Bible or portions of the Bible have been translated under the auspices of the three Bible societies, British and Foreign, American, and the National Society of Scotland, into the following dialects: Mandarin, Fu-chou, Canton, Shanghai, Su-chou, Hakka, Swatow (printed in Chinese characters); Ning-po, Fuchou, Amoy, Mandarin, Kien-ning, T'ai-chou, Shanghai, Hakka, Swatow, Hai-nan, Hing-hwa, Wen-chou, Kien-yang, Canton, Peking, Shan-tung, Su-chou (in Roman characters). In 1900 the publications of the Chinese agencies of the three Bible societies amounted to 1,523,930 copies of the whole Bible or portions thereof (991,300 in Mandarin, 291,900 in simple Wen-li, 187,000 in classical Chinese, etc.). The well-known periodical "The Chinese Repository" was edited from May, 1832 to Dec., 1851 (20 vols.), at Canton, by two American missionaries, E. C. Bridgman and his successor, S. W. Williams. The "Chinese Recorder", started in May, 1868, at Fu-chou by the Rev. S. L. Baldwin has been conducted at Shanghai since January, 1874. On the 1 January, 1903, according to "The Encyclopedia of Missions" (Dwight, Tupper, and Bliss), Protestant missions in China (including Manchuria) included 2708 foreign missionaries, 5700 native workers, 3316 places of religious worship, 1570 elementary schools, 129 high schools, 138 hospital dispensaries, 24 printing establishments, 144,237 professing Christians. According to the "Shanghai Mercury" the number of foreign workers (men and women), which in 1876 had been 473, was on 31 Dec., 1907, 3833; the total number of baptized Christians and catechumens being 256,779.

Russian Ecclesiastical Mission.—This mission was begun by thirty-one Russians, made prisoners at the time of the first siege of Albasin (7 July, 1684), and taken to Peking with the "Pope" Maxim Leontieff. The first mission was started in 1715 by the Archimandrite Hilarion, accompanied by a "pope" and a deacon; the mission is first mentioned in a diplomatic document, Article 5 of the treaty signed in 1727 by Count Vladislavitch; the "popes" never tried to make converts; they simply acted as chaplains to the Albasin refugees and later also to the Russian embassy. Between 1852 and 1866 the members of this mission issued four volumes of memoirs relating to various Chinese subjects; two of the "popes" have left a name in Chinese studies, Father Yakiuf Bichurin and the Archimandrite Palladius, compiler of a very valuable dictionary. The Russian mission suffered much during the Boxer rebellion, and its valuable library was destroyed.

Jews in China.—The first mention of Jews (*Tiao-kin-kiao*) in China is found in the records of the Jesuit missionaries of Peking. At the beginning of the seventeenth century a young Israelite, Ngai, on paying a visit (1605) to Matteo Ricci, declared that he worshipped one God, and seeing at the mission a picture representing the Virgin with the Child Jesus, he believed it was Rebecca with Esau or Jacob. He stated that he came from K'ai-feng, the capital of Ho-nan, where his brethren resided. However, the Jews, often taken for the *Hwei-hwei*, or Mohammedans, had been mentioned under the name of *Chu-hu* in the Chinese Annals (*Yuan-shi*) of 1329, for the

first time, and again in 1354. Ricci sent to K'ai-feng a Chinese Jesuit, who was followed later on by Giulio Aleni (1613), Gozani (1704), Gaubil, and Domenge. Finally it was discovered that these Jews had a synagogue (*Li-pai-sze*), looking to the East, and possessed many books. Facsimiles of some of the books were made at Shanghai in 1851. Three tablets bearing inscriptions have been found at K'ai-feng: (1) The oldest, dated 1489, commemorated the reconstruction of the synagogue *Ts'ing-chen-sze*, states that seventy Jewish families arrived in China at the court of the Sung (960 to 1278). (2) The second, dated 1512, placed in the synagogue *Ts'uen-chong-tao-king-sze*, was taken to China under the Han dynasty. (3) The third, dated 1663, commemorating the rebuilding of the synagogue *Ts'ing-chen-sze*, says that the Jewish religion had its origin in India and was introduced into China at the time of the Chou (1122–955 B.C.), which is manifestly wrong. The Jews came to China through Persia after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, during the first century of the Christian Era, under the Emperor Ming-ti of the Han dynasty. This statement is based upon oral tradition. Professor Chavannes writes that the Jews came to China from India by sea under the Sung dynasty, between 960 and 1126 (Revue de Synthèse historique. Dec., 1900). Father Joseph Brucker, after reading carefully Ricci's original manuscripts, finds that his informer, Ngai, stated that there were but ten or twelve families at K'ai-feng, where they had been settled but five or six hundred years, and that they were much more numerous at Hang-chou (Etudes, 20 Nov., 1907). This seems to confirm the theory of Chavannes and the text of the inscription of 1489: the arrival of the Jews at the court of the Sung, which was Lin-ngan, or Hang-chou. The Jews call themselves *Tiao-kin-kiao* (the sect which extracts the sinew), referring to the struggle of Jacob with the Angel (Genesis, xxxii, 32); they suffered greatly and were scattered during the T'ai-p'ing rebellion (1857). They have since gone back to their old seat, but they are neither numerous nor prosperous.

MOHAMMEDANS (*Hwei-hwei-kiao*).—The first mention of the Arabs, called *Ta-shi*, is found in the annals of the T'ang dynasty (618–907); in 713 there is a record in China of a *Ta-shi* ambassador. In 758 a large Mohammedan colony, settled at Canton, rebelled, burnt their houses, and fled by sea. They had a large mosque (*Hwei-sheng-sze*), built under the T'ang dynasty, which was destroyed by fire in 1343, and rebuilt in 1349–51; only the ruins of a tower mark the site of the first building. Two inscriptions of the sixteenth century refer to the mosques of Nan-king; one of the same date was found at Si-ngan-fu, as well as the following which is considered apocryphal by some savants. Palladius writes (Russian Mission, IV, 438) that a Mohammedan tablet was discovered at Si-ngan-fu bearing the date A. D. 742, and recording the fact that during the reign of the Sui emperor, K'ai-hwang (581–600) Islamism penetrated into China. The difficulty is to make this date tally with the Hegira (622). It is the belief of the writer that the introduction of Islam was gradual. The adherents were first known as *Ta-shi* (Arabs), but have since been known as *Hwei-hwei*. They paid tribute to the chief of the Si Liao or Kara K'itai and in the twelfth century there was a regiment of Hwei-hwei in the Kin army. Many distinguished Mohammedans served in the Mongol armies, among them Nasr-uddin, who was governor of Yun-nan. In the fourteenth century some of the Mongol chiefs, Barak Khan, Kabak Khan, and finally the Khakan Tughluk Timur, embraced Islamism. The influence of Mohammedanism in Central Asia rose as the Mongol authority was declining. The Arab geographer, Abu'lfeda, mentions the following cities of China (*Sîn*): Khanfu (Hang-chou), Khandju, Yandju (Yang-chou), Zaitun (Ts'ean-chou), Khangu, Sila (Korea), Khadjou, Sankdju (Su-chou). The city of Si-ngan was called Khamdan. Ibn Batuta (fourteenth century) visited Sin Kalan (Canton), and remarks that in every city of China there was always a *sheikh ul islam* and a *cadi* to act as judges among the Mussulmans. The Arabs called the Chinese emperor *Faghfur*, an alteration of the Persian *Baghpur* (Son of God), equivalent to "Son of Heaven". China was *Chin* or *Mahachin*, sometimes *Tung-t'u*, "Land of the East".

An imperial edict, dated 4 May, 1729, says of the Mohammedans: "They muster strongest in Shen-si, and there they are persecuted more than anywhere else, on account of their clubbing together to gamble, their secreting weapons, and various other illegal acts. There they also give expression unreservedly to their wrath about the imperial decrees forbidding the slaughter of horned cattle, which are so indispensable to agriculture. They should therefore be constantly reminded to be kind and tolerant" (De Groot). In 1648 a rebellion broke out in Kan-su in the part west of the Hwang-ho, and the Mohammedans occupied the *fus* of Kan-chou, Liang-chou, Min-chou, etc. Su-chou was retaken in 1649 by the imperial troops and the rebel leader, Ting Kwo-tung, was killed with his followers. In 1781 the black-turbaned Salar Mussulmans dwelling at Si-ning, east of Ku-ku-nor, killed the prefect of Kan-chou, took Ho-chou, and besieged Lan-chou. Imperial troops were called from all parts of the empire, and after a fierce resistance and great bloodshed, the chief, Tien Wu, was killed and other leaders were exiled (1784) to Hai-nan. New difficulties arose in August, 1789, and a number of Moslems were sent to Heh-lung-kiang, as slaves to the Tatars. They rebelled again in 1861, 1862, and 1895. In this region they are divided into "white-capped" Hwei-hwei, who burn incense as the other Chinese do, and the "black capped" Hwei-hwei, or Salar, who condemn this practice as pagan, and are more fanatical. These live at Salar Pakun, in the vicinity of Ho-chou.

In 1855 a quarrel between Mussulmans and Chinese miners working near Ta-li in the Yun-nan province, was the occasion of a general rising of all the Mohammedans of the region under two chiefs, Ma Te-sing and Ma-hien, who submitted in 1860, though they were victorious. However, a young chief, Tu Wen-siu, established himself as a sultan in the stronghold of Ta-li, where he resisted the imperial troops until 19 Jan., 1873, when a wholesale massacre of Mohammedans took place. In 1863 another great rebellion broke out in the T'ien-shan region, or Ili, which had been conquered for the empire by K'ien Lung in 1759. Burzuk Khan, a descendant of the ancient chieftains, with the help of Yakub, an adventurer, taking advantage of the difficult position of the Chinese, captured the territory south of T'ien-shan. Eventually Yakub replaced his chief, assumed his title of Ameer, and founded a short-lived empire which came to an end with the death of Yakub and the capture by General Tso Tsung-tang of Aksu, the capital (19 Oct., 1877), Yarkand (21 Dec., 1877), Kashgar (26 Dec., 1877), and Khotan (4 Jan., 1878).

Though some Chinese Mohammedan pilgrims probably visited Mecca between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, there is no mention of them in Chinese literature dealing with Islam. This does not date further back than 1681. The land-route of later *hadjis* (pilgrims) to Arabia ran through Kia-yu-kwan, Hami, Turfan, Aksu, Andijan, Khokand, Samarkand, Bokhara, Charjui, Meshed, Hamadan, Kermanshah, Bagdad, Mossul, Diarbekir, Aleppo, Damascus, Jerusalem, Cairo. Some embarked at Jaffa; others in Mekran. After leaving Bokhara they passed through Balkh, Tash-kurgan, Kabul, Kandahar, Kelat. The sea routes were through Ava to

Rangoon, or Po-se and the Si-kiang. Of course with the facilities of modern navigation the sea-route is much used. The writer has known one of these *haijis*. He could recite the Koran, though he did not understand what he said, nor could he read Arabic. Mohammedans have many mosques in the large cities of the empire, some of great importance at Peking, Si-ngan, Hang-chou, Canton, etc. In form they are much like Chinese temples, Arabic inscriptions being their characteristic feature. Many Moslems are officials of the empire, some occupying high positions, especially in the army. No accurate statistics are obtainable. According to M. Dabry, who is, however, a very unreliable author, there are in China between twenty and twenty-two million Mussulmans, of whom 8,350,000 are in Kan-su, 6,500,000 in Shen-si, 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 in Yun-nan. According to A. H. Keane, the numbers reach 30,000,000. Sara Chandra Das places them at 50,-000,000, while the late Dr. Andrew Happer brings the figures down to 3,000,000.

History.—The question of the origin of the Chinese has been discussed by several foreign savants: J. Edkins (China's Place in Philology) seeks in Armenia or Mesopotamia a common origin of European and Asiatic languages. Gust. Schlegel (Sinico-Aryaca) made a comparison between the primitive roots of the Chinese and Aryan languages; the theory of an Egyptian origin has found favour with Kircher, Mairan, De Guignes, and Pauthier. Terrien de Lacouperie has pushed to the limit the theory of so-called Bak tribes migrating from Elam to the banks of the Hwang-ho, 2500 B.C., and taking with them the civilization of what was later China. The foundations of these clever and lightly-built theories are slight; the only alternative is to follow Chinese tradition with its legends.

The first man was P'an-ku, the Chinese Adam, followed by the thirteen celestial kings, *T'ien-wang*, the eleven terrestrial kings, *Ti-wang*, and the nine human kings, *Jen-wang*. These ages comprise the first eight of the ten periods or *K'i*, into which Chinese historians divide the early history of their country. Next come the Five Sovereigns: Fu-hi, inventor of the art of writing; Shin-nung, who invented the plough and taught the art of husbandry; Hwang-ti, inventor of the fine arts, of ships, etc., whose wife taught men to raise silk worms and to weave silk; Shao-hao, who established the different classes of civil and military officials; Chuen-hiu, author of the calendar. These were followed by the two great emperors, the sages of China, Yao (2357–2257 B. C.), during whose reign occurred the great flood, and Shun. Yu, chosen by Shun as his successor, founded the first or Hia dynasty (2205 B. C.), which comprised seventeen sovereigns, under whom the monarchy became hereditary. The last emperor, Ti-kwei, fled to Nan-chao.—The second dynasty, known first as the Shang (1766 B. C.) and after 1401 B. C. as the Yin, comprised twenty-eight sovereigns, and was founded by Ch'eng-t'ang. The last prince, Chou, was burnt to death (1122).—The third or Chou dynasty, which began in 1122 B. C. and comprised thirty-eight sovereigns, was founded by Wu-wang, son of Wen-wang, and brother of Chou-kung. Under this dynasty appeared Confucius, Mencius, and Lao-tze. At the end of this dynasty China was divided into nine small states. Of these states only Han and Ts'in lasted for any length of time. The dynasty of Ts'in prevailed over the other states.—The fourth or Ts'in dynasty, dating from 249 B. C. and comprising four sovereigns, was founded by Chwan Siang-wang, who reigned but three years. His son, Prince Cheng (246), in the twenty-sixth year of his reign assumed the title of *Shi Hwang-ti* (first universal emperor), the sovereign having been hitherto styled *Wang*. Shi Hwang-ti may be considered as having consolidated China, doing away with the old feudal states, and dividing the empire into thirty-six *kiun*. To stop the incursions of the Hiung-nu he built the Great Wall of China (*Wan-li-ch'ang-ch'eng*, or wall 10,000 lis long), which extends from Chi-li to Kan-su. The three principal passes through the Great Wall are the Shan-hai-kwan Pass, at the eastern extremity, the Chang-kia-k'ou (Kalgan) Pass, and the Kia-yu Pass at the extreme west. Shi Hwang-ti ordered all books to be burnt, to suppress all traces of former dynasties. —His house was short-lived, and Liu-pang, Prince of Han, under the dynastic title of Kao-ti or Kao Tsu, founded the fifth or Han dynasty (206 B. C.), which comprised twenty-five sovereigns. This was a period of reconstruction. The classics were collected again; Buddhist works were introduced into the empire; relations were begun with the Roman Empire; the penal code was compiled; and examinations established. In A. D. 25 Kwang Wu-ti (Kien-wu) transferred the capital from Ch'ang-ngan to Lo-yang, and the dynasty called the Former Han (*Ts'ien Han*) or Si Han (Western Han) became the Hou Han (After Han) or Tung Han (Eastern Han).—Sixth dynasty: In 220, under the reign of Chao Lieh-ti, the empire was divided into three kingdoms (*San-kwo-chi*).—The three dynasties include: (1) the Minor Han in Shu (Sze-ch'wan); (2) the Wei, at Lo-yang; and (3) the Wu at Kien-kang (Nan-king). General Se Ma-shao having subjugated China, his son under the title of Wu-ti founded at Lo-yang the Western Tsin (265). —The eighth dynasty, which became the Eastern Tsin (317), or ninth dynasty, when the capital was removed to Nan-king. These Tsin dynasties comprised fifteen sovereigns. Emperor Kung Ti having been killed by Liu Yu, the murderer established at Nan-king the Sung dynasty (420).

This is the "period of division between North and South" (*Nan Pe Ch'ao*), and there were various dynasties: the Sung (420) at Hang-chou; the Ts'i, at Nan-king, the Liang, the Ch'ên, the Northern Wei (House of Toba, 386–532 at Ta-tung and later at Lo-yang), the Western Wei, Eastern Wei (end of dynasty, 550), the Northern Ts'i, and Northern Chou. Finally, the minister Yang-kien restored order, destroyed the Ch'ên (583), and under the name of Wen-ti founded at Ch'ang-ngan the Sui dynasty (590), which comprised three kings. In 618 Kung Ti T'ung was deposed by Li Yuan, who established at Ch'ang-ngan (Shen-si) the great dynasty of T'ang (620–907), comprising twenty sovereigns, restored order, and gave to the empire a period of unrivalled prosperity. The Empress Wu-hou (684–705) who usurped the government, under Jui Tsung, was followed by a long series of weak princes, which led to the fall of this once brilliant dynasty. Then came the period of anarchy and civil wars called Wu-tai (five generations) or Ten States: Posterior Liang (907–21) at Lo-yang; Posterior T'ang (923–34), at Lo-yang; Posterior Tsin (936–44), at Pien-liang (K'ai-feng); Posterior Han (947–48), at Pien-liang; Posterior Chou (951–60), at Pai-liang. Finally, after the death of Kung-ti, Chao Kwang-in was proclaimed emperor, and founded the Sung dynasty (960–1280), which comprised eighteen sovereigns. The Sung were attacked by the Eastern Tatars or K'itans of Tungusic (Tatar) origin, who founded in Northern China a dynasty, under Ye-liu A-pao-ki (907), which assumed in 937 the dynastic title of Liao. The capital of the Liao was at first Liao-yang, in Liao-tung, and was transferred by A-pao-ki to Yen-king (Peking). They were expelled by another Tungusic tribe, the Ju-chen or Niu-chen (1125), and retired to Kashgaria, where they created the empire of Kara-k'itai or Si-liao from the territory of the Karakhanides; the Niu-chen, at first vassals of Korea, became independent under Hien-phu. Their chief, Aguda (O-ko-ta), founded the Kin dynasty (1113).

His successor compelled the Sung to leave their capital K'ai-feng, and their emperor Kao Tsung retired to Hang-chou, called Lin-ngan (1129). China was then divided into two empires. The northern, or Kin, with the capital at Yen-king (Peking) was Cathay; the southern was the Nan-sung. The latter was also known as Manzi (Man-tze). The Mongols destroyed both empires, the Kin in 1234, and the Sung in 1280.

The Mongol or Yuen dynasty (1280–1368) comprised ten sovereigns. Jenghiz, the first great Khan, established his capital at Karakorum (Ho-lin); he died 18 Aug., 1227. His successors were Ogotai, Cuyuk (1246), Mangku (1251), Kublai (1260). The first real Chinese emperor of the dynasty (1280) was Kublai, known also under the names of Chung T'ung and Che-yuan. He transferred his capital to Cambaluc (Peking) and undertook an unsuccessful war against Japan, but was more fortunate against Mien (Burma). This is the period of successful Catholic missionaries, such as John of Montecorvino, and of great travellers like Marco Polo. In 1356, Chu, a Buddhist monk, rebelled, took Nan-king (1356), and under the title of Hung Wu founded the Ming dynasty (1368–1644), which included sixteen sovereigns. The third emperor, Yung-lo, transferred the capital from Nan-king to Peking. In 1514 the Portuguese arrived in China. The weakness of the last Ming emperors caused rebellions. One of the rebel chiefs, Li Tze-ch'ing, who had subjugated Ho-nan and Shen-si, captured Peking, and Emperor Ts'ung Chêng hanged himself in despair (1643). But the faithful general, Wu San-kwei, who was at the head of the imperial troops in Liao-tung, called the Manchus to the rescue. For many years the Tatars had threatened the empire. Their chief, Ts'ung Teh, son of T'ien Ming, defeated Li. Shun Che, the son of Ts'ung Teh, entered Peking and founded the Ts'ing dynasty, the dynasty now reigning over China. Shun Che, the first emperor, was succeeded in 1662 by his son, the illustrious K'ang-hi, who after a short minority took charge of the empire. He had many struggles to sustain in Fu-kien and Formosa against Koxinga, the rebellious Wu San-kwei, and the Kalmuks (Eleuths). Arts and letters were prosperous during this reign. In 1716 K'ang-hi published the celebrated dictionary "K'ang-hi Tze-tien", including 44,449 characters, classed under 214 radicals. K'ang-hi died 20 Dec., 1722, and was succeeded by his fourth son, Yung Cheng (1723–36), who persecuted the Christians. The fourth emperor, K'ien Lung (1736–96), son of Yung Chêng, annexed T'ien shan (1759), carried on an unsuccessful war against the Burmese, subjugated the Miao-tze (1775), and established Chinese power in Tibet. He abdicated on 8 Feb., 1796, in favour of his son, Kia K'ing, and died 7 Feb., 1799. Kia K'ing's reign (1796–1820) was marked by internal troubles; the members of the secret society of *Pei Lien-kiao* seized the imperial palace at Peking, 18 July, 1813. Kia K'ing died 2 Sept., 1820, and was succeeded by Tao Kwang (1821–51), during whose reign began the T'ai P'ing rebellion. This reign and the following, those of Hien Fung (1851–62), T'ung Che (1862–75), and Kwang Siu (b. 15 Aug., 1871), will be treated in the section on the foreign relations of China.

Foreign Relations.—Some commentators have found China in this passage of Isaias (A. V., xlix, 12): "these from the land of Sinim". Ptolemy divides Eastern Asia into the country of Sinæ and Serice, north of Sinæ, with its chief city Sera. Strabo, Virgil, Horace, Pomponius Mela, Pliny, and Ammianus Marcellinus, speak of the *Seres*, and they are mentioned by Florus among the nations which sent special embassies to Rome at the time of Augustus. The Chinese called the eastern part of the Roman Empire (Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor) *Ta Ts'in*, *Fu-lin* during the Middle Ages. The monk Cosmas had a correct idea of the position of China (sixth century). The Byzantine writer, Theophylactus Simocatta (seventh century), gives an account of China under the name *Taugas*. There is a Chinese record of a Roman embassy in A. D. 166. The sea voyages of Arabs and the pilgrimages of Chinese Buddhists to India have thrown considerable light on the geography of Asia during the Middle Ages.

The voyage of Vasco da Gama (1497) and the capture of Malacca by Albuquerque opened the Far East to the Portuguese, who arrived at Canton in 1514; Perestrello came in 1516; Fernão Perez de Andrade followed in 1517 with Thomas Pires, but the misconduct of Simon de Andrade caused the expulsion of the Portuguese from Canton (1521) and the de-



Looking East Along the Great Wall

struction of the fleet of Coutinho (1522); the Portuguese establishments of Liampo (1545) and Changchou (1549) were completely destroyed, and the inhabitants massacred. Finally, the Portuguese settled on the island of Hiang-shan at Macao, either in 1553 or in 1557. The Dutch commander, Cornelis Reyersz, took the Pescadore Islands in 1624; but after an agreement made with the Chinese (19 Feb., 1625), Martin Sonk, the governor, transferred the Dutch colony to Tai-wan (Formosa), where it was captured by the Chinese pirate, Koxinga (1661). The capture in 1592 of the Portuguese carrack, Madre de Dios, gave the English the secret of the East-Indian Trade. In 1596 three ships, the Bear, the Bear's Whelp, and the Benjamin, under the command of Benjamin Wood, were fitted out at the expense of Robert Dudley, and Queen Elizabeth wrote a letter (16 July) to the Emperor of China in favour of the London merchants Richard Allen and Thomas Broomfield. The expedition, however, never reached China. The first English vessel that visited China reached there by accident. It was the Unicorn which, going from Bantam to Japan, was cast by a storm on the coast of Macao at the end of June, 1620. In 1634 Captain Weddell explored the Canton River. The first English Company organized for the purpose of trading with India, commonly called the "Old Company", was incorporated by Queen Elizabeth, 31 Dec., 1600, under the title of "The Governour and Company of Merchants of London trading into the East

Indies". The "English Company (or General Society) trading to the East Indies" also called the "New Company" was incorporated by William III, 5 Sept., 1698, and the two were amalgamated in 1708–9 by Queen Anne, under the title of "The United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies", commonly known as "the Honourable East India Company".

The Russians crossed the Ural Mountains in the middle of the sixteenth century under Ivan IV, and subjugated Siberia; from the Lena River they passed, in 1642, into the basin of the Amur. Stepanof, one of their chiefs, met the Chinese for the first time in 1654, when exploring the Sungari River. After withstanding two sieges of their principal fort, Albasin, the Russians signed a treaty with the Chinese at Nerchinsk (27 Aug., 1689), which destroyed their influence in the region of Amur, and from which they did not recover until the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1727 Count Sava Vladislavitch signed a treaty regulating the inland trade between the two countries.

In 1660 the French organized a "Compagnie de Chine" which in 1664 was amalgamated with the "Compagnie des Indes", which gave up its China privileges in 1697–98 to "Compagnie Jourdan, la Coulange et Cie", which made Canton a trading centre. New companies were organized for the commerce of China in October, 1705, and November, 1712. Finally, in 1719, all the companies were merged into the "Compagnie des Indes", whose privilege was suspended in 1769, and which was finally dissolved 6 April, 1770. A new "Compagnie des Indes" was incorporated 14 April, 1785, and dissolved 3 April, 1790. A French consulate was established at Canton 3 Feb., 1776. The Danes had two companies organized in 1612 and 1670. Austria was represented by the Ostend Company, incorporated 17 Dec., 1722, and the Triest Company. Prussia had the Emden Company. In 1627 a Swedish company was organized; in 1655 Nils Matson Kiöping visited China. On 14 June, 1731, a charter was granted by King Frederick of Sweden to a company organized at Gothenburg. The first American commercial expedition to China was undertaken by the Empress of China, a vessel commanded by John Green, which sailed from New York for Canton, 22 Feb., 1784.

Trading was carried on at Canton through privileged merchants called *Hong* merchants, whose council, called *Co-hong*, was incorporated in 1720. Their number varied, but never exceeded thirteen. The foreign merchants traded in thirteen *hongs*, or factories, extending about 300 feet from the banks of the Pearl River, and about 1000 feet broad. The Hong merchants, hard pressed by the *Hoppo*, or custom mandarin, ran into debt with the foreign merchants. A visit of Commodore Anson (1742), a special mission of Captain Panton, even a transfer of business to another part of the empire, did not remedy the numerous grievances of Europeans, who were not allowed to reside permanently at Canton, but were compelled to retire to Macao when business was done. The English sent an embassy, headed by Lord Macartney, in the Lion and the Hindostan. Macartney reached Peking, 21 Aug., 1793, but did not obtain permission for the English to trade at Chusan, Ning-po, and T'ien-tsin, or to have a warehouse at Peking for their goods. Macartney's voyage cost £80,000 (about $380,000), but was without result. Still less successful was the embassy of Lord Amherst (1816). Lord Napier, who was sent on a special mission in 1833–4, died worn out by his negotiations. Grievances continued to increase year after year, until the destruction (June, 1839) of 20,283 chests of opium by Commissioner Lin brought matters to a climax.

On 9 June, 1840, a blockade of the Canton River was proclaimed by Admiral Sir John Gordon Bremer Ting-hai (Chusan) was captured, 7 July, 1841. Sir Henry Pottinger was now appointed plenipotentiary, and Sir William Parker commander-in-chief. Amoy was captured 27 August, Ning-po 13 Oct., 1841, Shanghai, 16 June, 1842, and the British squadron entered the Ta-kiang (Yang-tze). Finally a treaty of thirteen articles was signed at Nan-king by Pottinger and Ki-ying, 29 Aug., 1842, on board the Cornwallis. Canton, Amoy, Fu-chou, Ning-po, and Shanghai were to be opened to trade, and consuls appointed to reside at each of these cities. The island of Hong-Kong was ceded to Great Britain, and indemnities were paid: $6,000,000 for the opium seized, $12,000,000 for the expenses of war, and $3,000,000 for the debts of the Hong merchants, whose guild was abolished. The United States and France followed the example of Great Britain. A treaty was signed with the United States at Wang-hia, near Macao, 3 July, 1844, by Caleb Cushing, and one with France by Théodose de Lagrené at Whampoa, 24 Oct., 1844. An agreement with Belgium was signed at Canton, 25 July, 1845, and a treaty with Norway and Sweden, 20 March, 1847. The Chusan Archipelago was surrendered to the Chinese in 1847 by Sir John F. Davis, governor of Hong-Kong. Hong-Kong had been declared a free port, 6 Feb., 1842 to the great damage of Macao.

The advantages, however, obtained through the Treaty of Nan-king were soon found insufficient. The murder of the French priest Chapdelaine in Kwang-si (26 Feb., 1856) and the seizure at Canton of the lorcha Arrow (8 Oct., 1856) by the Chinese furnished the pretext for a joint action of England and France against China. The bombardment of Canton (27–29 Oct., 1856), the great rebellion in India (May, 1857), the appointment of Lord Elgin and Baron Gros as envoys to China by the two belligerents, the capture of Canton (29 Dec., 1857) and of the Taku forts (20 May, 1858), are the chief events which preceded the signing of the English (26 June) and French (27 June, 1858) treaties of T'ien-tsin. These treaties permitted the appointment of French and English ambassadors to Peking, and allowed the Chinese a like privilege of appointing ambassadors at the Court of St. James and the Court of Paris, provided for the opening of the ports of New-chwang, Tang-chou (Che-fu), Tai-wan (Formosa), Chao-chou (Swatow), and Kiung-chou (Hai-nan), granted an indemnity of 2,000,000 taels for damages to the British and a like sum to both powers for war expenses, besides an indemnity to French subjects for the loss sustained through plunder, when Canton was taken, and guaranteed the punishment of the murderer of Father Chapdelaine.

On the 25th of June, 1859, the plenipotentiaries, Bruce and Bourboulon, who were on their way to Peking to have these treaties ratified, were fired upon by the Taku forts. A second war ensued. Elgin and Gros were appointed special envoys to China; Sir Hope Grant and Admiral Hope, General de Montauban and Admiral Charner were placed in command of the British and French land and naval forces. The forts of Taku were recaptured (21 Aug., 1860). The allies marched past T'ien-tsin, and, after withstanding a treacherous attack by the Chinese at Tung-chou (18 Sept., 1860), they forced a passage across the Pa-li-k'iao bridge (21 Sept.), and captured the Summer Palace (Yuan-ming-yuan), 6 Oct., which was plundered. Wan-shou-shan, another part of the imperial summer resort, was burnt by order of Lord Elgin (18 Oct.) on account of the barbarous treatment inflicted upon the European prisoners taken in the dastardly attack at Tung-chou. The emperor fled to Shehol, and his brother, Prince Kung, who had remained at Peking, signed the Conventions of 24 and 25 Oct., 1860, with the allies. The

indemnity was raised to 8,000,000 taels, and Kow-loon, opposite Hong-Kong, was ceded to England as a dependency of this island. A like indemnity was to be paid to France, and T'ien-tsin was to be opened to trade. Meanwhile a treaty had been made at T'ien-tsin with the United States (18 June, 1858), signed by William B. Reed, and one with Russia (13 June, 1858) signed by Admiral Putiatin, and another treaty was made with Russia at Peking (9–14 Nov., 1860), and signed by General Ignatiev. A still earlier treaty had been made with Russia at Aigun (16 May, 1858) and signed by Muraviev. The final result of these various treaties was a rectification of the frontier between Russia and China, the Amur and Usuri rivers forming the new boundary lines.

The wretched Hien Fung, who had replaced Tao-kwang in 1851, died 22 Aug., 1861, and was succeeded by his son T'ung-chi (b. 17 Nov., 1834), under the regency of the two dowager empresses, Tze-ngan and Tze-hi, and Prince Kung. With the help of foreigners, the American, Ward, the English general, Gordon, and the "Ever Victorious Army", the French admiral Protet, Lebrethon, and others, the T'ai-p'ing rebels, who had captured Nan-king (19 March, 1853) and made a raid on T'ien-tsin, were expelled from Su-chou (4 Dec., 1863) and Nan-king (19 July, 1864), and their power completely destroyed. Treaties were signed with Prussia and the German States (T'ien-tsin, 2 Sept., 1861), Portugal (T'ien-tsin, 13 Aug., 1862), though not ratified, Denmark (T'ien-tsin, 13 July, 1863), Spain (T'ien-tsin, 10 Oct., 1864), Holland (T'ien-tsin, 6 Oct., 1863), Belgium (Peking, 2 Nov., 1865), Italy (26 Oct., 1866), and Austria (Peking, 2 Sept., 1869). A new convention, negotiated by the British minister, Sir Rutherford Alcock (Peking, 23 Oct., 1869), was not ratified by the British Government. In 1868 a special embassy headed by Anson Burlingame, formerly American Minister to Peking, was sent to the Western countries. They went first to the United States, and additional articles to the Treaty of 1858 were signed at Washington (28 July, 1868); thence they proceeded through Europe. Burlingame died at St. Petersburg. A few months afterwards news was received of the awful massacre of French and Russian subjects by the Chinese at T'ien-tsin, 21 June, 1870. A mission under Chung-hou was sent to Versailles to apologize for this. T'ung-chi married Oct., 1872, and being of age, received in audience the foreign envoys; Japan, France, Great Britain, Russia, the United States, and Holland were represented by their ministers, and Germany by an interpreter (29 June, 1873). Relations were strained between Japan and China, owing to an attack made by the aborigines of southern Formosa on the wrecked crew of a Luch'uan junk, and for a time war seemed inevitable. Through British intervention, however, satisfaction was obtained by Japan, and an agreement between the two Asiatic nations was signed at Peking, 31 Oct., 1874. T'ung-chi died 12 Jan., 1875.

The situation in China at this time presented many difficulties. There were grave questions to be settled with England, Russia, and France. On 21 Feb., 1875, the English interpreter, A. R. Margary, was murdered at Manwyne (Yun-nan), and an attack was made on the British exploring party from Burma headed by Col. Horace A. Browne, which Margary had preceded. Protracted and knotty negotiations conducted by the British minister, Thomas F. Wade, led to the conclusion of the convention signed at Che-fu, 13 Sept., 1876. According to this: regulations were to be framed for the frontier trade of Yun-nan; British officials were to be stationed at Ta-li, or some other suitable place in Yun-nan, for a period of five years; the Viceroy of India was given permission to send a mission to this province; the indemnity was fixed at 200,000 taels; China was to establish missions and consulates abroad; the ports of I-ch'ang, Wu-hu, Wen-chou, and Pak-hoi were to be opened to trade; British officers might be sent to Ch'ung-k'ing, which was to be opened to trade when steamers succeeded in ascending the river. A special mission, including the Hon. T. G. Grosvenor, A. Davenport, and E. C. Baber, was sent to Yun-nan to witness the trial and the punishment of the murderers of Margary. On 28 August, 1875, Kwo Sung-tao was appointed envoy extraordinary to the Court of St. James.

The Russians, who had signed a treaty with China, 25 July, 1851, at Kuldja, took possession of this region (4 July, 1871), during the rebellion of Yakub. When the Mohammedan rising was crushed by Tso Tsung-tang (1877–78), China claimed the territory occupied temporarily by Russia. A special Chinese mission with Ch'ung-hou as chief was sent to Russia and concluded a treaty at Livadia (Oct., 1879). The contested territory was ceded, together with the Muzart Pass, to Russia, and great inland commercial facilities were also granted to the Muscovite merchants. Ch'ung-hou was denounced by the censor, Chang Chi-tung, and sentenced to death; his treaty came to naught. It was a *casus belli*, but the intervention of England and France prevented the war. Tseng Ki-tze, the Chinese minister in Paris, was sent to St. Petersburg, where he signed a treaty restoring to China the greater part of the Ili and the Muzart Pass (12–24 Feb., 1881).

The third difficulty arose through the occupation of Tong-king by France. China interfered, as the suzerain power of Annam. A treaty was signed at T'ien-tsin by Commodore Fournier (11 May, 1884), but was soon followed by the Bac-lé affair (23 June, 1884), and hostilities were resumed. Admiral Courbet bombarded the Fu-chou arsenal (23 Aug., 1884); Ki-lung in northern Formosa was captured (1 Oct., 1884); the Pescadores were taken (29 March, 1885); finally the Billot-Campbell peace protocol, signed in Paris (4 April, 1885), was followed by a treaty signed at T'ien-tsin (9 June, 1885) by Patenôtre, minister, a commercial convention (T'ien-tsin, 25 April, 1886) by Cogordan, minister, and an additional convention (26 June, 1887) under Constans, minister. France retained possession of Tong-king.

Emperor Kwang Siu became of age 7 Feb., 1887, and took control of the government 4 March, 1889. On 26 Feb., 1889, he married Ye-ho-na-la-shi, daughter of Kwei-siang. The imperial audience took place 5 March, 1891. For a long time matters had gone from bad to worse between China and Japan, Korea being the coveted prey of both nations. The murder of the Korean Kim-ok Kyum, a friend of the Japanese, by his countryman, Hung Tjung-wu, at Shanghai (28 March, 1894), and the attack made on the steamship Kow-shing by the Japanese at the mouth of the Ya-lu River (25 July, 1894) were the starting points of a war. The principal events during the course of this war were: the battle of Sei-kwan (29 July, 1894); a declaration of war (1 Aug.); a convention between Korea and Japan (26 Aug.); the battles of Ping-yang (16 Sept.), and the Ya-lu (17 Sept.); the capture of Port Arthur (21 Nov.) and Wei-hai-wei (30 Jan., 1895) by the Japanese; the occupation of New-chwang by the Japanese (6 March); the landing of the Japanese at Formosa. The negotiations between Li Hung-chang, who had been wounded by a fanatic Japanese, and Ito and Mutsu, resulted in the signing of the Treaty of Shimonoseki (17 April, 1895). The principal articles of this treaty were the cession of Liao-tung, Formosa, and the Pescadores to the Japanese, an indemnity of 200,000,000 Kuping taels to be paid by China, the opening to Japanese trade of Sha-shi or Kin-chou (Hu-pe), Chung-k'ing, Su-chou, and Hang-chou, etc. On the interference of France, Russia and Germany, Liao-tung was retroceded to

China by the convention of 8 Nov., 1905. Korea fell entirely into the hands of the Japanese. Ostensibly to obtain satisfaction for the murder of two missionaries, the Germans seized Kiao-chou Bay (Shan-tung) (14 Nov., 1897), which was granted to them on long lease (6 March, 1898). Following the example of Germany, Russia obtained a similar lease of Ta-lien-wan and the adjacent waters (27 March, 1898); England, Wei-hai-wei (2 April, 1898); France, Kwang-chou-wan (27 May, 1898). On 9 June the territory of Kow-loon ceded to Great Britain was extended to include Deep Bay and Mir's Bay; moreover, various declarations stipulated the non-alienation by China of the Yang-tze valley (11 Feb., 1898), the provinces bordering on Tong-king (10 April, 1898), and Fu-kien (April, 1898). Prince Kung died 29 May, 1898.

From 10 June, 1898, until 20 Sept., 1898, when a *coup d'état* of Empress Tze-hi deprived Emperor Kwang Siu of all his power, he made a strong attempt to reform the administration of his empire with the assistance of K'ang Yu-wei and others. Then followed a terrible reaction, which culminated in the Boxer rebellion. This began in Shan-tung and extended to Chi-li, secretly fostered by the empress dowager and her camarilla, Prince Twan, and General Tung Fu-Siang. Everywhere missionaries were murdered. The German minister, Von Ketteler, was murdered (20 June); the legations at Peking were besieged by the troops and the infuriated mob. A relief column, under the command of the English admiral, Sir Edward Seymour, failed to reach the capital. The allied fleet captured the Taku forts (17 June, 1900). Finally a strong international army entered Peking (14 Aug., 1900), relieving the legations and the Catholic cathedral (Pe-tang), while the emperor, the empress dowager, and the court fled to Si-ngan-fu (Shen-si). Peking was looted and left in ruins.

The negotiations were long and involved, and on their completion a final protocol was signed at Peking, 7 Sept., 1901, by the representatives of the ten foreign powers. The principal clauses included: a mission of reparation to Berlin and an expiatory monument to Baron von Ketteler on the spot where he was assassinated; the punishment of the principal authors of the outrage; the rehabilitation of officials executed for being favourable to foreigners; the suspension of official examinations for five years in all cities where foreigners had been massacred or ill-treated; missions of reparation to Japan for the assassination of Sugiyama of the Japanese legation; expiatory monuments in cemeteries where foreign tombs had been desecrated; prohibition of the importation of arms; a total indemnity of 450,000,000 Haikwan taels (about $360,000,000), special quarters for the legations at Peking; the destruction of the forts of Taku; the reorganization of the foreign office. An imperial edict of 24 July, 1901, transformed the Tsung-li Yamen into a Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Wai-wu Pu), which takes precedence over the other ministries of State. Treaties were signed at Shanghai by China with Great Britain (5 Sept., 1902), with Japan (commercial, 8 Oct., 1903), and with the United States for the extension of commercial relations (8 Oct., 1903).

The great victories gained by Japan over Russia and the signing of the Treaty of Portsmouth (23 Aug., 5 Sept., 1905), the various agreements signed by European nations with the victorious power, the tremendous effect produced on all Asiatic peoples by the triumph of one of them, the latent discontent in China, the delusive and superficial attempts at reform in the Middle Kingdom, leave to the future prospects which are anything but encouraging for the Western countries.

Customs.—The imperial maritime customs were started in Shanghai in 1854 when, the city being threatened by rebels, the collection of dues on foreign trade became impossible. Representatives of the three consuls from Great Britain, France, and the United States, were placed in charge of the custom service, which was inaugurated on 12 July, 1854. The American and the French delegates having retired in the course of years, the British delegate, Horatio N. Lay, remained in charge until he was superseded in Nov., 1863, as inspector general, by Robert Hart (b. 20 Feb., 1835, at Portadown, Ireland). The Shanghai system was extended to Canton (Oct., 1859) and afterwards to the other treaty ports. The importance of the service has grown with years and now includes also the postal service. It is divided into four departments: (1) revenue department (Indoor, Outdoor, and Coast staff), with 957 foreigners of various nationalities, the majority being British, and 4138 Chinese (1903); (2) marine department; (3) educational department; (4) postal department. An imperial decree of 9 May, 1905, placed at the head of the custom service two high mandarins.

At the end of 1906, 2096 localities were open to postal business, and in 1907 the number of articles dealt with increased to nearly 113 millions. The number of parcels reached 1,383,000, and money transactions taels 1,539,000. Moreover, there are some foreign (British, German, French, Japanese, American, Russian) postal agencies at some of the treaty ports. On 6 Nov., 1906, a new Chinese ministry was created, styled the Yu-ch'wan Pu (Board of Posts and Communications) with a president and two vice-presidents.

Telegraph System.—In 1905 the Imperial Company had 379 stations throughout China, Manchuria, and Mongolia. Other companies are the Imperial German Telegraph Co., through Shanghai, Tsing-tao, and Che-fu; the French Telegraph Co., from Amoy to Tourane; the Great Northern Telegraph Co., through Shanghai, Gutzlaff, Nagasaki, Vladivostock, Amoy, and Hong-Kong; the Eastern Extension, Australasia and China Telegraph Co., connecting Shanghai, Gutzlaff, Fu-chou, Hong-Kong, Indo-China, and the Philippines; the Deutsch-Niederländische Telegraphengesellschaft, three cables connecting Yap (Carolines) and Shanghai, Menado (Celebes), and Guam (Marianes); the Commercial Pacific Cable Co., connecting San Francisco, Honolulu, Midway, Guam, Manila, and Shanghai with a branch line between Guam and Yokohama; the Japanese Telegraph Co., connecting Sharp Peak (Fu-chou), Formosa, Ishigakishima, Naha, Oshima, Japan, and Korea.

Trade.—The revenue of the customs in 1906 was Haikwan taels 36,068,595 (1 Haikwan tael=$0.80, U. S.), as against Haikwan taels 22,742,104 in 1897. It included import duties, taels 16,100,954; export duties tls. 9,825,706; coast trade duties, tls. 2,208,-192; tonnage dues, tls. 1,326,619; transit dues incoming, tls. 1,831,934; transit dues outgoing, tls. 445,167; opium *Likin*, tls. 4,330,083. The gross value of the foreign trade was Hk. tls. 682,767,231 in 1906, as against Hk. tls. 385,142,721 in 1897, the net value being Hk. tls. 646,726,821, as against tls. 366,329,983 in 1897. The value of the direct trade: Continent of Europe (Russia excepted), tls. 82,677,-826; Russian European ports, tls. 5,757,036; Russia and Siberia by land frontier, tls. 2,565,904; Russia, Pacific ports, tls. 11,018,087; Korea, tls., 1,811,037; Japan (including Formosa), tls. 94,357,287; Philippine Islands, tls. 2,536,704; Canada, tls. 5,192,127; United States, including Hawaii, tls. 70,107,657; Mexico and Central America (including Panama), tls. 54,142; South America, tls. 27,309; Australia, New Zealand, etc., tls. 1,014,469; South Africa (including Mauritius), tls. 58,136, a total of tls. 646,-726,821 (net imports, tls. 410,270,082; exports, tls. 236,456,739). The chief imports are: opium, tls.

32,285,377 (weighing 54,225 piculs); cotton goods, tls. 152,727,845; woollen and cotton mixtures, tls. 2,269,812; woollen goods, tls. 4,382,958; miscellaneous piece goods, tls. 3,062,711; copper, iron, steel, etc., tls. 17,289,855; cigarettes, tls. 5,846,781; cigars, tls. 408,081; fish and fishery products, tls. 8,125,721; flour, tls. 6,295,753; matches, tls. 5,139,808; machinery, tls. 5,730,221; medicines, tls. 2,137,134, etc. The chief exports are: beancake, tls. 7,064,108; beans, tls. 3,158,394; bristles, tls. 2,756,262; camphor, tls. 1,310,791; cattle, tls. 3,357,924; raw cotton, tls. 11,631,138; fire-crackers, tls. 3,585,733; matting, tls. 3,064,458; medicines, tls. 2,430,322; raw white silk, tls. 16,485,481; steam filature raw white silk, tls. 29,614,449; yellow silk, tls. 3,214,873; wild silk, tls. 6,372,970; silk cocoons, tls. 1,089,872; silk waste, tls. 3,208,162; silk cocoons, refuse, tls. 450,254; silk piece goods, tls. 8,474,750; Shantung pongees, tls. 1,279,104; silk products, unclassed, tls., 1,105,610; undressed skins and hides of cows and buffalos, tls. 5,491,908; of horses, asses, and mules, tls. 5,129; of goats, tls. 4,382,138; sheep, tls. 476,567; unclassed, tls. 33,509; straw braid, tls. 8,650,861; vegetable tallow, tls. 1,057,401; black tea, tls. 12,252,518; green tea, tls. 7,645,121; black brick tea, tls. 4,392,064; green brick tea, tls. 2,083,641; tea tablet, tls. 254,958; tea dust, tls. 1028; sheep's wool, tls. 4,847,015; chinaware, tls. 1,579,204, etc. In 1906, 87,949 steamers (70,117,628 tons), and 120,598 sailing vessels (5,702,260 tons), in all 208,547 vessels (75,819,888 tons) entered and cleared Chinese ports, of which Chinese shipping vessels (foreign type) numbered 45,847 (12,212,373 tons), Chinese junks 93,457 (3,974,378 tons), British 28,192 (33,450,560 tons), Japanese 25,108 (11,376,430 tons), French 5514 (3,125,749 tons), German 6315 (7,477,518 tons), American 582 (1,351,200 tons), Norwegian 1978 (1,616,460 tons), Portuguese 976 (183,908 tons), Danish 108 (172,826 tons), Swedish 75 (65,992 tons), etc.

Treaty Ports.—I. Northern Ports: (1) New-chwang, Sheng-king province, Manchuria, in accordance with British Treaty of T'ien-tsin, 1858; custom office opened 9 May, 1864; Chinese population 74,000. (2) Ching-wang-tao, Chi-li, in accordance with imperial decree, 31 March, 1898; opened 15 Dec., 1901; Chinese population, 5,000. (3) T'ien-tsin, Chi-li, in accordance with British and French Peking Conventions, 1860, opened May, 1861; Chinese population, 750,000. (4) Che-fu, Shan-tung, in accordance with British and French treaties of T'ien-tsin, 1858; opened March, 1862; Chinese population, 100,000. (5) Kiao-chou, Shan-tung, German Convention, 6 March, 1898; opened 1 July, 1899. II. Yang-tze Ports: (6) Ch'ung-k'ing, Sze-ch'wan; opened Nov., 1890; Chinese population, 702,000. (7) I-ch'ang, Hu-pe, in accordance with Che-fu Convention, 1876; opened 1 April, 1877; Chinese population, 50,000. (8) Sha-shi, Hu-pe, Treaty of Shimoneseki, 1895; opened 1 Oct., 1896; Chinese population, 85,000. (9) Chang-sha, Hu-nan; opened 1 July, 1904; Chinese population, 230,000. (10) Yo-chou, Hu-nan, imperial decree of 31 March, 1898; opened 13 Nov., 1899; Chinese population, 20,000. (11) Han-kou, Hu-pe, provincial regulations, 1861; opened Jan., 1862; Chinese population, 530,000. (12) Kiu-kiang, Kiang-si; same regulations; opened Jan., 1862; Chinese population, 36,000. (13) Wu-hu, Ngan-hwei, Che-fu Convention, 1876; opened 1 April, 1877; Chinese population, 123,000. (14) Nan-king, Kiang-su, French Treaty of T'ien-tsin, 1858; opened 1 May, 1899; Chinese population, 261,000. (15) Chin-kiang, Kiang-su, British Treaty, 1858; opened April, 1861; Chinese population, 170,000. III. Central Ports: (16) Shanghai, Kiang-su, Nan-king Treaty, 1842; opened officially 17 Nov., 1843; Chinese population, 651,000. (17) Su-chou, Kiang-su, Shimonoseki Treaty; opened 26 Sept., 1896; Chinese population, 500,000. (18) Hang-chou. Che-kiang, Shimonoseki Treaty; opened 26 Sept., 1896; Chinese population, 350,000. (19) Ning-po, Che-kiang, Nan-king Treaty, 1842; opened May, 1861; Chinese population, 260,000. (20) Wen-chou, Che-kiang, Che-fu Convention, 1876; opened April, 1877; Chinese population, 80,000. IV. South Coast Ports: (21) San-tuao, Fu-kien, imperial decree of 31 March, 1898; opened 1 May, 1899; Chinese population, 8000. (22) Fu-chou, Fu-kien, Nan-king Treaty, 1842; opened July, 1861; Chinese population, 624,000. (23) Amoy, Fu-kien, Nan-king Treaty, 1842; opened April, 1862; Chinese population, 114,000. (24) Swatow, Kwang-tung, English, French, and American Treaties of T'ien-tsin, 1858; opened Jan., 1860; Chinese population, 65,000. (25) Canton, Kwang-tung, Nan-king Treaty, 1842; opened Oct., 1859; Chinese population, 900,000. (26) Kow-loon, Kwang-tung; opened April, 1887; (27) Lappa, Kwang-tung; opened 27 June, 1871; (28) Kong-moon, Kwang-tung; opened 7 March, 1904; Chinese population, 55,000. (29) San-shui, Kwang-tung, Anglo-Chinese Convention, 4 Feb., 1897; opened 4 June, 1897; Chinese population, 5000. (30) Wu-chou, Kwang-si, same convention; opened 4 June, 1897; Chinese population, 59,000. (31) Kiung-chou (Hoi-hou), Hai-nan, Kwang-tung, French and English Treaties of T'ien-tsin, 1858; opened April, 1876; Chinese population, 38,000. (32) Pak-hoi, Kwang-tung, Che-fu Convention, 1876; opened April, 1877; Chinese population, 20,000. V. Frontier Ports: (33) Lung-chou, Kwang-si, French Treaty, 26 June, 1887; opened 1 June, 1899; Chinese population, 12,000. (34) Meng-tze, Yun-nan, French Treaty, 1887; opened 30 April, 1889; Chinese population, 15,000. (35) Sze-mao, Yun-nan, French Convention, 1895; British, 1896; opened 2 Jan., 1897; Chinese population, 15,000. (36) Teng-yueh or Momein, Yun-nan, Convention of 4 Feb., 1897; opened 8 May, 1902; Chinese population, 10,000. (37) Ya-tung, Tibet; opened 1 May, 1894.

As yet, Nan-ning, Kwang-si, opened by imperial decree, 3 Feb., 1899, has not a custom office. According to the customs statistics (1906), 6,917,000 Chinese inhabit the treaty ports. The foreign population include 1837 firms and 38,597 persons (Americans 3447, British 9256, Japanese 15,548, French 2189, Germans 1939, Portuguese 3184, Italians 786, Spaniards 389, Belgians 297, Austrians 236, Russians 273, Danes 209, Dutch 225, Brazilians 16, Koreans 47, Norwegians 185, Swedes 135, subjects of non-treaty powers 236).

Railways.—The first railroad was built in 1876, from Wu-sung to Shanghai, but was purchased by the Chinese and taken by them to Formosa in 1877. The following is a list of the railways completed and under construction at the end of 1906: in Manchuria (1) from Irkutsk through Manchuria, Harbin, Pogranichaya to Vladivostock, 925 miles; (2) from Harbin to Kwang-cheng-tze (not completed), 147 miles; (3) from Kwang-cheng-tze through Mukden, Sinmin-fu, Liao-yang, New-chwang, Talien, to Port Arthur, 481 miles (in addition to 36 miles under construction); (4) from Mukden to Antung (narrow gauge), 187 miles under construction; (5) from Kow-pangtze to Sin-min-fu, 70 miles. Chi-li and Manchuria: Peking through T'ien-tsin, Shan-hai-kwan, Kow-pang-tze, to New-chwang, 600 miles. Chi-li: Peking to Tung-chou, 13 miles. Chi-li and Mongolia: Peking through Nan-kou, to Kalgan, 33 miles (in addition to 92 miles under construction). Chi-li, Ho-nan, and Hu-pe: Peking, through Pao-ting-fu, Cheng-ting, Wei-hwei, Cheng-chou to Han-kou, 754 miles. Ho-nan: Tao-kou, through Wei-hwei, to Ching-hwa, 93 miles. Chi-li and Shan-si: Cheng-ting to Tai-yuan-fu, 87 miles (in addition to 68 under construction). Ho-nan:

THE FIVE ECCLESIASTICAL REGIONS
OF THE

CHINESE EMPIRE

(The Chung Kwo of the Chinese)

Containing one Diocese, 38 Vicariates Apostolic, 4 Prefectures Apostolic and one Mission. (The extent of the country shown here only covers the Shi-pa-sheng of the Chinese, or the Land of the 18 Provinces.)

AND THE VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF

KOREA

N. B. Seats of Vicariates or Prefectures Apostolic are underscored in red. Names of the 38 Free-Ports (1907) underscored in black dotted line. Names of capitals of Provinces are underscored in heavy and fine black line. The date underneath a town denotes the year of the establishment of the Catholic Mission at that place.

The Chinese designations of fu (1st order), chou (2d order), hien (3d order), at the end of a town name have been left off on this map, the circle mark replacing them, thus: fu (1st order): ⊙ chou (2d order): ⊙ hien (3d order): ○ other places thus: • capitals of countries thus: ⊛

The Great Wall (Wan-li-ch'ang-ch'eng) shown thus: ~~~~ The Palisade: ○-○-○-○ The Imperial Canal: ~~~~ Cables: ———

Seat of Bishopric: ‡
Seat of Vicariate Apostolic: ‡
Seat of Prefecture Apostolic: ‡

FIRST REGION

All names enumerated are Vicariates Apostolic unless otherwise stated.

Name of the Diocese, Vicariate, or Prefecture Apostolic.	Seat of Diocese, Vicariate, or Prefecture Apostolic
1 Northern Manchuria.	Kirin.
2 Southern Manchuria.	Mukden.
3 Eastern Mongolia.	Sung-hiu-tsoei-tze.
4 Central Mongolia.	Si-wan-tze.
5 So. Western Mongolia	San-tao-ho-tze.
6 Eastern Chili.	Yung-ping.
7 Northern Chili.	Peking.
8 South Western Chili.	Cheng-king.
9 South Eastern Chili.	Chang-kia-chwang.
10 Northern Ho-nan.	Wei-hwei

SECOND REGION

11 Eastern Shan-tung.	Che-fu.
12 Northern Shan-tung.	Tsi-nan.
13 Southern Shan-tung	Yen-chou.
14 Northern Shan-si.	Tai-yuan.
15 Southern Shan-si.	Lu-ngan.
16 Northern Shen-si.	Kao-lin (near Si-ngan-fu).
17 Southern Shen-si.	Ku-lu-pa.
18 Northern Kan-su.	Liang-chou.
19 Pr. Ap. S'thern Kan-su	Tsin-chou.
20 Ili Mission, Prov. of Sin-kiang (near Russian Turkestan)	Kuldja.

THIRD REGION

21 Kiang-nan (Ngan-hwei, and Kiang-su)	Shanghai.
22 Southern Ho-nan	Nan-yang.
23 Pr. Ap. West'n Ho-nan	Siang-cheng.
24 Eastern Hu-pe.	Wu-ch'ang.
25 North Western Hu-pe	Lao-ho-k'ou.
26 South Western Hu-pe	I-chang.
27 Northern Hu-nan	She-men (near Li-chu)
28 Southern Hu-nan	Sean-sa-van (near Heng-chou)
29 Northern Kiang-si	Kiu-kiang.
30 Eastern Kiang-si	Fu-chou.
31 Southern Kiang-si	Ki-ngan.
32 Che-kiang	Ning-po.

FOURTH REGION

33 Eastern Sze-ch'wan	Ch'ung-k'ing.
34 N. W. Sze-ch'wan	Ch'eng-tu.
35 Southern Sze-ch'wan.	Sui-fu.
36 Tibet	Ta-tsien-lu.
37 Yun-nan	Yun-nan.
38 Kwei-chou	Kwei-yang.

FIFTH REGION

39 Fu-kien	Fu-chou.
40 Amoy (incl. Formosa)	Amoy.
41 Pr. Ap. Kwang-tung.	Canton.
42 Hong-Kong	Hong-Kong.
43 Diocese of Macao (Suffragan of Archdiocese of Goa, India. Supported by the Portuguese Government)	Macao.
44 Pr. Ap. Kwang-si	Nan-ning.

KOREA

45 Korea	Seoul.

NOTE.—The spelling of Chinese and Korean names—which every language attempts to interpret phonetically—is here given in English sound-equivalents.

COPYRIGHT, 1908, BY ROBERT APPLETON CO.

Longitude 112 East 114 from 116 Greenwich 118 120 122 124 126 128 130
MONGOLIA
Dolon-nor (Lama-miao)
Nishang
Si-wan-tze
Kalgan
Ta-tung
Hun-yuen
Ying
Peking
Tu-shi-kou
Sien-hien
Tsin-hwa
Yung-ping
Tientsin
Taku
Pao-ting
Ngan
Cheng-ting
Chang-kia-chwang
Tai-yuan
Ping-ting
Shun-te
Kwang-ping
Ta-ming
Chang-te
Wei-hwei
Tsao-chou
Kai-feng
Ho-nan
Siang-cheng
Nan-yang
Si-chwan
Shu-ning
Ying-chou
Feng-yang
Nanking
Taiping
Li-chou
Lu-ngan
Ngan-lu
Te-ngan
Wu-ch'ang
Han-kou
Hwang-chou
Ngan-king
Hang-chou
Kiu-kiang
Yo-chou
I-ning
Siang-yin
Chang-sha
Siang-tan
Yuen-chou
Sean-sa-fan
Ki-ngan
Kien-chang
Kien-ning
Fu-chou
Shao-wu
Yen-ping
Ning-hwa
Kan-chou
Ting-chou
Nan-ngan
Nan-sung
Shao-chou
Lien-ping
Chao-chou
Canton
Macao
Hong-Kong
Kwei-chou
Ping-lo
Chao-king
Fa-chan
Sin-hing
Yang-kiang
Chang-chwan-shan (St. John I.)
Chi-feng
Kwang-ling
Chao-yang
Sung-hiu-tsoei-tze
Kien-chang
Cheng-te (Shehol)
Kin-chou
Palisades
Mukden
Feng-tien
Liao-yang
Hai-cheng
Ta-tse-shan
Port New-chwang
Ning-yuen
Shan-hai-kwan
Gulf of Liao-tung
Kwang-tung
Lo-ting
Port Adams
Elliot Is.
Korea Bay
Chin-nam-chen
Port Arthur (Ryojun)
Dalni (Japanese)
Che-fu (Yen-tai)
Wei-hai-wei (Brit.)
Teng-chou
Hwang
Fu-shan
Ning-hai
Yung-cheng
Gulf of Chi-li
Lai-chou
Tsing-chou
Kiao-chou
Tsi-nan
Wu-ting
Ping-yuen
Tung-chang
Tai-ngan
Yen-chou
Tsi-ning
I-chou
Tsing-tao
Kiao-chou Bay (German)
Yellow Sea (Hwang-hai)
Hwai-ngan
Yen-cheng
Kao-yu
Tai
Shu-kiao
Yang-chou
Tung
Mouths of Yang-tze
Shanghai
Sung-kiang
Kia-hsing
Hu-chau
Ning-po
Ting-hai
Chusan Archipelago
Hang-chou Bay
Shao-hsing
Chu-ki
Yen-chou
Kin-hwa
Kiu-chou
Tai-chou
Chu-chou
Kwang-hsin
Lung-tsuen
Yen-ho
Pung-yang
Wen-chou
Fu-ning
Fu-chou
Sing-hwa
Ting-chou
Yung-chun
Lung-yen
Sean-chou
Amoy (Sia-men)
Pescadores Is.
Formosa Strait
Taiwan (Formosa) (Japan)
Taihoku
Takao
Liu-kiu Is.
Japan Sea
Korea
Chemulpo
Seoul
Chemulpo Bay
Hong-chu
Kong-chu
Kyeng-chu
Tai-ku
Chin-chu
Fusan
Tsu Shima
Archipelago
Quelpart I. (Che-chu)
Gotoshima
Nagasaki
Japan
Eastern Chinese Sea (Tung-hai)
Cables
Scales
0 50 100 200 300
English Statute Miles
0 100 200 300 400 500
Kilometers
Siberia
Statute Miles
Nerchinsk
Shilka R.
Argun R.
Albasin
Kumara R.
Blagovesh-chensk
Khabarovsk
Amur River
Khailar
Tsitsikar
Ho-lung-kiang
Sansing
Harbin
Kirin
Mongolia
Gobi
Eastern Gobi
Liaotung Peninsula
Port Arthur (Ryojun)
Dalni (Japanese)
Yellow Sea
Latitude 120 East from 12 Greenwich Long
THE MATTHEWS-NORTHRUP WORKS, BUFFALO, N. Y. THE COMPLETE PRESS.
112 114 116 118 120

Kai-feng, through Cheng-chou, to Ho-nan-fu, 41 miles (in addition to 75 miles under construction). Shan-tung: Tsing-chou, through Tsi-nan, to Po-shan, 270 miles; Hwang-tai-kiao to Lo-kou, 4 miles. Kiang-su: Shanghai, through Su-chou, Chin-kiang, to Nan-king, 90 miles (in addition to 113 miles under construction). Che-kiang: Hang-chou City to Hang-chou Settlement, 3 miles, under construction. In Kiang-si and Hu-nan: Yuen-chou to Shui-chou, 64 miles. Kwang-tung: Swatow to Chao-chou-fu, 25 miles; Kung-yik through Sun-ning, to Sam-ka-hoi, 55 miles under construction; Canton to Sam-shui, 30 miles. Kwang-tung, Hu-nan, and Hu-pe: Canton, through Chang-sha, to Han-kou, 720 miles. Yun-nan: Ho-kou, through Meng-tze to Yun-nan-fu, 19 miles (in addition to 273 under construction).

Projected Railways.—Han-kou to Ch'eng-tu via Ch'ung-k'ing; Su-chou to Hang-chou and Ning-po; Chang-sha to Chenn-chou-fu; Shanghai to Kia-sing; Amoy to Yen-ping, Tsean-chou-fu, Fu-chou-fu; Singan-fu to Tung-kwan (Shen-si); Tai-yuan-fu to Ping-yang-fu (Shan-si); Tse-chou to Tao-kou; Ta-tung-fu to Kalgan; T'ien-tsin to Te-chou and Chin-kiang; Canton to Kow-loon; Wu-hu to Kwang-te-chou (Ngan-hwei); Canton to Amoy; Canton to Kan-chou (Kiang-si); Chenn-chou-fu to Chang-te (Northern Hunan); Heng-chou-fu to Yung-chou-fu (Hu-nan); Tung-kwan to Pu-chou-fu (Shen-si, Shan-si); Kiukiang to Nan-chang (Kiang-si); Sin-ning to Yung-kiang (Kwang-tung); Kalgan to Kulun (Mongolia); Lan-chou-fu to Ili (Sin-kiang).

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.—Measures of length: one foot (chih), 14⅔ inches = 10 tsun; 1 tsun = 10 fen; 10 feet = 1 chang; 10 chang = 1 yu. One li = 360 kung or 867 yards. The land measures are the mao (mow) = 240 pu or 26.73 sq. ft.; 100 mao = one k'ing or 16.7 acres. The t'ou = 10 cheng or 2.269 gallons. Measures of weight: The tan or picul = 100 kin or catties = 133⅓ lbs.; 1 kin (pound or catty) = 16 taels or 1⅓ lb.; 1 tael (ounce or liang) = 24 chou or 1⅓ oz.; 1 liang = 10 tsien; 1 tsien = 10 fen; 1 fen = 10 li. Money: 1 tael or liang = 10 tsien (mace); 1 mace = 10 fen (candareen); 1 candareen = 10 li or cash (in French *sapèque*). The tael is a weight of silver which varies considerably in value; in 1906 the Haikwan tael, in which the custom revenues and all values are given, was equivalent to 2.46 Indian rupees, 1.60 Japanese yen, Mexican $1.54, English 3s. 3½d., U. S. $0.80. Chinese lump silver, called *sycee* (fine silk), is made into ingots resembling in shape a shoe. The silver experts are called *shroff*.

CALENDAR.—The common year has twelve lunar months. In a period of 19 years there are seven intercalary years, each of 13 months. Years are reckoned either from the beginning of the reign of the emperor, or from their place in the cycle of 60 years. The sexagenary cycle was devised by Ta-nao, Minister of Hwang-ti, the sixty-first year of whose reign (2637 B. C.) was taken for the first cyclical sign. A common civil year consists of 354 or 355 days, and the intercalary year of from 383 to 385 days. Since the time of Emperor K'ang-hi the day is divided into 96 *k'o*, or quarters, sub-divided into 15 *fen*, or minutes, the minute into 60 *miao*, or seconds, each second into 60 *wei;* these in turn are divided into 12 *shih*, subdivided into 2 *siao-shi* (*ch'u* and *cheng*).

SOCIAL LIFE.—The family name of a Chinaman is *sing*. China is called *Pe-kia-sing*, the "hundred families". The prenomen is *ming-tze;* the Christian name *sheng-ming;* the name given to children by parents *nai-ming;* the official name *kwan-ming*. An emperor, besides his personal name, has a title as a ruler *nien-hao*, and a dynastic title or posthumous name *miao-hao;* some of the emperors have had several *nien-hao*. Thus *Hiuan-yi* was the personal name of the emperor, whose *nien-hao* (period) was K'ang-hi, and his *miao-hao* was Sheng Tsu.

The marriage ceremonies include the visit to the prospective bride's father and brother by an intermediary (*mei-jin*) sent by the prospective bridegroom's father and brother to inquire her name, which is to be examined by the horoscope; if the horoscope be auspicious, the *mei-jin* is sent to make an offer of marriage which, if accepted, is confirmed in writing; presents are sent to the parents of the bride; a lucky day is selected for the wedding, and the bridegroom sends some of his friends to bring the bride to his house. The seven valid grounds for divorce are: talkativeness, wantonness, theft, barrenness, disobedience to a husband's parents, jealousy, and inveterate infirmity; to these infidelity has been added.

The burial ceremonies are more or less varied, short or long according to the wealth of the deceased, and the dead are buried in graves. The graves of the Ming emperors at Nan-king and in Mongolia are famous. The emperors of the present dynasty are buried in Chi-li in mausoleums called *Tung-ling* and *Si-ling;* their ancestors rest at Mukden. The period of mourning for a father is three years, which is reduced in practice to twenty-seven months. White is the mourning colour in China; it is blue for the emperor, and the seals are inked blue instead of vermilion.

The main food is rice (*fan*), and as it does not grow in Northern China, great quantities are transported from the southern provinces and Cochin-China. Among Chinese delicacies are birds' nests (*Yen-wo*), nests of the *collocalia brevirostris*, which are made of a sea-weed (*gelidium*); dried shark's fins, black or white (*pe-yu-chi* or *he-yu-chi*); bêche-de-mer (*Hai-san*); preserved eggs (*pi-tan, sung-hwa-tan*). The Chinese use a great deal of oil (*hiang-yu*) extracted from the *sesamum orientale*, the *Arachis hypogœa*, or the *Brassica sinensis*. The Chinese drink tea (*cha*) and fermented liquors (*sam-shoo* and others). They eat with small wooden or ivory sticks, called chopsticks (*kwai-tze*); they know the use of the fork (*cha-tze*), the spoon (*piao-keng*), and the knife (*tao*).

FESTIVALS.—The first day of the first moon (*Yuan-tan*) or New Year's Day, is the occasion of great festivity. Houses are decorated with paper flowers and small strips of gilt and red paper; debts are paid, and accounts are settled. The first full moon of the year is the Feast of Lanterns (*Shang-yuan-tsieh*), when lanterns of various forms, colours, and materials are suspended before each door. The fifth day of the fifth moon is the Feast of the Dragon's Boats (*T'ien-chung-sieh*), instituted in the memory of the statesman K'iu Yuan, who drowned himself in the river Mi-lo, an affluent of the Tung-ting lake, in the fourth century B. C. Other festivals are those of the village gods (*T'u-ti-tan*), of the god of literature (*Wen-ch'ang-tan*), of Sakyamuni, Kwan-yn, Confucius, etc.

On 9 Oct., 1907, an imperial edict was issued in Peking, ordering the Board of Revenues and Commerce forthwith to introduce a uniform system of weights and measures throughout the Chinese Empire, the standards to be fixed within six months.

GENERAL.—For a complete bibliography see CORDIER, *Bibliotheca Sinica. Dict. bibliog. des ouvrages relatifs à l'empire chinois* (Paris, 1878–85); RICHARD, *Comprehensive Geography of the Chinese Empire and Dependencies*, tr. KENNELLY (Shanghai, 1908). DE MENDOÇA, *Hist. de las cosas mas notables . . . del gran Reyno de la China* (Rome, 1585); SEMEDO, *Imperio de la China* (Madrid, 1642); MAGAILLANS, *Nouv. relation de la Chine* (Paris, 1688); LE COMTE, *Nouv. mémoires sur l'état présent de la Chine* (Paris, 1696); DU HALDE, *Descrip. géog. . . . de l'empire de la Chine* (Paris, 1735); *Mémoires concernant l'histoire, les sciences, les arts . . . . des chinois* (Paris, 1776–1814); GROSIER, *Descrip. générale de la Chine* (Paris, 1818–20); DAVIS, *The Chinese* (London, 1857); WILLIAMS, *The Middle Kingdom* (London, 1883); RICHTHOFEN, *China* (Berlin, 1877); GRAY, *China: A History of the Laws, Manners*, etc. (1878); MAYERS, *The Chinese Government* (Shanghai, 1878); IDEM,

Treaties between the Empire of China and Foreign Powers (Shanghai, 1877); GILES, *A Glossary of References on Subjects Connected with the Far East* (Hong-Kong, 1886); YULE, *Hobson-Jobson* (London, 1886).

THE CHINESE PEOPLE AND LANGUAGE.—LEGENDRE, *Deux années au Setchouen* (Paris, 1906, xliv, 433-74); SMITH, *Chinese Characteristics* (New York, 1903); DOUGLAS, *Society in China* (London, 1895); BARD, *Les chinois chez eux* (Paris, 1900); KIONG, *Politesse chinoise* (Shanghai, 1906); HOANG, *Le mariage chinois* (Shanghai, 1898); VIAL, *L'esprit et le cœur chez les Lolos* in *Annales des Missions-Etrangères* (Paris, 1905); 129 sq.; CAVALERIE, *Chez les Chouy-kia, Ibid.* (1889), 101–07; IDEM, *Les Miaotse et les Tchongkia, Ibid.* (1904), 332–57; LIÉTARD, *Les A-Djè et les Lou-Ou, Ibid.* (1904), 74 sq.; JEREMIASSEN, *Loi Aborigines of Hainan and their Speech* in *China Rev.*, XX, 296–305; GILMAN, *The Aborigines of Hainan, Ibid.*, XXV, 247–51; SCHÆFFER, *The Lois or Aborigines of Hainan* in *East of Asia Magazine* (1904), III, 46–50; COLQUHOUN AND STEWART-LOCKHART, *The Aborigines of Formosa* in *China Review*, XIII, 200–07; WATTERS, *Essays on the Chinese Language* (Shanghai, 1889); WILLIAMS, *Syllabic Dictionary of the Chinese Language* (Shanghai); VOLPICELLI, *Chinese Phonology* (Shanghai, 1896); MÖLLENDORF, *Classification of the Chinese Dialects* (Shanghai, 1896); DOUGLAS, *China* (London, 1882), xviii, xix, 330–400; DE HARLEZ, *Le Yih-king* (Paris, 1890); LEGGE, *The Chinese Classics with Critical and Exegetical Notes* (Oxford, 1893); JENNINGS, *The Shi-king, or Old Poetry Classic of the Chinese* (London, 1891); ZOTTOLI, *Cursus Litteraturæ Sinicæ* (Shanghai, 1879—); PIRY, *Manuel de la langue Mandarine* (Shanghai, 1895); COUVREUR, *Dict. classique de la langue chinoise* (Ho-kien-fu, 1904); IDEM, *Guide to Conversation in French, English and Chinese* (Ho-kien-fu, 1906).

GOVERNMENT.—HOANG, *Mélanges sur l'administration: Variétés Sinologiques* (Shanghai, 1902); DOUGLAS, *Society in China* (London, 1895), i, 1–31, ii, 32–63; BOULGER, *A Short History of China* (London, 1893), xxii, 356–73; COLQUHOUN, *China in Transformation* (London, 1898), vii, 167–98; PARKER, *China, her History, Diplomacy and Commerce* (London, 1901), viii, 161–81; IDEM, *China Past and Present* (London, 1903), IV, 128–58, VI, 223–52; SMITH, *China from Within* (London, 1901), ii, 7–16, vi, 45–59; JERNIGAN, *China's Business Methods and Policy* (Shanghai, 1904); IDEM, *China in Law and Commerce* (New York, 1905); LEROY-BEAULIEU, *The Awakening of the East* (London, 1900).

EDUCATION.—ZI, *Pratique des examens littéraires* (Shanghai, 1894); IDEM, *Pratique des examens militaires* (Shanghai, 1896); TOBAR, *La réforme des études en Chine* in *Etudes*, 5 Dec., 1903; PARKER, *John Chinaman* (London, 1901), ix, 197–200; IDEM, *Educational Curriculum of the Chinese* in *China Rev.*, IX, 1–13; D'OLLONE, *La Chine novatrice et guerrière* (Paris, 1906), ii, 162–68, 280–84; MARTIN, *Chinese Education, Philosophy and Letters* (New York, 1898); GEE, *The Educational Directory for China* (Shanghai, 1905).

RELIGIONS.—DE HARLEZ, *Les religions de la Chine* (Leipzig, 1891); GODARD, *Les croyances chinoises et japonaises* (Paris, 1901); DE GROOT, *The Religious System of China* (Leyden, Amsterdam, 1894–1904); HAMPDEN, *Dragon, Image and Demon* (New York, 1887); STANLEY, *China from Within* (London, 1901), ch. xii, 172–89; CORNABY, *China under the Searchlight* (London, 1901), ch. ix; PARKER, *China Past and Present* (London, 1905), iii, 80–127.

MISSIONS.—NÈVE, *Etablissement et destruction de la première chrétienté en Chine* (Louvain, 1846); DABRY DE THIERSANT, *Le catholicisme en Chine au VIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1877); D'OLLONE, *La Chine novatrice et guerrière* (Paris, 1906), iii, 112–14, vi, 132–53; ROHRBACHER, *Hist. univ. de l'église cath.* (Paris, 1857), X, 179–84, XI, 61–73; PARKER, *The Earliest Christianity in China* in *Dublin Rev.* (1902), 380–404; IDEM, *China and Religion* (London, 1905), vi, 120–38, ix, 178–208; HENRION, *Hist. générale des missions cath. depuis le XIII^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, 1847); YULE, *The Book of Marco Polo the Venetian, Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East* (London, 1875); CORDIER, *Les voyages en Asie au XIV^e siècle du B. Frère Odoric de Pordenone* (Paris, 1891); HUC, *Le Christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie et au Tibet* (Paris, 1857–58), tr. HAZLITT (London, 1857, New York, 1887); MARSHALL, *Christian Missions, Their Agents, Methods and Results* (London, 1862); CORDIER, *Relations de la Chine avec les puissances étrangères* (Paris, 1901); PARKER, *The Preaching of the Gospel in China* in *China Rev.* (1889), Vol. XVIII, 152–77; FINK, *The Sicawei Observatory* in *East of Asia Magazine* (1902), I, 350–77; KANNENGEISER, *Missions cath.* (Paris, 1900); EDKINS, *Religion in China* (London, 1905), xiv, 166–77; ROY, *Hist. abrégée des missions cath. depuis le XV^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (Tours, 1855); PIOLET, *Les missions cath. françaises* (Paris, 1904), III; LOUVET, *Les missions cath. au XIX^e siècle* (Lille, Paris, 1895), xii, 215–34; VICTOR BERNARDIN DE ROUEN, *Hist. univ. des missions franciscaines* (Paris, 1898), I, II; LAUNAY, *Hist. de la Société des Missions-Etrangères* (Paris, 1896); LAUNAY, *La mission du Koang-si* (Paris, 1903); REYNAUD, *Another China* (Dublin, 1897); LEROY, *En Chine, au Tché-li S. E.* (Lille, 1900); PALÂTRE, *La mission du Kiang-nan: son hist. et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1900); CASARTELLI, *Catholic Missions* (London, 1891); FAUVEL, *Nos missionaires, patriotes et savantes* (Paris, 1900); MICHIE, *Political Obstacles to Missionary Success in China* (Hong-Kong, 1901).

HISTORY.—TSCHEPE, *Hist. du royaume de Tch'ou (Ch'u State, B. C. 1122–223)* (Shanghai, 1903); IDEM, *Hist. du royaume de Ts'in (Ts'in State B. C. 909–206)* in *Rev. de l'Extrême-Orient* (1900–02), and *Echo de Chine* (1904–05); TERRIEN DE LA COUPERIE, *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilisation* (London, 1894); HAWKS-POTT, *A Sketch of Chinese History* (Shanghai, 1903); CORDIER, *L'expedition de Chine de 1857–58* (Paris, 1905); IDEM, *L'expedition de Chine de 1860* (Paris, 1906); BOULGER, *The Life of Gordon* (London, 1896); D'ANTHOUARD, *Les Boxeurs* (Paris, 1902); MONNIER, *Le drame chinois (Juillet-Août, 1900)* (Paris, 1900); COLQUHOUN, *China in Transformation* (London, 1898).

FOREIGN RELATIONS.—CORDIER, *La France en Chine au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1883); IDEM, *Centenaire de Marco Polo* (Paris, 1896); IDEM, *Hist. des relations de la Chine avec les puissances occidentales (1860–1902)* (Paris, 1903); PARKER, *China's Intercourse with Europe* (London, 1890); MONTALTO DE JESUS, *Historic Macao* (Hong-Kong, 1902); KRAUSSE, *The Far East* (London, 1903), ii, 15–34, iii, 35–57; MCCARTHY, *The Coming Power: A Contemporary History of the Far East (1898–1905)* (London, 1906); NORMAN, *The Peoples and Politics of the Far East* (London, 1895); CURZON, *Problems of the Far East* (London, 1896), ix, 260–310, xiv, 413–28.

TRADE AND CUSTOMS.—EDKINS, *The Revenue and Taxation of the Chinese Empire* (Shanghai, 1903); HOSIE, *Foreign Trade of China for the Years 1904–1905* (Foreign Office, 1906); CORDIER, *Les douanes impériales maritimes chinoises. Les origines et le développement* (T'ung-pao, 1906); PARKER, *Chinese Revenue* (N. C. B. R. A. Soc., 1895); IDEM, *China, her History, Diplomacy and Commerce* (London, 1901), x, 195-208, xi, 209-26, xii, 227-43; DYER, *Things Chinese* (Shanghai, 1903).

HENRI CORDIER.

Chinese Rites. See CHINA; RICCI, MATTEO.

Chinooks, an aboriginal tribe of the extreme northwest of the United States, which might be adduced as an instance of the baneful effects of our civilization on a people not prepared for it by the influence of religion. Its habitat was the basin of the lower Columbia, from the Dalles to its mouth, except a small area of land on the south bank of the river occupied by a Déné tribe. The family was divided into the Lower and the Upper Chinooks, and they all lived in large houses of wood, each containing several families and forming villages situated, as a rule, on the north side of the Columbia and Willamette rivers. Each village was presided over by a chief, who was independent of all outside influence. A few of these head men attained wealth and enjoyed a consideration unusual among savages. The most prominent of them within historical times was Comcomly, who received the Lewis and Clarke expedition. According to Father De Smet, this man, when at the height of his power, was preceded by 300 slaves whenever he visited Fort Vancouver, "and he used to carpet the ground that he had to traverse, from the main entrance of the fort to the governor's door, several hundred feet, with beaver and otter skins" (Chittenden and Richardson, Life, Letters, and Travels of Father Pierre Jean De Smet, New York, 1905, II, 443). The staple food of the Chinooks was salmon, with a few roots and berries. These people were great traders and, as most maritime races, they used to barter with the interior tribes the objects obtained from white skippers. It seems that even before the advent of the whites on their coast, they were famous for their commercial excursions, which they accomplished in their beautiful high-prowed canoes, reaching as far as Nootka Sound, on Vancouver Island. A stray member of the tribe has been met in the very centre of British Columbia and another at Wrangel, Alaska. These expeditions, bringing into contact people of different tongues, called for a means of communication which was provided in the shape of a jargon originally made up of Chinook and Nootkan words more or less disfigured according to the nationality of the speaker. To this was added, after the coming of the whites, a considerable number of French and English terms, until it became an intertribal idiom of the greatest use to trader and missionary alike.

The Chinooks were somewhat taller than the generality of the coast tribes. They were universally addicted to the custom of deforming the heads of their infants, through the agency of a board secured to the top of the cradle and pressing down the forehead and occiput. Their character was none of the best. Proud and haughty, their notions of honesty, at least as applied to their relations with strangers,

were at best rather hazy, and the readiness with which their females fell preys to unprincipled whites does not speak well of their consideration for chastity. Practically their first contact with the whites dates from the visit of Captains Lewis and Clarke in 1805. Their numbers were then estimated at no less than 16,000. Though their first intercourse with the strangers was of a peaceful nature, they lost no opportunity later on to pilfer from the Astorian traders who established themselves among them in 1812. In 1829, however, their arrogance was somewhat curbed by the visitation of an epidemic which carried off four-fifths of their entire population.

Through the French Canadians in the employ of the Pacific Fur Company, they had heard of the Christian religion; and the Rev. F. N. Blanchet (later Archbishop of Oregon City) even tells us that "very old crucifixes were found among them" when first visited by the Catholic priests (Mémoire présenté à la S. Congrégation de la Propagande, p. 12). This was in 1838, when, accompanied by the Rev. M. Demers (later Bishop of the Diocese of Vancouver) he arrived in the valley of the lower Columbia. The Chinooks who, by this time, had acquired most of the vices of the whites, did not show any particular enthusiasm for the creed of the missionaries. On the other hand, the latter were too few, and they had to limit their ministrations to the French Canadians with their large half-breed families, and to such of the natives as were sufficiently well disposed. Occasionally, however, some Chinooks would come to see them at Fort Vancouver, more out of curiosity than through a desire for instruction. In 1839 Father Demers speaks of "their abominable lives", and it was only the following year (1840) that he could visit them at their homes, which he reached on 22 May, as a band of Methodist preachers were landing at Astoria. During a stay of three weeks' duration, he instructed the adults and baptized the children, but they soon relapsed into indifference. In 1851 another special effort was made, with little success, to reclaim them from their degenerate condition. Gradually vice and disease further thinned their ranks, and it actually came to pass that the Lower Chinooks became extinct, while what remained of the upper part of the family, being scattered abroad, was soon more or less mixed with the neighbouring tribes and shared with them in the spiritual assistance proffered. To-day, there are not more than 300 Chinooks extant, who are found mostly on the Warm Springs, Yakima, and Grande Ronde reservations in Oregon.

De Smet, *Letters and Sketches* (Philadelphia, 1843); Duflot, de Mofras, *Exploration du territoire de l'Orégon* (Paris, 1844); Lewis and Clarke, *Hist. of the Expedition* (Toronto, s. d.); Demers, *Chinook Dictionary, Catechism, Prayers and Hymns* (Montreal, 1871).

A. G. Morice.

Chioggia (Chiozza), Diocese of (Clodiensis).—Chioggia is a sea-coast city in the province of Venice. It has an important harbour and extensive fisheries. In antiquity it was known as Fossa Clodia; in the Middle Ages as Clugia. In 452 it offered a safe refuge to the inhabitants of the neighbouring cities of Monselice and Este who fled before Attila. Later, however, it shared the political vicissitudes of that region, falling successively into the power of the Goths, the Lombards, and finally of Pepin, King of Italy, son of Charlemagne. During the tenth and eleventh centuries it became a republic. It was ruined and subjugated by the Genoese during their war with the Venetians, but was freed by the Venetian general Zeno (1378–81), and soon flourished under the rule of Venice. In 1106, Enrico Grancarolo, Bishop of the island of Malamocco, then nearly deserted, transferred his see to Chioggia. Other noteworthy bishops are: the Dominican Marco Medici (1578), a famous theologian at the Council of Trent, and his successor Gabriello Fiamma (1584), one of the greatest orators of his time. Cardinal Pietro Bembo was a canon of the cathedral. This cathedral is remarkable for its magnificent pulpit and baptistery. The Diocese of Chioggia is a suffragan of Venice; it has 93,500 inhabitants, 31 parishes, 2 religious houses for men and 11 for women.

Cappelletti, *Le chiese d'Italia*, X, 341–415; Bullo, *Della Cittadinanza di Chioggia*, etc., in *Archivio Veneto*, 1875–82.

U. Benigni.

Chios (Gr. Χίος, It. *Scio*, Turkish, *Sakiz Adassi*), one of the Sporades in the Ægean Sea, separated from the mainland of Asia Minor by a strait five miles wide in its narrowest part; also the chief town of this island. Its origin is lost in the remotest antiquity. In historical times it became a rich Ionian colony with a great navy, and took an important part in the Medic wars. Allied with Athens during the Peloponnesian War, it was conquered by Lacedæmon, wavered in allegiance between Philip of Macedon and the Persians, entered into an alliance with the Romans, and at last became a Roman possession (70 B. C.). Under the Byzantine Empire it was ravaged by the Arabs in the eighth century, and by the Turkish pirate, Tsachas, in 1089. The Venetians occupied it from the beginning of the thirteenth century till 1261, and the Genoese from 1346 to 1566, when it was conquered by Piali Pasha. Since then it has remained a Turkish possession, except for a short occupation by the Tuscans in 1595, and by the Venetians in 1694. In 1822, on the occasion of the Greek insurrection, 30,000 Greeks were killed or sold as slaves, and 20,000 fled from the island, most of them to Syros, where they built Hermopolis. On 22 March, 1881, a great earthquake afflicted the island. With some neighbouring islets Chios forms a sanjak of the archipelago vilayet. The population is said to be 60,000: 1500 Mussulmans, 400 Catholics, 250 Jews, and the rest Greeks. The town itself (Scio) has 15,000 inhabitants. Chios is a metropolitan see for the Greeks (see the episcopal list in Lequien, "Oriens Christianus", I, 931); they have several churches and schools, and a library. There is also a Latin bishopric, a suffragan of Naxos, which has three churches served by some ten priests. The religious are the Capuchins, Brothers of Christian Doctrine, and Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition, with schools. The list of Latin bishops since the fourteenth century is in Lequien, op. cit., II, 1062; more complete in Gams (448) and Eubel, I, 191; II, 141. The diocese also includes the island of Samos, with 100 Catholics, a church, and school conducted by Fathers of the African Missions from Lyons.

The fertile valleys of Chios are like vast orchards, in which grow oranges, lemons, and other fruits. The island also produces wine, mastic, resin of a lentiscus, used chiefly in perfuming the raki, turpentine, silk and cotton, wax, marble, and antimony. In extreme length the island is about thirty-two miles, north to south, and at its widest part eighteen, narrowing down to about eight miles. Chios is one of the sites that lay claim to the honour of Homer's birthplace; the Dascalopetra, or Homer's school, a rock where he is said to have taught, is still shown. Chios is also the birthplace of the tragic poet Ion, the historian Theopompus, the philosopher Metrodorus, and many artists; of the Catholics, Giustiniani, a defender of Constantinople in 1453, Allatius (q. v.), and Pepanos; the Greeks, Coresios, Coraïs, and others.

Cramer, *A Geogr. and Histor. Description of Asia Minor* (Oxford, 1832), II, 395–402; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.*, I, 609; Tozer, *The Islands of the Ægean* (Oxford, 1890), 139–156; Cuinet, *Turquie d'Asie*, I, 406; Giustiniani, *La Scio sacra del rito latino descritta* (1658); Blastos, *Chiaca, or History of the Island of Chios* (Gr.); Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyc.*, III, 2286–2297 (important bibliography); Houssaye, *l'Ile de Chio*, in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1881), XLVI, 82–103; Pernot, *En pays turc: l'île de Chio* (Paris, 1903).

S. Pétridès.

Chippewa Indians, the largest and most important tribe north of Mexico, numbering some 30,000 souls, about equally divided between the United States and Canada. The popular name is a corruption of Ojibwa, a name of uncertain etymology, but generally supposed to refer to the "puckered up" appearance of the seam along the front of the tribal moccasin. They call themselves *Anishinabag*, "original men", and on account of having formerly had their principal residence at Sault Sainte Marie, at the outlet of Lake Superior, they were known to the French as *Saulteurs*. The Ojibwa belong to the great Algonquian stock and are closely related to the Ottawa and the Cree. According to their own tradition they came from the east, advancing along the Great Lakes and had their first settlement in their present country at Sault Sainte Marie and at Shaugawaumikong (French *Chegoimegon*) on the southern shore of Lake Superior, about the present Lapointe or Bayfield, Wisconsin. Their first mention in history occurs in the "Jesuit Relation" for 1640. Through their friendship with the French traders they were able to procure guns and thus to prosecute most successfully their hereditary wars with the Sioux and Foxes on their west and south, with such result that the Sioux were driven out from the Upper Mississippi region, and the Foxes forced down from Northern Wisconsin and compelled to confederate with the Sauk. By the end of the eighteenth century the Ojibwa were the almost unchallenged owners of nearly all of the present Michigan, Northern Wisconsin, and Minnesota, including most of the Red River country and westward to the Turtle Mountains of North Dakota, together with the entire northern shores and drainage of Lakes Huron and Superior on the Canadian side. They have never been removed as have been so many other tribes, but by successive treaty sales they are now restricted to reservations within this home territory, with the exception of a few families resident in Kansas.

Notwithstanding their importance as a tribe the Ojibwa are not prominent in colonial history, owing chiefly to their remote situation. In conjunction with the French they had greatly reduced the formidable Foxes early in the eighteenth century, and finally crushed them, single-handed, in a decisive battle about 1780. At a much earlier period they had turned the westward march of the conquering Iroquois. The hereditary war with the Sioux continued until within the past half-century, in spite of repeated efforts of the Government to bring about peace. In common with most of the western tribes they were allies of the French throughout the colonial period, but joined the side of England against the Americans in the Revolution and again in 1812, being especially active in the latter war. They first entered into treaty relations with the United States in 1785.

Although to a certain extent a sedentary people, the Ojibwa were not agricultural, their country being too cold for profitable farming by the rude Indian method, but depended for subsistence upon fishing, hunting, and the gathering of wild rice. Their territory abounded in lakes and clear streams well stocked with fish, with vast fields of wild rice in the quieter waters. They also gathered cranberries and manufactured maple sugar, the latter being itself an Indian discovery. Their pottery was rude and unimportant, but they were expert in basket and mat weaving, and in the manipulation of birch-bark for houses, canoes, boxes, and other purposes. Their dwellings were either rectangular, round-topped structures of poles covered with mats or bark, or were of tipi or tent shape and covered usually with bark. They were much upon the water and were noted for their skill in making and handling their beautiful birch-bark canoes. Living in a timber country they travelled and fought on foot, except when going by water, and had but little acquaintance with either the buffalo or the horse. Physically and intellectually they ranked high among the tribes.

In their system of government each band was practically independent of the others, although according to their tradition it had been more centralized in ancient times, when the tribe had dwelt within a smaller compass. They had the clan system with some twenty clans, the exact number being a matter of controversy owing to the wide dispersion of the bands. Each clan had its own special precedence in war, deliberation, ceremonial function, etc. They buried in the ground, leaving articles of property and food offerings at the grave, as was the almost universal Indian custom. They had the usual multiplicity of gods, but there were no great ceremonial tribal gatherings such as were found among the agricultural and the buffalo-hunting tribes, the religious and ceremonial observances being in the keeping of various societies, of which the Mide (Meda) secret society was the dominant one and preserved the sacred tribal tradition. Despite centuries of missionary effort these societies still flourish and the majority of the tribe continues pagan.

The mission history of the Ojibwa begins in 1660, when the Jesuit René Menard established himself about Keweenaw Bay in Upper Michigan. Five years later another Jesuit, Father Claude Allouez, founded the mission of Saint-Esprit at Chegoimegon (Bayfield, Wisconsin), the principal gathering-place for all the bands south of Lake Superior. Other missions were soon after begun at Sault Sainte Marie and Mackinaw. The work continued under Jesuit auspices down nearly to the end of the eighteenth century when it was taken up by secular priests. Within the last few years a large share of the labour has again devolved upon a Jesuit worker stationed at the Sault, the only priest in Upper Michigan who knows the language. Chief among the later missionaries may be mentioned the well-known philologist, Bishop Frederick Baraga (q. v.), who, beginning in 1830, devoted thirty-six years of his life to the Ojibwa and Ottawa, chiefly at L'Anse on Keweenaw Bay. The narrative of his career is one long record of heroic sacrifice. His great grammar and dictionary is the accepted standard upon the Ojibwa language. Another noted worker in the Red River country, was Father George Belcourt, 1831–1846, author of another dictionary which still remains in manuscript. Of more recent period is the Franciscan, Father Chrysostom Verwyst, stationed at Bayfield, Wisconsin, who has also given much attention to the language. Protestant effort in the tribe was inaugurated in 1823 in Ontario on the Canada side, by the Wesleyan Methodists, followed the next year by the Baptists at Sault Sainte Marie. In 1827 the Congregationalists began work at Mackinaw, and about 1830 the Episcopalians established themselves at the Sault. The majority of the Christian portion of the tribe is Catholic.

THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896–1901); MOONEY, *Missions* in *Handbook of American Indians* (Washington, 1907); PILLING, *Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages* (1891); SHEA, *Catholic Missions* (New York, 1855); SCHOOLCRAFT, *History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes* (Philadelphia, 1851–59).

JAMES MOONEY.

Chiusi-Pienza, DIOCESE OF (CLUSINENSIS ET PIENTINENSIS), suffragan of Siena. Chiusi is an important town in the province of that name in Tuscany. It is the ancient *Clusium*, one of the twelve cities of the Etruscan Confederation. Even yet many vestiges of Etruscan fortresses and tombs are visible. At an early period it became subject to the Romans. The Gospel, it is said, was preached there by the immediate disciples of the Apostles. Better authenticated, however, is the story of the martyrdom of the deacon Irenæus and the virgin Mustiola, which probably took place under Valerian, not under Aurelian. Catacombs are found at Chiusi. The first

known bishop was Florentius, present in 465 at the Roman synod under Pope Hilary. Bishop Francesco degli Atti (1348) was a famous canonist, and died in the odour of sanctity. Chiusi formerly boasted of a famous relic, the betrothal ring of the Blessed Virgin, which was taken to Perugia about 1449 by an Augustinian friar; in consequence of this a war broke out between them, in which Perugia was victorious and remained in possession of the ring. Chiusi was at first immediately subject to the Holy See, but was made a suffragan of Siena by Pius II. In 1773 Clement XIV added to it the Diocese of Pienza. Among the famous abbeys of the diocese was that of Ammiato, which was built by Rachis, King of the Lombards, and afterwards rose to great power and influence. The diocese has a population of 26,300, with 56 parishes, 125 churches and chapels, 91 secular and 50 regular priests, 4 religious houses for men and 7 for women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), XVII; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 400–02.

U. BENIGNI.

Chivalry (derived through the French *cheval* from the Latin *caballus*) as an institution is to be considered from three points of view: the military, the social, and the religious.

Military.—In the military sense, chivalry was the heavy cavalry of the Middle Ages which constituted the chief and most effective warlike force. The knight or chevalier was the professional soldier of the time; in medieval Latin, the ordinary word *miles* (soldier) was equivalent to "knight". This pre-eminence of cavalry was correlative with the decline of infantry on the battle-field. Four peculiarities distinguished the professional warrior: (1) his weapons; (2) horse; (3) attendants; (4) flag. (1) The medieval army was poorly equipped for long-distance fighting, and bows and cross-bows were still employed, although the Church endeavoured to prohibit their use, at least between Christian armies as contrary to humanity. At all events, they were regarded as unfair in combat by the medieval knight. His only offensive weapons were the lance for the encounter and the sword for the close fight, weapons common to both light-armed and heavy cavalry. The characteristic distinction of the latter, which really constituted chivalry, lay in their defensive weapons, which varied with different periods. These weapons were always costly to get and heavy to bear, such as the *brunia* or hauberk of the Carlovingian Era, the coat of mail, which prevailed during the Crusades, and lastly the plate-armour, introduced in the fourteenth century. (2) No knight was thought to be properly equipped without at least three horses, viz. the battle horse, or *dexterarius*, which was led by hand, and used only for the onset (hence the saying, "to mount one's high horse"), a second horse, palfrey or courser, for the route, and the pack-horse for the luggage. (3) The knight required several attendants: one to conduct the horses, another to bear the heaviest weapons, particularly the shield or escutcheon (*scutum*, hence *scutarius*, Fr. *escuyer*, esquire); still another to aid his master to mount his battle horse or to raise him if dismounted; a fourth to guard prisoners, chiefly those of quality, for whom a high ransom was expected. These attendants, who were of low condition, were not to be confounded with the armed retainers, who formed the escort of a knight. From the thirteenth century the squires also went armed and mounted and, passing from one grade to the other, were raised finally to knighthood. (4) Banners were also a distinctive mark of chivalry. They were attached to, and carried on, the lance. There was a sharp distinction between the pennon, a flag pointed or forked at the extremity, used by a single chevalier or bachelor as a personal ensign, and the banner, square in form, used as the ensign of a band, and reserved to the baron or baronet in command of a group of at least ten knights, called a constabulary. Each flag or banner was emblazoned with the arms of its owner, to distinguish one from another on the battle-field. These armorial bearings afterwards became hereditary and gave birth to the complicated science of heraldry.

Social.—The career of a knight was costly, requiring personal means in keeping with the station; for a knight had to defray his own expenses in an age when the sovereign had neither treasury nor war budget at his disposal. When land was the only kind of riches, each lord paramount who wished to raise an army divided his domain into military fiefs, the tenant being held to military service at his own personal expense for a fixed number of days (forty in France and in England during the Norman period). These fees, like other feudal grants, became hereditary, and thus developed a noble class, for whom the knightly profession was the only career. Knighthood, however, was not hereditary, though only the sons of a knight were eligible to its ranks. In boyhood they were sent to the court of some noble, where they were trained in the use of horses and weapons, and were taught lessons of courtesy. From the thirteenth century, the candidates, after they had attained the rank of squire, were allowed to take part in battles; but it was only when they had come of age, commonly twenty-one years, that they were admitted to the rank of knight by means of a peculiar ceremonial called "dubbing". Every knight was qualified to confer knighthood, provided the aspirant fulfilled the requisite conditions of birth, age, and training. Where the condition of birth was lacking in the aspirant, the sovereign alone could create a knight, as a part of his royal prerogative.

Religious.—In the ceremonial of conferring knighthood the Church shared, through the blessing of the sword, and by the virtue of this blessing chivalry assumed a religious character. In early Christianity, although Tertullian's teaching that Christianity and the profession of arms were incompatible was condemned as heretical, the military career was regarded with little favour. In chivalry, religion and the profession of arms were reconciled. This change in attitude on the part of the Church dates, according to some, from the Crusades, when Christian armies were for the first time devoted to a sacred purpose. Even prior to the Crusades, however, an anticipation of this attitude is found in the custom called the "Truce of God" (q. v.). It was then that the clergy seized upon the opportunity offered by these truces to exact from the rough warriors of feudal times a religious vow to use their weapons chiefly for the protection of the weak and defenceless, especially women and orphans, and of churches. Chivalry, in the new sense, rested on a vow; it was this vow which dignified the soldier, elevated him in his own esteem, and raised him almost to the level of the monk in medieval society. As if in return for this vow, the Church ordained a special blessing for the knight in the ceremony called in the "Pontificale Romanum", "Benedictio novi militis". At first very simple in its form, this ritual gradually developed into an elaborate ceremony. Before the blessing of the sword on the altar, many preliminaries were required of the aspirant, such as confession, a vigil of prayer, fasting, a symbolical bath, and investiture with a white robe, for the purpose of impressing on the candidate the purity of soul with which he was to enter upon such a noble career. Kneeling, in the presence of the clergy, he pronounced the solemn vow of chivalry, at the same time often renewing the baptismal vow; the one chosen as godfather then struck him lightly on the neck with a sword (the dubbing) in the name of God and St. George, the patron of chivalry.

History.—There are four distinct periods in the

history of chivalry. The period of foundation, i. e. the time when the Truce of God was in force, witnessed the long contest of the Church against the violence of the age, before she succeeded in curbing the savage spirit of the feudal warriors, who prior to this recognized no law but that of brute force.

The Crusades (q. v.) introduced the golden age of chivalry, and the crusader was the pattern of the perfect knight. The rescue of the holy places of Palestine from Moslem domination and the defence of pilgrims became the new object of his vow. In return, the Church took him under her protection in a special way, and conferred upon him exceptional temporal and spiritual privileges, such as the remission of all penances, dispensation from the jurisdiction of the secular courts, and as a means of defraying the expenses of the journey to the Holy Land, knights were granted the tenth of all the church revenues. The vow of the crusader was limited to a specified period. For the distant expeditions into Asia, the average time was two or three years. After the conquest of Jerusalem, the necessity of a standing army became peremptory, in order to prevent the loss of the Holy City to surrounding hostile nations. Out of this necessity arose the military orders (q. v.) which adopted as a fourth monastic vow that of perpetual warfare against the infidels. In these orders, wherein was realized the perfect fusion of the religious and the military spirit, chivalry reached its apogee. This heroic spirit had also its notable representatives among the secular crusaders, as Godfrey of Bouillon, Tancred of Normandy, Richard Cœur de Lion, and above all Louis IX of France, in whom knighthood was crowned by sanctity. Like the monastic, the knightly vow bound with common ties warriors of every nation and condition, and enrolled them in a vast brotherhood of manners, ideals, and aims. The secular brotherhood had, like the regular, its rule imposing on its members fidelity to their lords and to their word, fair play on the battle-field, and the observance of the maxims of honour and courtesy. Medieval chivalry, moreover, opened a new chapter in the history of literature. It prepared the way and gave ready currency to an epic and romantic movement in literature reflecting the ideal of knighthood and celebrating its accomplishment and achievements. Provence and Normandy were the chief centres of this kind of literature, which was spread throughout all Europe by the trouvères and troubadours.

After the Crusades chivalry gradually lost its religious aspect. In this, its third period, honour remains the peculiar worship of knighthood. This spirit is manifested in the many knightly exploits which fill the annals of the long contest between England and France during the Hundred Years War. The chronicles of Froissart give a vivid picture of this age, where bloody battles alternate with tournaments and gorgeous pageants. Each contending nation has its heroes. If England could boast of the victories of the Black Prince, Chandos, and Talbot, France could pride herself on the exploits of Du Guesclin, Boucicaut, and Dunois. But with all the brilliancy and glamour of their achievements, the main result was a useless shedding of blood, waste of money, and misery for the lower classes. The amorous character of the new literature had contributed not a little to deflect chivalry from its original ideal. Under the influence of the romances love now became the mainspring of chivalry. As a consequence there arose a new type of chevalier, vowed to the service of some noble lady, who could even be another man's wife. This idol of his heart was to be worshipped at a distance. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the obligations imposed upon the knightly lover, these extravagant fancies often led to lamentable results.

In its last stages, chivalry became a mere court service. The Order of the Garter, founded in 1348 by Edward III of England, the Order of the Golden Fleece (*Toison d'or*) of Philip of Burgundy, dating from 1430, formed a brotherhood, not of crusaders, but of courtiers, with no other aim than to contribute to the splendour of the sovereign. Their most serious business was the sport of jousts and tournaments. They made their vows not in chapels, but in banquet-halls, not on the cross, but on some emblematic bird. The "vow of the Swan" of 1306, was instituted during the feast of the dubbing of the son of Edward I. It was before God and the swan that the old king swore with his knights to avenge on Scotland the murder of his lieutenant. More celebrated is the "vow of the Pheasant", made in 1454 at the court of Philip of Burgundy. The motive was weighty indeed, being nothing else than the rescue of Constantinople, which had fallen the past year into the hands of the Turks. But the solemnity of the motive did not lessen the frivolity of the occasion. A solemn vow was taken before God and the pheasant at a gorgeous banquet, the profligate cost of which might better have been devoted to the expedition itself. No less than one hundred and fifty knights, the flower of the nobility, repeated the vow, but the enterprise came to nought. Chivalry had degenerated to a futile pastime and an empty promise. Literature, which had in the past so greatly contributed to the exaltation of chivalry, now reacted against its extravagances. In the early part of the fourteenth century this turning-point becomes evident in the poetry of Chaucer. Although he himself had made many translations from the French romances, he mildly derides their manner in his "Sir Thopas". The final blow was reserved for the immortal work of Cervantes, "Don Quixote", which aroused the laughter of all Europe. Infantry, on its revival as an effective force on the battle-field during the fourteenth century, began to dispute the supremacy which heavy cavalry had so long enjoyed. Chivalry, which rested entirely upon the superiority of the horseman in warfare, rapidly declined. At Crécy (1346) and Agincourt (1415) the French knighthood was decimated by the arrows of the English archers of Edward III and Henry V. The Austrian nobility at Sempach (1386) and the Burgundian chivalry at Morat (1476) were unable to sustain the overpowering onslaught of the Swiss peasantry. With the advent of gunpowder and the general use of firearms in battle, chivalry rapidly disintegrated and finally disappeared altogether.

OMAN, *The Art of War in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1885); KÖHLER, *Kriegwesen in der Ritterzeit* (Breslau, 1886–1890); BOUTARIC, *Institutions militaires de la France avant les armées permanentes* (Paris, 1863); LACURNE DE STE PALAYE, *Mémoires sur l'ancienne chevalerie* in *Mémoires de l'Ac. des inscriptions* (1781); MILLS, *History of Chivalry* (London, 1820–26); GAUTIER, *La chevalerie* (Paris, 1884); GUILHIERMOZ, *Essai sur l'origine de la noblesse* (Paris, 1902); ROTH VON SCHREGKENSTEIN, *Die Ritterwürde und der Ritterstand* (Freiburg im Br., 1886); HENNE AM RHYN, *Geschichte des Ritterthum* (Leipzig, 1893); KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE, *Froissart; étude littéraire sur le XIVe siècle* (Brussels, 1857); DE MONGE, *Epopées et romans chevaleresques* (Brussels, 1889); DIGBY, *The Broadstone of Honour.*

CH. MOELLER.

Chnad, DIOCESE OF. See CSANAD.

Choctaw Indians, an important tribe or confederacy of Muskogean stock formerly holding most of Southern Alabama and Mississippi, with adjoining portions of Louisiana, U. S. A., but now resident in Eastern Oklahoma. The origin and meaning of the name are uncertain. According to their own tradition, which agrees with linguistic evidence, they were formerly connected with the Chickasaw and crossed the Mississippi together from the West. Their first appearance in history was in 1540, when their giant chief, Toscalusa the "Black Warrior", opposed De Soto's march in what was perhaps the most terrible Indian battle ever fought in the Eastern United States.

Their connected history dates from the establishment of the French at Biloxi in 1699. They were generally more friendly to the French than to the English, but were always unsatisfactory and uncertain allies. They made their first treaty with the United States in 1786, since which time they have never been at war with the Government. In 1820 they sold their last remaining lands east of the Mississippi and agreed to remove to Oklahoma, but the removal was not completed until about twenty years later. Even then a considerable band, known later as Mississippi Choctaw, remained behind, most of whom, however, have recently joined the main body, though there are still hundreds in Louisiana. Those in the Territory constituted an autonomous Government under the title of the Choctaw Nation until 1906, when they were admitted to American citizenship. They number now altogether about 18,000 souls, probably their original number. The Choctaw were agricultural, dwelling in regularly arranged towns, with houses of logs plastered with clay, or of poles covered with mats or thatch. They were noted for their beautiful pottery and artistic basketry. In temperament they were considered rather indolent and without the sense of honour which characterized some tribes. Among their peculiar customs was that of flattening the head, and of digging up and cleaning the bones of the dead, after a short interment, for preservation in the family. They were much given to an athletic ball-play, which is still a favourite among them in the West. Not much is known of their myths or religion, which probably resembled those of the Muskogean tribes generally. Their tribal organization was lax and without central authority. They had the clan system, with descent in the female line, but the number of their clans is not definitely known.

Catholic mission work in the tribe was begun early in the French period, and though renewed effort was made under Jesuit auspices some years later, there were few results. In later years the work has been more successful, and the majority of those still remaining in their old homes are now Catholics, while two mission schools are also in operation among those in Oklahoma. The earlier missions among the Choctaw were intrusted to the Jesuits. Father Mathurin le Petit began work in the tribe in 1726, and continued until his transfer to New Orleans as superior of the Louisiana missions about two years later. He was succeeded by Father Michel Baudouin, who continued with them eighteen years, often in extreme danger from their treacherous and insolent disposition and the hostility of the English traders, until both governor and superior deemed it necessary to recall him and discontinue the work for a time. It was afterwards taken up by Father Nicholas le Febvre, who appears to have continued it until the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1764. Protestant work was begun in Mississippi by the American Board of Foreign Missions in 1818, and continued with success in the West. The Baptists began work in the Territory about 1832. Of the Protestant missionaries the most noted names are those of the Revs. Cyrus Byington and Allen Wright, both of whom have made important contributions to our knowledge of the language. In accordance with a former policy the earlier Protestant establishments were supported largely by Government funds.

JAMES MOONEY.

Choir.—There is much ambiguity about the terms *choir* and *presbytery*. Strictly speaking, the choir is that part of the church where the stalls of the clergy are. The term is often loosely used for the whole of the eastern arm, including the choir proper, sanctuary, retro-choir, etc. At Westminster Abbey the stalls are in the east nave and therefore no part of the choir is in the eastern arm. At Canterbury the stalls are in the eastern arm and the choir occupies its western bays, i. e. the space between the crossing and the sanctuary. In non-collegiate churches the eastern arm is called the chancel, the eastern portion of which is the presbytery or sanctuary. In the earliest Christian churches, e. g. Santa Maria Maggiore at Rome, there were but two parts, a nave and sanctuary; there was no architectural choir. The sanctuary occupied the apse, and the apse was joined immediately to the nave, or, in the double-aisled basilicas of the fourth century, such as those of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome, to the transept; there was no interposition of a choir between nave and apse. The choir was simply the east part of the nave, and was fenced off by low walls, usually of marble, carved or perforated with interlacing patterns—peacocks (the symbol of immortality), lions, doves, etc. These walls were called *cancelli*, hence the English word "chancel". The word *choir* is first used by writers of the Western Church. Isidore of Seville and Honorius of Autun derive it from the *corona* or circle of clergy or singers who surrounded the altar. The choir proper did not exist until the time of Constantine, when the clergy were able to develop the services of the Church. The introduction of the choir, or enclosed space in the centre of the nave, attached to the *bema* or presbytery, as the raised space came to be called, was the last great change of plan. Round three sides of this choir the faithful were allowed to congregate to hear the Gospels or Epistles read from the two pulpits or ambones, which were built into its enclosure, one on either side; or to hear the services which were read or sung by the inferior order of clergy who occupied its precincts. The enclosure of the choir was kept low, so as not to hide the view of the raised presbytery. In the south-western districts of France and throughout Spain, also in St. John Lateran, St. Clement, St. Laurence Without-the-walls, and St. Mary Major at Rome, the choir occupies the centre of the nave with an enclosed passage to the sanctuary. In parts of Italy the choir still retains its ancient position behind or eastward of the altar. In the Duomo of Fiesole, and at Lucca, there are two choirs, one behind and the other in front of the high altar. In the north of Germany choirs are usually elevated upon crypts (that of Milan stands over the *confessio*) and shut in with solid stone screens; the same arrangement exists at Canterbury, Auch, Augsburg, Chartres, Bourges, St-Denis, Amiens, and Notre-Dame in Paris. The finest existing enclosures are those of Paris and Amiens.

BOND, *Gothic Architecture in England*, 183–85; FERGUSSON, *History of Architecture*, I, 407; PARKER, *Glossary of Architecture*, I, 102, 103; WALCOTT, *Sacred Archæology*, 146, 147, 148; REBER, *History of Medieval Art*, 712; LETHABY, *Medieval Art*, 182, 183.

THOMAS H. POOLE.

Choir, a body of singers entrusted with the musical parts of the Church service, and organized and instructed for that purpose. The Talmud witnesses to the careful organization of the Temple choir, and as the first Christians worshipped with the Jews, we find them from the first using the psalmodic solo with congregational refrain, and from the fourth century, psalmody in alternating chorus, both possibly based on Jewish practice. Thus early, and all through the plain-chant period, the choir seems to have been influenced by the liturgical division of the music into solo and chorus chants. Soon after Constantine's conversion we hear of lector-schools in which, as boys, many of the clergy had received their training. But perhaps the most famous song-school of history was the Roman *schola cantorum* of St. Gregory, described by John the Deacon, called also *orphanotrophium*, as its singing boys came chiefly from orphanages. Many of the popes of the seventh century were connected with or came from it. Following this we have the establishment of many other schools, of which the

most famous were those of Metz and St. Gall, in the eighth century. The current system of oral instruction rendered such schools necessary. About the year 1100, after the introduction of the musical staff, they began to decline in importance. So thoroughly was music practised in the medieval song-schools connected with churches or monasteries, founded for the purpose of setting forth the liturgy with the utmost splendour and beauty, that until the Protestant Reformation, the history of music is practically the history of church music. Yet even about the fourteenth century the gradual substitution of *musica mensurata* for the *cantilena romana*, part-music for unisonous, wrought an increasing change in the relation of choir to altar. This change was marked when Pope Gregory XI, in 1377, returned to Rome from Avignon, where the new music had flourished, and amalgamated his choir with the *schola cantorum*, reorganizing it under the title *Collegio dei Capellani Cantori* and placing it under a *Maestro della Capella Pontificia*. The choir now became more laicised and self-contained. It had grown out of, and been shaped by liturgical needs. Its place was in the sanctuary, its members were ecclesiastics or boys brought up under ecclesiastical direction in a house attached to the cathedral. Now it might occupy a gallery and be ruled by a layman. Yet the school of composition associated with this change was largely built upon plain-chant, and produced such masters of religious music as Palestrina, Vittoria, and Byrd. Later, the introduction of female voices, the toleration of mixed choirs, and the secularization in style of the music sung, brought about a still greater departure from the idea and influence of St. Gregory's *schola cantorum*. During the present liturgical revival, however, boys who have been actively employed in church music for so many centuries (we find them mentioned indeed as early as the fourth century) are gradually taking their old place in the constitution and functions of the Christian choir.

Encyclopædia Biblica (London, 1899); GERBERT, *De Cantu et Musicâ Sacrâ*; WAGNER, *History of Plain Chant* (London, 1907); MEES, *Choirs and Choral Music* (London, 1901); DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship* (London, 1903); BÄUMER, *Histoire du bréviaire* (Paris, 1905); GROVE, *Dict. of Music and Musicians* (London, 1896); GASTOUÉ, *Les Origines du chant romain* (Paris, 1907).

WILFRID G. A. SHEBBEARE.

Choiseul, ETIENNE-FRANÇOIS, DUC DE, French statesman, b. 28 June, 1719; d. in Paris 8 May, 1785. Until his thirty-seventh year he pursued a military career and was known as the Comte de Stainville, his social standing being such as to permit him to marry the daughter of Crozat, the wealthy financier, in 1750. So caustic was his speech that he was often declared to be the original of Gresset's "Méchant" and, despite his clever manœuvring, he was in no special favour at court until he rendered Madame de Pompadour a service by informing her of d'Argenson's scheming to make his kinswoman, Madame de Choiseul-Romanet, the mistress of King Louis XV. He even went so far as to transmit to the favourite a letter from Madame de Choiseul-Romanet which proved the conspiracy. Madame de Pompadour recompensed Choiseul by having him appointed ambassador to Rome in 1754. He occupied this post from 5 November, 1754, to 23 January, 1757, at which time religious France was disturbed by the contest between parliament and the clergy in regard to the Bull "Unigenitus". In 1752 the Parliament of Paris had condemned the practice of certain priests who exacted a certificate of confession from all sick people requesting the sacraments and deprived of the same those whom they called *appelants*, that is to say, who refused to acknowledge the Bull "Unigenitus". Louis XV took issue with the clergy, dissolved the parliament at Pontoise in 1753 and summoned it to Paris again in 1754, ordering silence on all religious controversies. At the Assembly of the Clergy of France in 1755, it was manifest that on this question of confession-tickets the episcopate was divided, and the pope had to intervene. Choiseul negotiated with Benedict XIV, and the Bull "Ex Omnibus", solicited by Louis XV, was the occasion of numerous conferences between Rome and Versailles, being finally published, 16 October, 1756. This re-established religious peace in France. "By following the course it prescribes", said de Pressy, Bishop of Boulogne, "one will be in no danger of exposing the sacrament to scandalous profanation by administering it to the refractory or of subjecting to unjust defamation those to whom it should not be publicly refused." Thanks to this peaceful adjustment of affairs, the Jansenists lost all political prestige in France. A few days after issuing the Bull Benedict XIV fell ill and Choiseul wrote several letters and memoirs concerning the expected conclave. These were recently published and they enlighten us as to how the ambassadors of that time watched the pontifical court and planned how they should use the right of veto in the conclave. However, Choiseul left the Roman embassy in 1757 for that of Vienna without having seen a conclave.

Reaching Vienna, 20 August, 1757, he gave his attention to the confirmation of the Franco-Austrian alliance, a decisive episode in the French politics of the day. France renounced its secular struggle against the House of Austria and joined forces with the latter against Prussia. This policy of the *Renversement des Alliances*, regarding which historians have held very conflicting views, received but poor support from the courts of Paris and Vienna where political anarchy then reigned supreme; it was with great regret that Choiseul declared that "both courts lacked the good order indispensable to the furtherance of great projects". In November, 1758, Choiseul replaced the Abbé de Bernis as Minister of Foreign Affairs; in 1761 he became Minister of War, and in 1762 Minister of the Navy. "I am like the miser's coachman", said he, "sometimes in stable-coat, sometimes in apron; at the command of all." For twelve years he governed France, his great capacity for work and unusual gift of assimilation being of decided value to him. At first he was said to be "a dandy utterly lacking in ability but in whose mind gleamed a bit of phosphorus"; a few years later, according to Catherine of Russia, this dandy had become "the coachman of Europe". Nothing was beyond the scope of his activity. He reduced the expenses of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs from fifty-eight to seven millions, reorganized the artillery and military engineering corps, and, although confronted with perpetual threats of war, sought to avenge the insults that France had received from England during the Seven Years' War. "The navy", he said, "will achieve either the salvation or the downfall of France"; and thanks to the combined efforts of Choiseul and his cousin Praslin to re-establish the navy, France was enabled in 1768 to annex Corsica without any opposition whatever on the part of England. Moreover, in 1778, it aided the United States in shaking off the yoke of England and in 1783 recovered its place as a colonial power.

"Choiseul", said Talleyrand, was "the man who had the clearest insight into the future". He dreamed of a greater France and contemplated negotiations for the cession of Egypt to France. However, owing to lack of persistency his attempts at colonization were not very successful; the venture in Guiana ended disastrously, and that in Madagascar, due to the private initiative of the Comte de Mandave, did not receive sufficient encouragement from the Government. Nevertheless, Choiseul, by his colonial plans at least, initiated a policy which was

consistent and productive of results. In 1768 and 1769 when Bougainville and Surville discovered the archipelago to the south-east of New Guinea, it was very appropriate that two harbours in the Louisiade group of islands should have been called respectively Port Choiseul and Port Praslin. Choiseul's great political achievement in Europe, known as the "Family Compact" or alliance of all the Bourbons, has been widely discussed and he has been censured for not having understood the Polish question. It was under Choiseul's government that the Jesuits were expelled. In the letters and memoirs that date from his embassy at Rome the Jesuits are not mentioned. But, according to Besanval's "Mémoires", Choiseul was thenceforth in disfavour with the Society because, at a court supper, he remarked that Père Laugier, a Jesuit who had preached vehemently against the Jansenists, ought to be banished from Versailles. When in Rome, Choiseul excluded the Jesuits from his negotiations but always received them courteously, and there is no proof that from this period he planned the abolition of the order. However, when one day in 1760 the Dauphin spoke with great earnestness about the Jesuits, Choiseul, who was present, replied: "Monsieur, how can a Dauphin become so enamoured of monks!" Some days later the Dauphin, having called the king's attention to a memoir in which Choiseul was accused of pursuing, with the parliament, the destruction of the Jesuits, the duke, addressing the Dauphin said: "Perhaps some day I shall be so unfortunate as to become your subject but I shall never be at your service."

Hence, in 1762, Choiseul was quite ready to have parliament close the Jesuit colleges and, in 1764, decree the suppression of the Society in France. In his "Mémoires" he denies having inspired the intrigues of parliament. It seems proved, however, that, far from deploring these schemes, he took advantage of his influence over Louis XV in order to further them; in the conflict between the Duke of Aiguillon and the magistrate La Chalotais, the Jesuits' enemy, Choiseul's sympathies were with La Chalotais. "It is difficult", he wrote to the king, "to attack me directly on religion because I never speak of it. Formally I am a strict observer of decorum and in public affairs it is my principle to uphold religion." Apparently, like his friend Voltaire, whose property at Ferney he exempted from taxation, Choiseul deemed religion good for the people, but the spirit of his religious policy was what was called at that time "an enlightened despotism", ever ready to suspect and paralyze the Church; the expulsion of the Jesuits, agreed to by all the Bourbons, was the greatest effort of lay absolutism against ecclesiastical autonomy and vitality. In 1770 a conspiracy formed by the Duke of Aiguillon, the Chancellor Maupeou, and Madame du Barry, caused Choiseul's downfall and a *lettre de cachet*, dated 24 December, 1770, sentenced him to exile at Chanteloup, his estate in Touraine. His departure from Paris was a veritable triumph and the last fourteen years of his life were spent at Chanteloup, where he was surrounded by a regular court and sustained by the affection of his wife and his friend the Abbé Barthélemy, a celebrated archæologist. He died in Paris, being well nigh financially ruined owing to his extravagant manner of life. His brother, Léopold-Charles (1724–1781), was Bishop of Evreux and Archbishop of Albi and Cambrai.

Mémoires de M. le duc de Choiseul (Paris, 1790), merely a collection by SOULAVIE of a certain number of disconnected writings that Choiseul had printed in 1778 for private distribution among his friends; MAUGRAS, *La disgrâce du duc et de la duchesse de Choiseul, la vie à Chanteloup, le retour à Paris, la mort* (Paris, 1903); MAUGRAS, *Le duc et la duchesse de Choiseul, leur vie intime, leurs amis et leur temps* (Paris, 1903); CALMETTES, *Choiseul et Voltaire* (Paris, 1902); DAUBIGNY, *La politique coloniale de Choiseul* (Paris, 1892); BOUTRY, *Choiseul à Rome* (Paris, 1902).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Choiseul du Plessis-Praslin, GILBERT, French bishop, b. 1613; d. at Paris, 31 December, 1689. He was a descendant of the noble family of du Plessis. He devoted himself from his earliest youth to the ecclesiastical state, while his brother César entered the military career. Both attained distinction. Gilbert received the title of Doctor at the Sorbonne in 1640, was consecrated Bishop of Comminges in 1644, and at once set about visiting his diocese, restoring discipline among the clergy, and establishing schools and colleges. In time of famine he pawned his own property to assist the poor; and during the plague until stricken by the disease he ministered in person to the sick. In 1671 he was transferred to the Diocese of Tournai, where he displayed the same pastoral zeal.

His influence on the ecclesiastical affairs of France at large was less successful. When, in 1651, the majority of the French bishops petitioned Innocent X to decide upon the five propositions of Jansenius, Choiseul was among the eleven who requested the Holy Father by special letter to issue no decision in the case. Unable to prevent a formal condemnation of the Jansenists, he exerted himself to bring about an agreement between the contending parties. These efforts had no other result than to reveal in the zealous bishop a regrettable leniency towards a heresy which proved so disastrous to France. His standing towards Gallicanism was clearer. For his bold and constant advocacy of the "Gallican Liberties" he was chosen, in the Assembly of the Clergy of 1682, member of the committee on resolutions, and was personally entrusted with the duty of formulating in Latin the propositions on which the Assembly was to vote. Louis XIV had in 1673 extended to his entire kingdom the royal right of *régale*. Two bishops only protested against the usurpation and appealed to Rome. This was the beginning of a stubborn struggle between Innocent XI and Louis XIV. To obtain public approval and support from his clergy, and to have limits set to the pontifical power, the king, at the instance principally of his minister, Colbert, convoked the French clergy in a general assembly. Choiseul had no sooner presented his draft than Bossuet rose against it. An animated discussion, related in full by Fénelon in his "De Summi Pontificis Auctoritate", ensued. When Choiseul saw that Bossuet's conciliatory distinction between the Holy See's infallibility in teaching the Faith and its indefectibility in holding it found favour with both clergy and Court, he resigned his special commission. Bossuet took his place and drew up the four articles as they passed into history.

Choiseul's leaning towards Jansenism betrayed him into another false step. He approved the French translation of a little book published in Cologne under the title "Monita salutaria Beatæ Mariæ Virginis ad cultores suos discretos". This book was justly reproved by so many that Choiseul thought it well to publish, in a pastoral letter on the Blessed Virgin, a justification of himself. Fortunately the attitude of this prelate towards Gallicanism and Jansenism did not affect his zeal for souls and the Church. He published (Paris, 1681–85) his "Mémoires touchant la Religion", against atheists, libertines, and Protestants. His "Psalms and Hymns of the Church", done into French, ran through several editions. He also arranged and gave the literary finish to the interesting memoirs of his brother, the Maréchal Choiseul du Plessis.

FÉNELON, *De Summi Pontificis Auctoritate* (Paris, 1854); ROHRBACHER, *Histoire de l'église* (Paris, 1852); VON WEISS, *Weltgeschichte* (Graz and Leipzig, 1898).

CHARLES B. SCHRANTZ.

Cholonec, PIERRE, biographer and French missionary among the Canadian Indians, b. in the Diocese of St-Pol-de-Léon, Finistère, 29 June, 1641; d. in Que-

bec, 30 October, 1723. Cholonec entered the Society of Jesus in Paris, 8 October, 1659, and taught in the colleges of Moulins and Eu from 1661 to 1670, except three years spent at La Flèche in the study of philosophy. After four years of theology in Paris, he departed for Canada in August, 1674. For many years he was stationed among the Indians at St. Francis Xavier du Sault, where the saintly Indian maiden Catherine Tegakwitha died. Father Cholonec wrote her life which was published in the "Lettres édifiantes" (1781), VI, 40–100; (1839), I, 647–662. A translation is given in Kip, "Jesuit Missions" (New York, 1846), I, 79, 116; but this is only an abridgment of a more extended biography preserved in the archives of the Jesuits in Montreal. In later years Cholonec was superior of the Jesuit residence in Montreal.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.*, II, 1153; IX, 39; THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896–1901), LIX, 315–316; LXII, 158; SHEA, *Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886), 309.

E. P. SPILLANE.

Choron, ALEXANDRE-ETIENNE, French musician and teacher of music, b. at Caen, 21 October, 1772; d. 29 June, 1834. Being denied by his father the permission to study music under proper guidance, he nevertheless endeavoured to master the theories of J.-P. Rameau and his school. Later he received instruction in harmony for a short time, from the Abbé Roze and Bonesi. Through Bonesi, Choron became acquainted with the treatise of Nicolò Sala (1701-1800) on fugue and counterpoint, and with Italian musical art in general. The result was his work "Principes d'accompagnement des écoles d'Italie". In order to acquire thoroughly the science of Kirnberger, Marpurg, and Albrechtsberger, he studied the German language. Thus equipped, Choron entered upon his wonderful career of reform in all branches of musical activity. In 1811, he was entrusted by the Government with the important task of reorganizing the more important church choirs of Paris and other cities and of directing the musical performances on solemn public and religious occasions. In 1816 Choron became musical director of the Grand Opéra, but this engagement lasted only one year, on account of the unpopularity of his endeavours towards reform. He now brought about the reopening, under the name of "Ecole royale de Chant et de Déclamation", of the Conservatoire, which had been closed in 1815. In 1817 Choron founded the "Institution royale de Musique classique et religieuse", which was subsidized by the Government and was destined to exert a far-reaching influence through the distinguished musicians it produced and its publication and performance of important choral works, especially those of Palestrina, Bach, and Händel. By the withdrawal of the Government subsidy on the death of Charles X, the school's efficiency was crippled. This caused such disappointment to Choron that he did not long survive.

Besides accomplishing all this work, Choron published, in collaboration with François-Joseph-Marie Fayolle (1774-1852), "Dictionaire historique des musiciens", "Méthode élémentaire de musique et de plain chant", a revised and enlarged edition of Francœurs' "Traité général des voix et des instruments d'orchestre", translations of theoretical works by Albrechtsberger and Azopardi, "Méthode concertante à plusieurs voix" (which treatise formed the basis of instruction in Choron's school), "Méthode de plain chant", "Manuel complet de musique vocale et instrumentale", and an "Encyclopédie musicale" in eight volumes. Choron's school was afterward revived, as the "Ecole Niedermeyer", by Louis Niedermeyer (1802-61), who, by means of a small Government subsidy, succeeded in keeping alive Choron's principles and tradition.

Choron's principal service to musical art in France consists in having trained and purified French taste. Through him and men like Louis Niedermeyer and Joseph d'Ortigue there gradually developed among musicians that appreciation of the essential difference between sacred music and profane music—between music of the Church and music of the theatre —which finally culminated in the foundation of the now flourishing "Schola Cantorum" and the famous association "Les Chanteurs de Saint-Gervais". Both institutions were founded by Charles Bordes and became the principal agencies in France for the realization of the aims of Pope Pius X in regard to the reform of church music.

LAROUSSE, *Dictionnaire universel* (Paris, 1865), IV, 194; RIEMANN, *Musiklexikon* (Leipzig, 1905), 232; GROVE, *Dictionary of Music* (New York, 1904), I, 531, 532.

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Chosroes. See KHOSRU.

Chrism, a mixture of oil of olives and balsam, blessed by a bishop in a special manner and used in the administration of certain sacraments and in the performance of certain ecclesiastical functions. That chrism may serve as valid matter for the Sacrament of Confirmation it must consist of pure oil of olives, and it must be blessed by a bishop, or at least by a priest delegated by the Holy See. These two conditions are certainly necessary for validity; moreover it is probable that there should be an admixture of balsam, and that the blessing of the chrism should be special, in the sense that it ought to be different from that which is given to the oil of the sick or the oil of catechumens. (Cf. Lehmkuhl, Cas. Cons. II, n. 102.) If either of the last two conditions is wanting the sacrament will be doubtfully valid. To deal with the subject in a sufficiently exhaustive manner, it will be enough to touch upon (1) the origin and antiquity of chrism; (2) its constituent nature; (3) its blessing; and (4) its use and symbolical significance.

(1) *Origin.*—In its primitive meaning the word chrism, like the Greek χρίσμα, was used to designate any and every substance that served the purpose of smearing or anointing, such as the various kinds of oils, unguents, and pigments. This was its ordinary signification in profane literature, and even in the early patristic writings. Gradually however, in the writings of the Fathers at all events, the term came to be restricted to that special kind of oil that was used in religious ceremonies and functions, especially in the administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation. Thus Origen refers to the visible chrism in which we have all been baptized: St. Ambrose venerates in the chrism the oil of grace which makes kings and priests; and St. Cyril of Jerusalem celebrates the praises of the mystic chrism (cf. Dict. de théol. cath., s. v. Chrême, where many references are given to patristic passages in which the word occurs). The early councils of the Church have also references to chrism as something set apart for sacred purposes and making for the sanctification of men. Thus the Council of Constantinople held in 381 (Can. vii) and the Council of Toledo, 398 (Can. x). Regarding the institution of chrism, or its introduction into the sacramental and ceremonial system of the Church, some theologians like St. Thomas (Sum., III, Q. lxxii, a. 4) and Suarez (De Conf., D. xxxiii) hold that it was instituted immediately by Christ, while others contend that it is altogether of ecclesiastical origin. Eugene IV, in his famous "Instruction for the Armenians" (Bull "Exultate Deo", apud Denzinger, "Enchiridion", p. 160), asserts that chrism is the matter of the Sacrament of Confirmation, and, indeed, this opinion is so certain that it may not be denied without incurring some note of theological censure. (Cf. Catechism of the Council of Trent, Pt. II, c. iii, q. 7.) All that the Council of Trent has defined in this connexion is that they who attribute a certain spiritual

and salutary efficacy to holy chrism do not in any way derogate from the respect and reverence due to the Holy Ghost (Sess. VII, c. iv).

(2) *Nature.*—Two elements enter into the constitution of legitimate chrism, viz. olive-oil and balsam. The former is indeed the preponderating, as well as the principal, ingredient, but the latter must be added in greater or lesser quantity, if not for reasons of validity, at all events in obedience to a grave ecclesiastical precept. Frequent reference is made in the Old Testament to the use of oil in religious ceremonies. It was employed in the coronation of kings, in the consecration of the high priest and in the ordination of the Levites, and indeed, it figured very prominently in the Mosaic ordinances generally, as can be abundantly gathered from Exodus (xxx, 22 sqq.), Leviticus (viii), and Deuteronomy (xxviii, 40). Such being the prevailing usage of the Old Testament in adopting olive-oil for religious ceremonies, it is no cause for wonder that it also came to receive under the New Dispensation a certain religious recognition and approval. The second element that enters into the constitution of genuine chrism is balsam. This is an aromatic, resinous substance that is extracted from the wood of certain trees or plants, especially those belonging to the terebinthine group or family. In the manufacture of this sweet-smelling unguent the early Greek Christians were wont to employ as many as forty different perfumed spices or essences (Goar, Euchologion, p. 627). In the beginning of the Christian Era balsam was obtained from Judea (opobalsam) and from Arabia Felix (balm of Mecca), but in modern times it is also procured, and in superior quality, from the West Indies. What is required for chrism should of course be such as is sanctioned by the usage of the Church. The first mention of balsam as an ingredient in the composition of chrism seems to be found in the "Gregorian Sacramentary", a work belonging to the sixth century. (Cf. Perrone, Præl. Theol., III, 135.) Now, however, according to existing legislation, the addition of balsam is requisite for lawful chrism, but whether it is necessary for the validity of the sacrament, assuming that chrism is the matter of confirmation, this is a matter about which theologians do not agree. (Cf. Bellarmine, De Conf., ix.) The modern view appears to be that it is not so required. But owing to the uncertainty mere olive-oil alone would be doubtful matter and could not, therefore, be employed apart from very grave necessity.

(3) *Blessing.*—For proper and legitimate chrism the blessing by a bishop is necessary, and, probably too, such a blessing as is peculiar to it alone. That the bishop is the ordinary minister of this blessing is certain. So much is amply recognized in all the writings of the early centuries, by the early councils (cf. Const. Apos., VII, 42; the Second Council of Carthage of 390, and Third Council of Braga, 572), and by all modern theologians (cf. Frassen, xi, 440). But whether a priest may be the extraordinary minister of this blessing, and, if so, in what circumstances, this is a question that is more or less freely discussed. It seems agreed that the pope may delegate a priest for this purpose, but it is not so clear that bishops can bestow the same delegated authority *ex jure ordinario*. They exercised, it seems, this prerogative in former times in the East, but the power of delegating priests to bless chrism is now strictly reserved to the Holy See in the Western Church. (Cf. Perrone, Præl. Theol., III, 135.) The rites employed in consecrating the sacred chrism go to show that it is a ceremony of the highest importance. Formerly it could be blessed on any day of the year according as necessity arose. Now, however, it must be blessed during the solemn high Mass of Holy Thursday. (Cf. Decr. S. R. C., ed. Gardellini, n. 2475.) For the full solemn ceremonial the consecrating prelate should be assisted by twelve priests, seven deacons, and seven subdeacons. The oil and balsam, being prepared in the sacristy beforehand, are carried in solemn procession to the sanctuary after the Communion, and placed on a table. Then the balsam, held on a silver salver, is blessed, and similarly the olive-oil, which is reserved in a silver jar. After this the balsam is mixed with the oil. Then, the chrism, being perfected with a final prayer, receives the homage of all the sacred ministers present, making each a triple genuflection towards it, and each time saying the words, *Ave sanctum chrisma.* After the ceremony it is taken back to the sacristy, and distributed among the priests who take it away in silver vessels commonly called oil-stocks, what remains being securely and reverently guarded under lock and key. (Cf. Catalani, Com. in Rom. Pont., I, 120; Bernard, Le Pontifical, II, 470-495.)

(4) *Use and Significance.*—Chrism is used in the administration of the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders, in the consecration of churches, chalices, patens, altars, and altar-stones, and in the solemn blessing of bells and baptismal water. The head of the newly-baptized is anointed with chrism, the forehead of the person confirmed, the head and hands of a bishop at his consecration, and the hands of a priest at his ordination. So are the walls of churches, which are solemnly consecrated, anointed with the same holy oil, and the parts of the sacred vessels used in the Mass which come in contact with the Sacred Species, as the paten and chalice. If it be asked why chrism has been thus introduced into the functions of the church liturgy, a reason is found in its special fitness for this purpose by reason of its symbolical significance. For olive-oil, being of its own nature rich, diffusive, and abiding, is fitted to represent the copious outpouring of sacramental grace, while balsam, which gives forth most agreeable and fragrant odours, typifies the innate sweetness of Christian virtue. Oil also gives strength and suppleness to the limbs, while balsam preserves from corruption. Thus anointing with chrism aptly signifies that fulness of grace and spiritual strength by which we are enabled to resist the contagion of sin and produce the sweet flowers of virtue. "For we are the good odour of Christ unto God" (II Cor., ii, 15).

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *De Officiis Ecclesiasticis*, II, n. 26 in *P. L.* LXXXIII; RUPERT, *De Officiis Ecclesiasticis*, V, xvi, xvii, xviii in *P. L.* CLXXII; ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theol.* (Rome, 1894), III, Q. lxxii, a. 2; GOAR, *Euchologion* (Paris, 1647), 618–642; BINGHAM, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, s. v. *Chrism* (London, 1850); CATALANI, *Pontificale Romanum* (Rome, 1850), I, 120; DENZINGER, *Ritus Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (Würzburg, 1863), I, 54 sq.; PERRONE, *Prælectiones Theologicæ*, III, *De Confirmatione* (Paris, 1887); BELLARMINE, III, *De Confirmatione* (Naples, 1858); LEHMKUHL, *Casus Conscientiæ* (Freiburg im Br., 1902); JANSSENS, *La Confirmation* (Lille, 1888), 100–120; VAN DER STAPPEN, *De Sacramentorum Administratione* (Mechlin, 1902), passim; BERNARD, *Le Pontifical* (Paris, 1902) II, xi; DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution* (London, 1903), 306; CABROL, *Les Origines Liturgiques* (Paris, 1906), 164 sq.; *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, s. v. *Chrême* (Paris, 1905); *Kirchenlex.*, art. *Chrisma* (Freiburg im Br., 1882).

PATRICK MORRISROE.

Chrismal, Chrismatory, were formerly used to designate the sheath, or cloth-covering (*theca*) in which relics were wrapped up. The Latin *chrismale* was also applied (a) to the pall or corporal, (b) to the vessel for the Blessed Eucharist, (c) to the cere-cloth covering the table of the altar (see ALTAR-CLOTHS), and (d) sometimes to the long white-hooded robes in which the newly-baptized were clothed (cf. Roman Ritual, II, cap. ii, n. 24), and which they wore from Holy Saturday evening till Low Sunday—called consequently *Dominica in Albis* (cf. Du Cange, Glossar. infimæ et mediæ Latinitatis). This garment, however, was more commonly known as the *chrisome* (cf. Pugin, Glossary), and resembled in shape the modern alb, except that it had a kind of hood for the head. Its representative is now the *vestis candida* still used at baptism. In present-day usage the words *chris-*

mal and *chrismatory* are taken indiscriminately and almost universally to refer to the vessels that are employed to hold the oils that are solemnly consecrated by the bishop on Holy Thursday, viz., oil of catechumens, oil of the sick, and chrism. It is the last mentioned that has given its name to these receptacles. Two kinds of these vessels are in service. One set is employed to reserve the yearly supply and is kept in the sacristy of the cathedral, while the other contains what is required for daily use and is kept in the parochial church. Both kinds should be made either of gold, silver, or at least of tin and pewter (*stannum*), and should have sheaths or cases. They cannot be made of any substance that is likely to become oxidized. In shape the longer ones resemble little jars, while the smaller sort are like small cylindrical boxes and are commonly jointed together. As the vessels for each oil are similar in appearance, they should be stamped with distinctive marks to discriminate one from the other. The letters I (or INF.), CAT., and CHR. are usually engraved on the outside to designate respectively oil of the sick, oil of catechumens, and chrism. Many interesting specimens of these vessels have come down from the Middle Ages and are still preserved in the treasuries of English and continental cathedrals. These vessels are not blessed, but when containing the oils they may not be handled or carried by lay persons except in cases of necessity (Cong. of Rites).

Rituale Romanum (Rome, 1903), passim; CATALANI, *Rituale Romanum: De Sacramenti Baptismi Administratione* (Rome, 1850); DU CANGE, *Glossarium Latinitatis* (Venice, 1736), s. v. *Chrisma*, etc.; BONA, *De Rebus Liturgicis* (Turin, 1747), I, XXV; O'KANE, *Notes on Roman Ritual* (Dublin, 1867), 148; VAN DER STAPPEN, *De Sacramentorum Administratione* (Mechlin, 1900).

PATRICK MORRISROE.

Chrismarium.—(1) A place in a church set apart for the administration of confirmation. (2) An ampulla or jar, globular in form, usually made of silver or pewter, and used for containing the holy oils. See CHRISMAL.

Christ, JESUS. See JESUS CHRIST.

Christ, MONOGRAM OF. See MONOGRAM OF CHRIST.

Christ, OFFICES OF. See JESUS CHRIST.

Christ, ORDER OF THE KNIGHTS OF, a military order which sprang out of the famous Order of the Temple (see KNIGHTS TEMPLARS). As Portugal was the first country in Europe where the Templars settled (in 1128), so it has been the last to preserve any remnant of that order. The Portuguese Templars had contributed to the conquest of Algarve from the Moslems; they were still defending that conquest when their order was suppressed (1312) by Pope Clement V (q.v.). King Diniz, who then ruled Portugal, regretted the loss of these useful auxiliaries all the more because, in the trial to which the order had been submitted everywhere throughout Christendom, the Templars of Portugal had been declared innocent by the ecclesiastical court of the Bishop of Lisbon. To fill their place, the king instituted a new order, under the name of *Christi Militia* (1317). He then obtained for this order the approbation of Pope John XXII, who, by a Bull (1319), gave these knights the rule of the Knights of Calatrava (see CALATRAVA, MILITARY ORDER OF) and put them under the control of the Cistercian Abbot of Alcobaça. Further, by another Bull (1323), the same pope authorized King Diniz to turn over to the new Order of Christ the Portuguese estates of the suppressed Templars, and, as many of the latter hastened to become Knights of Christ, it may fairly be said that the foundation of Dom Diniz was both in its personnel and in its territorial position a continuation in Portugal of the Order of the Temple. Seated first at Castro Marino, it was later (1357) definitively established in the monastery of Thomar, near Santarem.

By this time, however, Portugal had rid its soil of the Moslem, and it seemed that the Order of Christ must waste its strength in idleness, when Prince Henry, the Navigator, son of King João I, opened a new field for its usefulness by carrying the war against Islam into Africa. The conquest of Ceuta (1415) was the first step towards the formation of a great Portuguese empire beyond the seas. It may at present be taken as demonstrated, that the motive of this great enterprise was not mercenary, but religious, its aim being the conquest of Africa for Christ and His Faith. Nothing could have been more in accord with the spirit of the order, which, under Prince Henry himself as its grand master (1417–65), took up the plan with enthusiasm. This explains the extraordinary favours granted by the popes to the order—favours intended to encourage a work of evangelization. Martin V, by a Bull the text of which is lost, granted to Prince Henry, as Grand Master of the Order of Christ, the right of presentation to all ecclesiastical benefices to be founded beyond the seas, together with complete jurisdiction and the disposal of church revenues in those regions. Naturally, the clergy of these early foreign missions were recruited by preference from those priests who were members of the order, and, in 1514, a Bull of Leo X confirmed to it the right of presentation to all bishoprics beyond the seas, from which privilege afterwards arose the custom by which incumbents of such sees wear pectoral crosses of the form peculiar to the Order of Christ. After this campaign King Manoel of Portugal, in order to overcome the repugnance of the knights to remaining in African garrisons, established thirty new commanderies in the conquered territory. Leo X, in order to further increase the number of the order's establishments, granted an annual income of 20,000 cruzadas to be derived from Portuguese church property, and, as a result of all this material assistance, the total of seventy commanderies of the order at the beginning of Manoel's reign had become four hundred and fifty-four at its end, in 1521.

While these foreign expeditions kept alive the military spirit of the order, its religious discipline was declining. Pope Alexander VI, in 1492, commuted the vow of celibacy to that of conjugal chastity, alleging the prevalence among the knights of a concubinage to which regular marriage would be far preferable. The order was becoming less monastic and more secular, and was taking on more and more the character of a royal institution. After Prince Henry the Navigator, the grand mastership was always held by a royal prince; under Manoel it became definitively, with those of Aviz and Santiago, a prerogative of the crown; João III, Manoel's successor, instituted a special council (*Mesa das Ordens*) for the government of these orders in the king's name. Brother Antonius of Lisbon, in attempting a reform, succeeded in bringing about the complete annihilation of religious life among the knights of the order. The priests of the Order of Christ were compelled to resume conventual life at Thomar, the convent itself becoming a regular cloister with which the knights thenceforward maintained only a remote connexion. This unwholesome change the young king, Dom Sebastian, tried to reverse (1574), but the glorious, though useless, death, in Africa, of this last of the crusaders (1578) prevented the accomplishment of his design. During the period of Spanish domination (1580–1640), another attempt to revive the monastic character of the whole order resulted in the statutes enacted by a general chapter, at Thomar, in 1619, and promulgated by Philip IV of Spain, in 1627. The three vows were re-established, even for knights not living in houses of the order, though with certain mitigations, marriage, for instance, being permitted to those who could ob-

tain a papal dispensation. The conditions of admission were noble birth and either two years' service in Africa or three years with the fleet, but commanderies could be held only by those who had served three years in Africa or five years with the fleet.

The last attempt at a reform of the order was that of the Queen Donna Maria, made with the approbation of Pius VI (1789). This, the most important of all the schemes of reformation designed for the order's benefit, made the convent of Thomar once more the headquarters of the whole order, and instead of the conventual prior, who, since 1551, had been elected by his brethren for a term of three years, there was a grand prior of the order, acknowledged by all classes and invested with all the privileges and the whole jurisdiction formerly granted by the popes. The sovereign, however, remained grand master, and the last Grand Priors of the Order of Christ, as official subordinates of the Crown, did not fail to enter into the political entanglements of the nineteenth century. The last of all, Furtado de Mendoça, was identified with the Miguelista party in the troubles of 1829–32, and it was in the general confiscation of monastic property following the defeat of Dom Miguel that the convent of Thomar and four hundred and fifty commanderies were lost. The King of Portugal is still officially "Grand Master of the Order of Our Lord Jesus Christ", and as such confers titular membership in the order, with the decoration of the crimson cross charged with another, smaller, cross of white.

The ORDER OF CHRIST, as a papal decoration, or order of merit, is also a historical survival of the right, anciently reserved to the Holy See, of admitting new members into the Portuguese order. (See DECORATIONS, PAPAL.)

For the GERMAN order sometimes called the ORDER OF CHRIST (*Fratres Militiæ Christi*) see SWORD, BROTHERS OF THE.

FERREIRA, *Memorias e noticias da Ordem dos Templarios* (Lisbon, 1735); *Definições e statutos dos Cavalleros da Ordem de Christo* (Lisbon, 1621); GUIMARÃES, *A Ordem de Christo* (Lisbon, 1901).—See also works on Portuguese history cited in bibliography of AVIZ.

CH. MOELLER.

Christchurch, DIOCESE OF (CHRISTOPOLITANA), its centre being Christchurch, the capital of Canterbury, New Zealand. It comprises the provinces of Canterbury and Westland, a small portion of the Province of Nelson, and the Chatham Islands. In July, 1840, the French corvette l'Aube started for Akaroa (Canterbury) to land a body of settlers there, and to annex to France the South Island of New Zealand. The former project was accomplished; the latter was frustrated by Lieutenant-Governor Hobson. Having ascertained the destination and purpose of the expedition, he raced the corvette to Akaroa in the warship Britomart and, four days before the arrival of the French settlers, proclaimed the South Island British territory. The first English colonists (the "Canterbury Pilgrims") landed at Lyttelton 16 December, 1850. They, and many that followed them, were sent out by the Canterbury Association, a High Church organization whose colonizing scheme was described by Low Churchmen as a "Puseyite invasion of New Zealand". The Canterbury concessions (nearly 3,000,000 fertile acres) were intended to be and remain a great Anglican monopoly. This, however, was prevented by the Constitution Act of 1852. In all Canterbury, including Akaroa, there were 136 Catholics in 1851. During the first two decades they were ministered to by the Marist Fathers Comte, Pesant, Tripe, Séon, Petitjean, and others. In 1860 Christchurch received its first resident priest, Father Chataignier, S. M. On 11 September of that year he laid the foundations of the first church in Canterbury, a wooden structure, 28 by 18 ft. A more spacious church was erected in 1864. Enlarged and beautified by Father Ginaty, S. M., this subsequently served as a pro-cathedral from 1887 till 1905. On the discovery of gold in 1864 there was a great influx of people to Westland, which led to the formation of missions in Hokitika, Greymouth, and elsewhere on the West Coast. The Diocese of Christchurch, formerly part of the Diocese of Wellington, was established by papal Brief, 10 May, 1887. Its first bishop, the Right Reverend John Joseph Grimes, S. M., was consecrated in London, 26 July, 1887. On his arrival in Christchurch there were in the diocese 35 churches, 16 schools, 7 convents, and 17 priests (8 secular and 9 Marists). The history of the diocese since then is one of closer organization and steady progress. The Marist Brothers and the Sisters of Nazareth were introduced; new parochial districts formed; 30 churches built or enlarged; 15 presbyteries, 9 schools, 10 convents, and 3 monasteries (Marist Brothers) erected; and a white stone cathedral, one of the most beautiful religious edifices in Australasia, was opened 12 February, 1905.

STATISTICS (August, 1907): Parochial districts, 21; priests 38 (20 Marists, 18 seculars); Marist Brothers, 13; nuns, 150; convents, 17; Marist Brothers' monasteries, 3; boarding schools (girls), 6; primary schools, 30; charitable institutions, 2 (Nazareth Home and a great Magdalen Asylum); Catholic population, about 25,000.

MORAN, *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia* (Sydney, s. d.); POMPALLIER, *Early History of the Catholic Church in Oceania* (Auckland, 1888); THOMSON, *The Story of New Zealand* (2 vols., London, 1859); JOSE, *History of Australasia* (Sydney, 1901); *New Zealand Tablet*, files.

HENRY W. CLEARY.

Christendom.—In its wider sense this term is used to describe the part of the world which is inhabited by Christians, as Germany in the Middle Ages was the country inhabited by Germans. The word will be taken in this quantitative sense in the article RELIGIONS (q. v.) in comparing the extent of Christendom with that of Paganism or of Islam. But there is a narrower sense in which Christendom stands for a polity as well as a religion, for a nation as well as for a people. Christendom in this sense was an ideal which inspired and dignified many centuries of history and which has not yet altogether lost its power over the minds of men.

The foundations of a Christian polity are to be found in the traditions of the Jewish theocracy softened and broadened by Christian cosmopolitanism, in the completeness with which Christian principles were applied to the whole of life, in the aloofness of the Christian communities from the world around them, and in the hierarchical organization of the clergy. The conflict between the new religion and the Roman Empire was due partly to the very thoroughness of the Christian system and it naturally emphasized the distinction between this new society and the old state. Thus when Constantine proclaimed the Peace of the Church he might almost be described as signing a treaty between two powers. From that Peace to the time of the Barbarian inroads into the West, Christendom was all but conterminous with the Roman Empire, and it might be thought that the ideal of a Christian nation was then at least realized. The legal privileges which were granted to the bishops from the first and which tended to increase, the protection given to the churches and the property of the clergy, and the principle admitted by the emperors, that questions of faith were to be freely decided by the bishops, all these concessions seemed to show that the empire had become positively as well as negatively Christian. To St. Ambrose and the bishops of the fourth century the destruction of the empire seemed almost incredible except as a phase of the final catastrophe, and the system which prevailed in

the days of Theodosius seemed almost the ideal Christian polity. Yet there was about it much that fell short of the ideal of Christendom. In many ways, as a contemporary bishop expressed it, "the church was in the empire, not the empire in the church". The traditions of Roman imperialism were too strong to be easily mitigated. Constantine, though not even a catechumen, in a sense, at least, presided over the Council of Nicæa and the "Divinity" of his son Constantius, though formally observing the rule that decisions of faith belonged to the bishops, was able to exert such pressure upon them that at one time not a single strictly orthodox bishop was left in the occupation of his see. The officious interference of a theologian emperor was more dangerous to the Church than the hostility of Julian, his successor. But the wish to dominate in every sphere was not the only relic of pagan Rome. Though the emperor was no longer pontifex maximus and the statue of Victory was removed from the senate house, though Theodosius decreed the final closing of the temples and put an end to pagan public worship, the ancient world was not really converted, it was hardly a catechumen. In philosophy, literature, and art it clung to the old models and reproduced them in a debased form. Pagan civilization had not been renewed in Christ. Such a rebirth demanded Christians of a simpler character and a more spontaneous vigour than the inhabitants of the degenerate empire. The formation of Christendom was to be the work of a new generation of nations, baptized in their infancy and receiving even the message of the ancient world from the lips of Christian teachers.

But it was to be long before the great future hidden in the Barbarian invasions was to become manifest. At their first irruption the influence of the Teutonic tribes was only destructive; the Christian polity seemed to be perishing with the empire. The Church, however, as a spiritual power survived and mitigated even the fury of the Barbarian, for the helpless population of Rome found a refuge in the churches during the sack of the city by Alaric in 410. The distinction between Church and empire, which this disaster illustrated, was emphasized by the accusations brought against the patriotism of the Christians and by St. Augustine's reply in his "De Civitate Dei". He develops in this encyclopædic treatise the idea of the two kingdoms or societies (*city*, except in a very metaphorical sense, is too narrow to be an adequate translation of *civitas*), the Kingdom of God consisting of His friends in this world and the next, whether men or angels, while the earthly kingdom is that of His enemies. These two kingdoms have existed since the fall of the angels, but in a more limited sense and in relation to the Christian dispensation, the Church is spoken of as God's kingdom on earth while the Roman Empire is all but identified with the *civitas terrena;* not altogether, however, because the civil power, in securing peace for that part of the heavenly kingdom which is on its earthly pilgrimage, receives some kind of Divine sanction. We might, perhaps, have expected, now that the empire was Christian, that St. Augustine would have looked forward to a new *civitas terrena* reconciled and united to the *civitas Dei;* but this prophetic vision of the future was prevented, it may be, by the prevalent opinion, that the world was near its end. The "De Civitate", however, which had a commanding influence in the Middle Ages, helped to form the ideal of Christendom by the development which it gave to the idea of the kingdom of God upon earth, its past history, its dignity, and universality.

From the fifth century till the days of Charles the Great (see CHARLEMAGNE) there was no effectual political unity in the West, and the Church had no civil counterpart. But Charles' dominions extended from the Elbe to the Ebro and from Brittany to Belgrade; there was but little of Western Christendom which they did not include. Ireland and the South of Italy were the only parts of it which his power or his influence did not reach. Over the territories actually comprised in his empire he exercised a real control, administrative and legislative, as well as military. But the Carlovingian empire was far more than a mere political federation: it was a period of renewal and reorganization in nearly every sphere of social life. It was spiritual, perhaps, even more than political. In war conversion went hand in hand with victory; in peace Charles ruled through bishops as effectively as through counts; his active solicitude extended to the reform and education of the clergy, the promotion of learning, the revival of the Benedictine Rule, to the arts, to the liturgy and even the doctrines of the Church. In the West Christendom became a temporal polity and a society as well as a Church, and the empire of Charles, brief though its existence proved to be, remained for many centuries an ideal and therefore a power. Yet the Carlovingian civilization was in most cases a return to late Roman models. Originality is not its characteristic. Charles' favourite church at Aachen is supported on the columns which he sent for from the ruined temples of Italy. Even in his relations with the Church he would have found the closest precedents for his policy in the attitude of Constantine or even perhaps of Justinian. Great as was his respect for the successor of St. Peter, he claimed for himself a masterful share in the administration of matters ecclesiastical: he could write, even before his coronation as emperor, to Pope Leo III, "My part is to defend the Church by force of arms from external attacks and to secure her internally through the establishment of the Catholic faith; your part is to render us the assistance of prayer". Still every step forward has usually begun with a return to the past; it is thus that the artist or the statesman learns his craft. If the Carlovingian system had lasted, no doubt much that was new would have been developed, and even under Charles's successor the spiritual and temporal powers were placed on a more equal and more appropriate footing. But Charles was too great for his age; his work was premature. The political bond was too weak to prevail over tribal loyalty and Teutonic particularism. Disorder and disruption would have broken up Carlovingian civilization even if Northman, Saracen, and Hungarian had not come to plunge Europe once more into anarchy.

During the tenth century the work of moral and political reconstruction was slowly carried on by the Church and feudalism; in the eleventh came that struggle between these two creative factors of the new Europe which saved the Church from absorption into feudalism. This century opened with what was, perhaps, the most hopeful attempt, after Charles the Great, to give the medieval empire a really universal character. The revived empire of Otto I in the middle of the tenth century had been but an imperfect copy of its Carlovingian model. It was much more limited geographically, as it included only Germany, its dependent states to the east, and Italy; it was limited also in its interests, for Otto left to the Church nearly all those spheres of ecclesiastical, educational, literary, and artistic activity for which Charles had done so much. But Otto's grandson, the boy-emperor Otto III, "magnum quoddam et improbabile cogitans", as a contemporary expressed it, attempted to make the empire less German, less military, more Roman, more universal, and more of a spiritual force. He was in intimate alliance with the Holy See, and with almost startling originality he established in Rome the first German and then the first French pope. He seems to have realized the truth that it was only by leaning on and developing the religious aspect of

the empire that he could hope at that stage of history to make its influence universal in the West. Europe was so unformed politically that the long reign of a wise and determined emperor backed up by the Church might perhaps have changed its future history, have brought together into one broad and rather indefinite channel the small but already divergent streams of national tendencies, and built up Europe on the basis of a Christian federalism. But Otto, *mirabilia mundi*, died at the age of twenty-two, and the dream of a Christian empire faded away. Never again did a successor of his make a serious attempt to throw off his German character and to make the sphere of his rule conterminous with Christendom. Fascinating as is the theory of the Holy Roman Empire, and great as was its influence on history and speculation, it was always something of a sham. It claimed in political matters a sphere of action as wide as that of the popes in things spiritual; but, unlike the spiritual, this political *plena potestas* was never admitted. Even before the War of Investitures and the First Crusade had made so wide a breach in the imperial prestige, an Abbot of Dijon of Italian origin could contrast the still enduring unity of the Church with the disruption of the civil power. The empire is generally held to have reached its zenith in the middle of the eleventh century, but that is not the century in which we find the ideal of a united Christendom nearest its realization.

Political unity in the West was never restored after the fall of the Carlovingian Empire, religious unity lasted till the Reformation, but in the twelfth century we find, in addition, a very large measure of what may compendiously be called "social unity". Before that time isolation, disorder, and the predominance of feudalism had kept men apart; after it the development of national distinctions was to have something of the same effect. The twelfth century is therefore the period in which Christian cosmopolitanism can best be studied. The Church was naturally the chief unifying force; in the darkest days she had preached the same gospel to Frank, Saxon, and Gallo-Roman, and her organization had been, at critical moments when the civil power had almost sunk under the flood, the only bond which linked together the populations of the West. The opening century found the Church in the midst of that Hildebrandine movement, in favour of clerical celibacy and against simony, which was necessary to save the spiritual character of the clergy from being obliterated by too close a contact with temporal administration and the material ambitions of feudal society. The reform, though its centre was at Rome, was a European movement. Its forerunners had been found in the monasteries of Burgundy and among the students of canon law in the Rhine cities; at the height of the struggle its leaders included Italians, Lorrainers, Frenchmen, and a German monastic revival. When Paschal II showed signs of faltering, the movement was carried on almost in spite of him by the zeal of French reformers. Even Spain, England, and Denmark caught the saving infection, and the eventual settlement between Church and empire was foreshadowed in the concordat, devised probably by a French canonist, which was agreed to by St. Anselm and Henry I. Thus did all the nations which were to be have their share in the victory of Hildebrandine principles, and there was roused throughout the West a revival of the spiritual life. The ideals of the clergy were raised, or rather they acquired strength and confidence to pursue ideals which they had always, though despairingly, acknowledged. This crusade against selfishness, passion, and weakness brought together the clergy of the West, as the attack on more material foes united its peoples, and as a consequence the ecclesiastical body in the twelfth century is a real society almost contemptuous of political or racial frontiers. We find Frenchmen and an Englishman in the chair of St. Peter; an Italian, St. Anselm, at Canterbury; a Savoyard, St. Hugh, at Lincoln; an English John of Salisbury at Chartres: instances such as those could be multiplied almost indefinitely. In medieval Latin this vast society possessed a language suited to the varied wants of the age, and it is as living as any vernacular if we read it in a letter of St. Anselm, a sermon of St. Bernard, a poem of Adam of St. Victor, the "Polycraticus" of John of Salisbury, an assize of Henry II, the desultory chronicle of Ordericus Vitalis, or the finished history of William of Tyre. It was a language which might have had a greater literature if the less simple amongst those who wrote had not been continually harking back to classical models.

The spirit of Catholicity in the Church was guarded and prompted by the ever increasing power of the popes. The days when the Holy See had had to be rescued by the emperors from the petty and passionate Roman nobility must have seemed far off, and the most definite result of the War of Investitures was a second liberation, the conquest of the complete independence of papal elections. Never was the papal power in Europe so great as in the years between the end of that war in 1122 and the great disaster of the Second Crusade. Besides being the guardian of the Faith, the papacy was fast becoming the central court of Christendom. For close on two centuries, from Nicholas I to Leo IX in the middle of the eleventh century, the plenary powers of the pope had been but exceptionally exercised north of the Alps, though they had been acknowledged in principle, but in this most legal of centuries the exercise of papal jurisdiction becomes habitual. The Curia was treated as a court of first instance as well as a court of appeal. Hardly any subject was too small or too local to be referred to Rome: the pope, for instance, decided whether or not the Duke of Lorraine might have a castle within four miles of Toul. Papal legates might be met on all the highways of Christendom; papal courts sat in every land. Canon law grew fast, and the "Decretum" of Gratian, about the middle of the century, though it was not an authoritative collection, provided legates and judges with an admirable synthesis of papal pronouncements. St. Bernard was much troubled at the amount of legal business which poured in upon the pope; it must, he considered, interfere with the more spiritual duties of his high office. But the movement was irresistible; the papacy had become *de facto* the centre of a vast Christian nation. The empire was, as we have seen, out of court. It was in the papacy that Christendom, a temporal as well as a spiritual society, found its head in temporal and spiritual things alike.

After the faith and the hierarchy of the Church the monastic orders have usually formed the strongest bond of Catholic union, and in the twelfth century the monastic spirit was full of life. In the previous epoch the Cluniac Benedictines had played an essential part in the work of reconstruction; but life was now more complicated, and monasticism took many forms. The contemplative spirit of the old hermits inspired the Carthusian foundation of St. Bruno, "the only ancient order which has never been reformed and never required reforming", the increased demand for parish work led to the revival of regular canons, and in part to the foundation of the Premonstratensians, the Crusades produced the military orders, while in the Cistercians the new spiritual fervour with its ascetical and mystical tendencies found appropriate expression. Seldom has a new order spread with such rapidity throughout Europe as these white Benedictines, and St. Bernard, their great representative, is the most marvellous instance of the power of a single man, without official position, over all classes and different nations. The settlement of a disputed papal election practically depended on his verdict, he ap-

peased the feuds of German noble families and reconciled Italian cities, he led one emperor to the South of Italy and sent another on a crusade to the East; more wonderful still, single-handed he persuaded the Roman people to forsake the antipope. Though not the originator, he was the motive power of the Second Crusade, and his eloquence seemed as persuasive in the Rhine cities as in Burgundy, and as successful in saving the Jews from the fanaticism of the crusaders as in rousing the crusading spirit.

Besides the Church and its many activities, there were other forces at work, other expressions of the energy of youthful Christendom which must at least be enumerated. The twelfth-century renaissance was a rapid development of what may be called Franco-Norman civilization. France, if the name is given a comprehensive meaning, had conquered England and South Italy, had brought about the Crusades, and had helped the papacy to victory over the empire. It was in France that the new monastic movements took their rise, and the intellectual movement as well. The University of Paris was the university of Christendom, and the problems stated by the Breton Abelard excited the curiosity and the enthusiasm of young men from every country. French was spoken nearly as widely as Latin, and the medieval epic, the romances of the Arthurian legend, and the lyrics of the troubadours, the three most characteristic forms of medieval vernacular literature, all were developed amongst men who spoke one of the dialects of French. Politically the Franco-Norman world was divided between Plantagenet, Capetian, and the princes of the South, and the personality of Frederick Barbarossa gave a splendour to German politics, but intellectually and socially French civilization dominated Europe. It was, however, a supremacy which lay in the rapidity and logical thoroughness with which she expressed ideas common to the whole West. The development of Gothic architecture in England was almost parallel to the French, the epic and the Arthurian legend found a congenial soil in Germany, and the lyrical poetry of Italy was almost a younger sister to that of Provence. The same spirit seemed to be abroad from Scotland to Palermo, and the Christians of the West must have felt that they were indeed citizens of a great city.

For this sense of a common Christendom was not confined to the clergy or the knightly and baronial classes. The peasantry and the town-population had much improved their economic and legal positions since the beginning of the eleventh century; they had also profited by the education of action and experience. In the movement for the Truce of God, in the Hildebrandine reform, in the Crusades, in all these struggles of a crowded age, "the holy people of God" had taken a prominent part; all had increased their self-confidence, all had drawn them closer to the clergy and to one another. Though the aim of the Hildebrandine reform was to preserve the distinctive features of the priestly life, it had not formed the clergy into a caste. Gregory VII had appealed to the laity, and the reformers found among the people allies most enthusiastic, at times indeed fanatical and cruel. The Crusades, too, had consecrated the devotion of the poor pilgrims as well as knightly valour. At one moment, when the leaders had forgotten the Holy City for the sake of Syrian castles, it was the zeal of the poor that alone saved the fortunes of the expedition. In the other movements of the time clergy and people were often united, and municipal liberties, at least in their earlier stages, found a support in the Church. Alexander III, the greatest pope of the century, was allied with the Lombard republics in their struggle with Frederick Barbarossa, the greatest of its emperors. It is at least probable that since the early ages of the Church, clergy and laity have never been so united as in this century. Few medieval saints have excited so much universal and popular enthusiasm as St. Thomas of Canterbury, a martyr for the rights of the Church and the clergy, and the pilgrims who thronged to Canterbury from all parts of Christendom are perhaps the best evidence of the union between people and clergy, and between the different nations of the West.

The pontificate of Innocent III, which began before the close of the twelfth century, was the climax of this period of Christian cosmopolitanism. It illustrates both the splendour of the ideal and the increasing difficulty of realizing it. Few popes have had nobler aims than Innocent, few have been more favoured by nature and circumstance or have been apparently more successful. He was enabled to put himself at the head of a national movement in Italy, to govern Rome, where his predecessors had been weakest, to compel the King of France to respect the rights of marriage and the King of England those of the Church, to help in the success of two papalist candidates to the empire, and to see a crusade sail for the East. These are but some of the successes of his reign, yet it is impossible to study the fortunes of his pontificate without observing that nearly every one of his victories is marked by the signs of ultimate failure. Of the two emperors whom he helped to the throne, the first repudiated all his engagements and declared open war upon him in Italy, the second was that Frederick II who was to be the most thoroughgoing foe of the papacy. The homage which Innocent won from King John contributed in a later generation to embitter the relations between England and the Holy See. In his Italian policy, disinterested as it was, can be traced the first beginnings of future evils; the political power he had acquired led to the first case of nepotism and to the first appeal to a French noble for help in the South of Italy. He lost control over both the religious campaigns which he set in motion, for he endeavoured unsuccessfully to protect Raymond of Toulouse from the Albigensian crusaders and to prevent the Venetians diverting the Fourth Crusade from Jerusalem to Constantinople.

That so great a pope should meet with failures so signal was significant of the change coming over Europe. The control over temporal and even ecclesiastical matters was slipping away from the head of Christendom, though the great personality of Innocent and the successful war waged by his successors against the empire might disguise the fact from contemporaries. In the fourteenth century the national wars, the Great Schism, the unimpeded progress of the Turks, these were all witnesses to the divisions of Christendom. For a moment, at the time of the Council of Constance in 1414, there seemed to be a rally; the Christian society appeared to be drawing together again in order to put an end to the schism and to reform the Church; but as a matter of fact that council was the first of European congresses, a meeting of national delegates rather than a parliament of Christendom. The history of this change from the Christendom of the twelfth century to the nations of the Reformation epoch, is the history of the later Middle Ages. It is possible, however, to disentangle some of the elements of this complicated process of disintegration.

To the modern student, who is wise after the event, it is clear by the eleventh century that the Europe of the future is not going to be built up politically as an empire, and that the ultimate development of some form of national state is assured. The Church, though she might have preserved a large measure of social unity and linked the nations together, could never have formed a permanent, universal state, for Christianity is not, like Islam, a political system. Politically, there seem but two alternatives: empire or nations. Indeed the roots of nationality can be traced deep down in geographical and racial differences and

in the varying degrees in which the Teutonic invaders of the Roman Empire coalesced with its old inhabitants. In the twelfth century, though the sense of a common Christianity is the predominant characteristic of the age, the development of national distinctions proceeded apace. Germany was long to regret the glories of the reign of Frederick Barbarossa, yet even his power failed to level the Alps politically and to overcome the still hardly conscious nationalism of the Lombard cities. The social and intellectual influence which France had exerted in the middle of the century began under Philip Augustus to take a political form; while in England conquerors and conquered were fast amalgamating, and a national feeling, fostered by insular position, had grown up, though it was concealed for the moment by the extent of the Angevin Empire and the foreign interests of Henry II and Richard I. This empire broke into pieces under John, and, after an interval of weakness and hesitation, England appears in the reign of Edward I as the country where nationality had most rapidly developed. Elsewhere, too, the process continued. The personality of St. Louis gave to the French monarchy a halo comparable to the spiritual character which was to cling for so many centuries to the Holy Roman Empire. The fall of the Hohenstauffen decided finally what had long threatened, that Germany was to be not a State, but at any rate a nation severed from Italy, and that Italy itself was to live its own turbulent city life so fruitful in war, in tyranny, in saints, and in works of art.

Meanwhile the new monarchies of the West became self-conscious through their lawyers. Secular law in the twelfth century had given its support to the civil power, but it had been overshadowed, on the whole, by the great development of canon law. Towards the close of the thirteenth it had its revenge as the ally of the national sovereigns. Edward I was both one of the most legal and one of the most powerful of English kings, yet in his case legal absolutism was mitigated by customary law. In France the enigmatic figure of Philip the Fair was half-concealed by his legist ministers, men who combined a radical anti-clericalism, ready to go any lengths, with the most frank acknowledgment of the absolute power of the sovereign. It is an instance of the irony of history that Edward and Philip should be the contemporaries of Boniface VIII, the boldest assertor of papal supremacy. The probable explanation is that the recent victory over the empire misled the papalist writers and perhaps the popes themselves. The disappearance of the Hohenstauffen seemed to leave the papacy an undisputed supremacy in the Christian world. It had been the practice to speak of the spiritual and temporal powers in terms of pope and emperor, and it was long before it was realized, at least on the papal side, that the civil power, defeated as emperor, had returned to the attack with more aggressive vigour as the Monarchy and the State. The papal-imperial controversy continued, though with increasing unreality, when the pope was at Avignon, and the emperor was Louis of Bavaria, and little effort was made to adapt to the new conditions the older theory of the co-ordinate powers of Church and State, both of immediate Divine origin but differing in dignity.

The struggle between Boniface and Philip culminated in the outrage of Anagni, where Nogaret, the French lawyer, struck the aged pope. It was a brutal act, disgraceful only to the perpetrator. Unfortunately, it was followed by the migration, a few years later, of the papal court to the prison-palace of Avignon. This premature development of French absolutism was followed by years of war and anarchy; but from her misfortunes France rose up a consolidated monarchy. In England, aristocratic misrule and some forty years of intermittent civil war produced the same result. In Spain, and even in the German and Scandinavian principalities and kingdoms, different causes tended in the same direction. Thus grew up those monarchies, powerful at home, jealous of foreign interference, which contributed so much to the Reformation.

While in the political sphere nations were drawing apart, in the social sphere the Church was losing much of her influence on the thoughts of men. Some of this loss was perhaps inevitable. New interests were springing up on every side with the growth of wealth, of education, and of the complexity of life, new professions, other than that of arms, were being opened to the educated laity. Religion could hardly expect to keep the hold she had exercised on the outward lives of Christians. Meanwhile the improvement of secular law would in time render unnecessary and invidious many of the clerical privileges which had been so essential in a simpler age. Thus, as European society developed, the clergy, the most cosmopolitan element of it, would necessarily lose some of the commanding influence they had exercised in the ages when they represented civilization as well as religion. But other causes were at work. The high religious enthusiasm of the earlier twelfth century was not maintained at the same level either in clergy or people. And indeed even that Christian age had had its dark side. Passion, the fierce passionate character of a primitive people, was not yet subdued. What had been won by the Hildebrandine movement had to be preserved. No moral victory is final: no generation can afford to disarm. The very success of the Church brought its dangers, and increased power tended to ambition and worldliness. The faults and the wealth of the clergy must have contributed something, it would be difficult to say how much, to the darkest feature of the age, the heresy which even in St. Bernard's time lurked in secret nearly everywhere. This evil spread like a plague through Southern France and Italy, and kept appearing sporadically north of the Alps. It seemed to threaten Christian morals and Christian faith alike. So acute did the danger become in France that it almost justified the violences of the Albigensian Crusade; but the Church of the thirteenth century had nobler weapons than those of De Montfort or the Inquisition: the Friars and Scholastic movement attacked heresy, morally and intellectually, and routed it. Henceforth, however, till the sixteenth century, no great religious or monastic movement, common to Christendom, was provoked by the many moral and intellectual causes which led to the decline and fall of the medieval system and finally to the Reformation itself.

The history of the papacy cannot be separated from that of the Church. The great popes of the past had had a share which can hardly be over-estimated in binding together Christian society and raising its moral level; it is not surprising that the diminished influence of the papacy is among the causes of the disintegration of Christendom. It is difficult not to trace the decadence to the struggle with Frederick II. Before that struggle, in the days of Innocent III, the difficulties of the papacy were due to its agents, its subjects, to the very greatness of the task it had undertaken, not to the character or aims of the popes themselves, But from Gregory IX a different spirit seemed to prevail. The popes were engaged in a hand-to-hand conflict with a power which aimed at establishing a strong monarchy in Italy which threatened to stifle Roman and papal freedom; the contest was not being waged with an imperious but distant German: it was Italian, territorial and bitter. The spiritual ruler seemed almost merged in the sovereign of Rome and the feudal lord of Sicily. Money was necessary, and in order to obtain it funds had to be raised in other,

and especially, transalpine lands, and by means which aroused much discontent and which affected the credit of Rome as the central court of Christendom. The conception of canon law, of a system of courts Christian and a sacred jurisdiction over-riding political frontiers, is a magnificent one, and the debt which European law owes to the canonists is admitted by the modern masters of legal history. It was a system, however, which had many rivals, and it required the support of a high moral prestige. Unfortunately, the machinery was, from the first, defective; there was no organization at Rome capable of dealing with the press of legal business, and even in the twelfth century complaints of venality and delay were frequent and bitter. Litigants are not easily satisfied, nor has the law often been at once impartial, cheap, and speedy in any country; yet it can hardly be denied that in the thirteenth century the Roman courts suffered from very serious abuses.

It is unnecessary to follow the fortunes of the papacy after the thirteenth century; the lesson of the French influence, of the schism, of the Italianization of the fifteenth-century popes, is but too clear. Though the essential rights of the Holy See were but seldom denied in those years, it was clear, when the crisis came, and when the papal supremacy had to bear the first attack, that that devotion which makes martyrs and the enthusiasm which inspires righteous rebellion were sadly lacking. It would seem, then, that the growth of national divisions, the increased secularism of everyday life, the diminished influence of the Church and the papacy, that all these interdependent influences had broken up the social unity of Christendom at least two centuries before the Reformation, yet it must never be forgotten that religious unity remained. As long as Christendom was Catholic it was a reality, a visible society with one head and one hierarchy. Though for the moment centrifugal tendencies were in the ascendant, the future was full of possibilities. A great religious movement, a revival of the Christian spirit, the reform which should have come when the Reformation came, any such appeal to the common faith and to Catholic loyalty might have brought the Christian nations together again, have put some check upon their internal absolutism and external combativeness, and have removed from the Christian name the reproach of mutual antagonism.

Such speculation is, however, as idle as it is fascinating; instead of the reform, of the renewal of the spiritual life of the Church round the old principles of Christian faith and unity, there came the Reformation, and Christian society was broken up beyond the hope of at least proximate reunion. But it was long before this fact was realized even by the Reformers, and indeed it must have been more difficult for a subject of Henry VIII to convince himself that the Latin Church was really being torn asunder than for us to conceive the full meaning and all the consequences of a united Christendom. Much of the weakness of ordinary men in the earlier years of the Reformation, much of their attitude towards the papacy, can be explained by their blindness to what was happening. They thought, no doubt, that all would come right in the end. So dangerous is it, particularly in times of revolution, to trust to anything but principle.

The effect of the Reformation was to separate from the Church all the Scandinavian, most of the Teutonic, and a few of the Latin-speaking populations of Europe; but the spirit of division once established worked further mischief, and the antagonism between Lutheran and Calvinist was almost as bitter as that between Catholic and Protestant. At the beginning, however, of the seventeenth century, Christendom was weary of religious war and persecution, and for a moment it almost seemed as if the breach were to be closed. The deaths of Philip II and Elizabeth, the conversion and tolerant policy of Henry IV of France, the accession of the House of Stuart to the English throne, the pacification between Spain and the Dutch, all these events pointed in the same direction. A like tendency is apparent in the theological speculation of the time: the learning and judgment of Hooker, the first beginnings of the High Church movement, the spread of Arminianism in Holland, these were all signs that in the Protestant Churches thought, study, and piety had begun to moderate the fires of controversy, while in the monumental works of Suarez and the other Spanish doctors, Catholic theology seemed to be resuming that stately, comprehensive view of its problems which is so impressive in the great Scholastics. It is not surprising that this moment, when the cause of reconciliation seemed in the ascendant, was marked by a scheme of Christian political union. Much importance was at one time attributed to the *grand dessein* of Henry IV. Recent historians are inclined to assign most of the design to Henry's Protestant minister, Sully; the king's share in the plan was probably but small. A coalition war against Austria was first to secure Europe against the domination of the Hapsburgs, but an era of peace was to follow. The different Christian States, whether Catholic or Protestant, were to preserve their independence, to practise toleration, to be united in a "Christian Republic" under the presidency of the pope, and to find an outlet for their energies in the recovery of the East. These dreams of Christian reunion soon melted away. Religious divisions were too deep-seated to permit the reconstruction of a Christian polity, and the cure for international ills has been sought in other directions. The international law of the seventeenth-century jurists was based upon national law, not upon Christian fellowship, the balance of power of the eighteenth century on the elementary instinct of self-defence, and the nationalism of the nineteenth on racial or linguistic distinctions. It has never occurred to anyone to take seriously the mystic terminology with which in the Holy Alliance Alexander I of Russia clothed his policy of conservative intervention. The Greek insurrection and the Eastern questions generally restored the word *Christian* to the vocabulary of the European chanceries, but it has come in recent times to express our common civilization rather than a religion which so many Europeans now no longer profess. (See RELIGIONS.)

Older works are: GUIZOT, *Civilization in Europe;* BRYCE, *Holy Roman Empire;* HERGENRÖTHER, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols., 1884-86), with his *Catholic Church and Christian State* (London, 1876); KRAUS, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte.* Among more modern works the following might be consulted: MAITLAND, tr. (with commentary) of GIECKE, *Political Theories of the Middle Age* (Cambridge, 1900); GRUPP, *Kulturgesch. des Mittelalters* (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1894); DEVAS, *The Key of the World's Progress* (London, 1906); KARL MÜLLER, *Kirchengesch.* (Tübingen, 1902); HILL, *A History of Diplomacy* (London, 1906), especially vol. I. Of these writers HERGENRÖTHER, KRAUS, DEVAS, and GRUPP are Catholics.

FRANCIS URQUHART.

Christening. See BAPTISM.

Christian, first Bishop of Prussia, d. 1245. Before becoming a missionary he was a Cistercian monk at the monastery of Oliva near Danzig or, as appears more probable, at Lekno or some other Polish monastery. In 1209 he was commissioned by Innocent III to direct the Prussian missions between the Rivers Vistula and Memel, which had been begun by Abbot Godfrey of Lekno and the monk Philip in 1207. He was appointed bishop in 1212, and, when, in 1215, he went to Rome in order to report to the pope on the condition and prospects of his mission, he was consecrated first Bishop of Prussia. On his journey to Rome he was accompanied by two converted Prussian noblemen, Warpoda and Suavabona, who were

then solemnly baptized by Innocent III. Soon after Christian's return to Prussia the pagans rose against the foreign Christians who had settled there, destroyed their fortifications, and compelled many of the newly converted to return to paganism. With the permission of Pope Honorius III, Christian gathered an army of crusaders who, however, were too few to gain a decisive victory. The bishop was even forced to leave Prussia. In a contract made with Duke Conrad of Masovia and Bishop Gedeon of Plock, in 1222, Christian received rich possessions and incomes as well as episcopal jurisdiction in Culmerland. He, therefore, decided to erect his episcopal see at Culm, and from there direct the affairs of the Prussian missions. But soon the Prussians invaded Culmerland also. In his extremity Christian founded the Order of the Knights of Dobrin, which was approved by Pope Gregory IX about 1228. When these knights were unsuccessful Christian and Duke Conrad of Masovia applied for assistance to Herman of Salza, the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order in Palestine. In 1228 Conrad entered into a contract with the Teutonic Order, by virtue of which his possessions in Culmerland became the property of the order. In 1230 Bishop Christian added to this grant all his own possessions in Culmerland and, a year later, one-third of his possessions in Prussia, retaining, however, for himself ecclesiastical jurisdiction both in Culmerland and in Prussia.

Under the leadership of Herman Balk the Teutonic Order began the great conflict which after more than half a century of bloodshed dealt the death-blow to paganism in Prussia and made the Teutonic Order one of the greatest powers in Europe. When Christian asked for the assistance of the German Knights he was determined to keep the ecclesiastical administration of Prussia under his control. Soon, however, he became aware that the order laid claim to the spiritual as well as the temporal management of the conquered territory. Up to the year 1227 none but Cistercians assisted Christian in his apostolic labours; but with the arrival of the German Knights, the Dominicans, who were favoured by the order and by Pope Gregory IX, took a strong foothold in Prussia, while Christian and his Cistercian colabourers were thrown into the background. William of Modena, who had been appointed papal legate for Prussia, disregarded the rights of Christian and proceeded as if there were no Bishop of Prussia. In addition to these misfortunes, Christian was captured and his attendants slain by some pagan Prussians who pretended to have been converted and to desire the Sacrament of Baptism from the bishop. During the six years of his captivity (1233–39) the Teutonic Order and the papal legate did nothing for his release. In 1236 Gregory IX, who, it appears, considered the liberation of Christian impossible, empowered William of Modena to divide Prussia into three dioceses. The bishops for these new sees were, in accordance with the wish of the Teutonic Order, to be selected from the Dominican Order, while no provision whatever was made for the imprisoned Bishop Christian.

Finally, in the winter of 1239–40, Christian obtained his liberty. He was obliged to give hostages, whom he afterwards ransomed for a sum stated as of eight hundred marks (at that time a large amount), which was granted him by Pope Gregory. Immediately upon his liberation Christian complained to the pope that the Teutonic Order refused baptism to the catechumens who desired it, oppressed the newly converted, claimed episcopal rights, and refused to restore property which belonged to the bishop. The first two accusations may have been wrong or exaggerated, but the last two were founded on truth. In 1240 the pope instructed Bishop Henry and two provosts of Meissen to induce the Teutonic Order to satisfy the demands of Christian. The legate's intended division of Prussia into three dioceses did not take effect, and after Gregory's death (22 Aug., 1241) Christian and the Teutonic Order agreed that two-thirds of the conquered territory in Prussia should belong to the Order, and one-third to the bishop; that, moreover, the bishop should have the right to exercise in the territory belonging to the order those ecclesiastical functions which only a bishop can perform.

William of Modena, the papal legate, did not give up his plans of dividing Prussia into various dioceses. He finally obtained from Pope Innocent IV permission to make a division, and on 29 July, 1243, Prussia was divided into the four dioceses: Culm, Pomerania, Ermland, and Samland. The only recognition which Christian received for his apostolic labours of more than twenty years consisted in the privilege to select for himself any one of the four new episcopal sees. When Christian refused to make a selection he was severely reprimanded by the pope. Despite numerous petitions sent by Cistercian abbots in favour of Bishop Christian, the pope in a Brief of 6 Feb., 1245, threatened to deprive him of all episcopal jurisdiction unless he selected one of the new Prussian dioceses within two months. In the spring of the same year, probably before the two months had passed, Christian died.

PLINSKY in SDRALEK'S *Kirchgeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, 1902, I, 151–249; KETRZYNSKI, *Deutschorden und Konrad von Masovien* (Lemberg, 1904); HAUCK, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1903), IV, 643 sqq.; PRUTZ, *Preussische Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1900), I, 42 sqq.; MICHAEL, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes* (Freiburg im Br., 1897), I, 108 sqq.; FELTEN, *Papst Gregor IX* (Freiburg im Br., 1886), 124–27, 230–32; WÖLKY in *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte Ermlands* (Leipzig, 1878), VI, 289 sqq.

MICHAEL OTT.

Christian Archæology.—Christian archæology is that branch of the science of archæology the object of which is the study of ancient Christian monuments. The modern historian who endeavours to reconstruct the life of the primitive Christians has two sources of information to draw upon, namely: literary and monumental sources. By literary sources is commonly understood the existing remains of early Christian literature; monumental sources consist of the various classes of objects of a material character surviving from antiquity, which were produced by Christians or under Christian influence, sepulchral inscriptions, paintings, sculptures, churches, and the products of the minor arts. The principal aim of Christian archæology, as indicated, is to ascertain all that is possible relative to the manners and customs of the early Christians from the monuments of Christian antiquity. Any attempt to determine the date when the period loosely designated "Christian Antiquity" gave place to the medieval period must of necessity be more or less arbitrary. As a consequence of this difficulty, differences of opinion exist among archæologists as to the chronological limits to be assigned to Christian archæology. However, such authorities as De Rossi and Le Blant regard the beginning of the seventh century, or the death of Gregory the Great (604), as a date which marks sufficiently well the end of the ancient, and the beginning of the medieval, period. In Gaul and Germany Christian monuments preserved much of their ancient character till a century later.

I. SUMMARY OF ITS HISTORY.—The honour of inaugurating the scientific study of Christian antiquity belongs to an Augustinian monk, Onofrio Panvinio, who in 1554 and 1568 published two important works on the basilicas of Rome (De præcipuis urbis Romæ sanctioribus basilicis) and on the cemeteries and sepulchral rites of the early Christians ("De ritu sepeliendi mortuos apud veteres Christianos et de eorum cœmeteriis"). Ten years after the publication of the latter work, some la-

bourers accidentally discovered (31 May, 1578), on the Via Salaria an ancient subterranean cemetery containing inscriptions and frescoes of an unmistakably Christian character. Among the first to visit the newly-discovered cemetery was the ecclesiastical historian Baronius, who, though he recognized the importance of the find, yet took no part in contemporary explorations. He had, however, already commenced his great historical work, "Annales Ecclesiastici", the composition of which absorbed his whole attention. For fifteen years after the discovery on the Via Salaria the only persons to attempt any explorations in the catacombs were a Spanish Dominican, Alfonso Ciacconio, and two Flemish laymen, Philip de Winghe and Jean l'Heureux. Ciacconio accomplished nothing of importance. The investigations of the two Flemish explorers gave promise of better results, but their writings remained unpublished, and consequently had no influence on their contemporaries.

The first to begin the systematic exploration of the ancient Roman cemeteries or catacombs, was the "Father of Christian Archæology", Antonio Bosio. Born in Malta in 1575, Bosio was placed at an early age under the care of an uncle who resided at Rome, as procurator of the Knights of Malta. At the age of eighteen he was attracted to the study of the early Christian sepulchral monuments of Rome, and from that date till his death, in 1629, a period of thirty-six years, he devoted his life to the exploration of the catacombs. Three years after his death (1632), the results of his investigations and studies were made known to the world in an Italian work entitled "Roma Sotterranea", edited by the Oratorian Severano, and published at the expense of the Order of Malta. The great merit of this work was at once recognized, and led to the publication by Aringhi, in 1651, of a Latin translation for the benefit of the savants of Europe. The scientific character of Bosio's explorations has recently been confirmed by an interesting discovery. De Rossi, in spite of his admiration for Bosio, maintained that the cemetery of Sts. Mark and Marcellianus, in which Pope Damasus was interred, lay to the right of the Via Ardeatina, and not to the left, as Bosio believed. In 1902 both the crypts of Pope Damasus and of Sts. Mark and Marcellianus were discovered by Wilpert, and in the locality indicated by Bosio. Important as was the work of Bosio, it was, however, in one department defective. The copies of catacomb paintings made for his "Roma Sotterranea" have been very often found by Wilpert to be quite inaccurate. This fault must be attributed to Bosio's copyists.

For more than two centuries after the death of Bosio, little advance was made in the exploration of the Roman catacombs, the great treasure-house of the monuments of primitive Christianity. Protestant writers either altogether ignored the discoveries of Bosio or refuted them to their own satisfaction, without ever having seen the monuments. Even Bingham, whose work on Christian Antiquities was published nearly a century after the first edition of Bosio's work appeared, made no use of the results of his investigations. Yet Catholic authors scarcely showed more appreciation of the monuments than their Protestant contemporaries. Unlike De Rossi in our own age, Bosio founded no school of trained archæologists to carry on the work he so happily inaugurated; the consequence of which was that all systematic exploration ceased at his death. Fabretti, in his collection of inscriptions published in 1699, devoted only one chapter (viii) to Christian inscriptions. Twenty-one years later, Boldetti, who held the office of custodian of the catacombs, published an apologetic work of little value on the "Cemeteries of the holy Martyrs and ancient Christians of Rome". A work of Buonarotti on cemeterial glasses (Florence, 1716) is of greater merit. But the eighteenth century will be longer remembered for the destruction of Christian monuments than for the labours of its archæologists. Under the direction of Boldetti numerous inscriptions were removed from the places where they were originally erected, and scattered through various Roman churches, without any clear indication of the localities from which they were taken. These inscriptions were afterwards collected by Benedict XIV (1740–58) in the Christian Museum of the Vatican, of which he was founder. Many invaluable frescoes, also, were injured or destroyed during the eighteenth century. It would be natural to expect that the establishment of a department in connexion with the Vatican Library for the collection of Christian inscriptions and other relics of the early Church would arouse the curiosity of Roman antiquarians. Such is not the fact, however. For several years after the death of Benedict XIV no one took any interest in the catacombs. In view of later occurrences it was, perhaps, as well that this was the case. About 1780, Séroux d'Agincourt (q. v.) visited several of the ancient cemeteries, and copied for publication in his "Histoire de l'art par les monuments" (Paris, 1823), a number of catacomb frescoes. But M. d'Agincourt was not always satisfied with copies. Following the example of other explorers in the same field, he was too often desirous of obtaining the original paintings, and thus inaugurated a more systematic destruction of monuments than any of his predecessors.

With the first half of the nineteenth century began a new epoch in archæological studies. The work of M. Raoul Rochette "Discours sur l'origine etc. des types qui constituent l'art du Christianisme" (Paris, 1834), and his "Tableau des Catacombes de Rome" (Paris, 1837) had the merit of arousing interest in the Christian monuments of Rome, although his conclusions were not at all convincing. In Italy, Sarti, Settele, Pasquini, De Minicis, Valentini, Manara, Cordero, and others produced works of minor importance on the subterranean-cemeterial monuments, the Christian sarcophagi, and the early basilicas of their country. The honour of inaugurating really important work, however, belongs to the Jesuit Father Marchi. Marchi was the first to demonstrate the essential difference between the *arenaria*, or sand-pits in the vicinity of Rome, and the galleries of the catacombs. In 1841 he published the first volume of what he intended to be an exhaustive work on early Christian art; for various reasons he was unable to complete the undertaking. But Marchi had associated with him, from the time he began to devote particular attention to the Christian monuments of Rome (1841), a young man, not yet twenty years of age, who was destined to take up the work of Bosio and elevate Christian archæology to the dignity of a science. This was Giovanni Battista De Rossi (1822–94). The first important work undertaken by De Rossi (q. v.) was a collection of the Christian inscriptions of Rome prior to the seventh century (Rome, 1861–88). While engaged in collecting materials for this great work, the young archæologist had frequent occasion to visit the catacombs. His observations soon convinced him that the real work of exploring these venerable sanctuaries of Christian antiquity had merely been commenced by previous investigators, and that results of the greatest interest and importance for the history of the early Church might be obtained by systematic investigations carried out on scientific principles. No one was better qualified than himself to execute his plans, a fact recognized by Pope Pius IX, who commissioned him to begin the work destined to be so fruitful in results.

The work of De Rossi which best reveals his immense learning and the scientific manner in which his investigations were carried out is his "Roma Sotterranea" (Rome, 1864–77, 3 vols., fol.). The time that has elapsed since the publication of the last volume of this truly *magnum opus* has confirmed in the main the theories of its author on the civil and religious conditions of the primitive Christians, and on the symbolic character of early Christian art. In 1863 he began the publication of his "Bullettino d'archeologia cristiana", a periodical almost as indispensable to the student of Christian archæology as the "Roma Sotterranea". De Rossi left at his death a school of archæologists, trained in his scientific methods, and capable of continuing his work. The three earliest of his disciples, Armellini, Stevenson, and Marucchi, have published numerous works giving the results of their own investigations, or popularizing the general results of Christian archæological discoveries, besides continuing the publication of the Bullettino under the title "Nuovo Bullettino d'archeologia cristiana". A publicist who accomplished considerable work of permanent value in the domain of Christian archæology was the Jesuit Garrucci. His most important publication was a "History of Christian Art", in six volumes, which contains five hundred tables of illustrations. Many of these, however, have been found inaccurate and must be used with caution. His text also has been in a great measure superseded by that of recent writers. The best results achieved since the death of De Rossi are attributable to a young German priest, whose love for archæological studies drew him to Rome nearly two decades ago: Mgr. Joseph Wilpert. Wilpert has devoted himself in a special manner to the study of early Christian painting, a department of archæology to which De Rossi was unable to give the attention the subject deserved. In 1889 Wilpert published his "Principienfragen der christlichen Archäologie", a brochure defending the principles of interpretation of the Roman school of archæologists against the attacks of German non-Catholic authors. In 1892 appeared his study on "Die Gottgeweihten Jungfrauen", a valuable contribution on the origins of the religious life. In 1895 he published his "Fractio Panis," wherein he describes the cycle of sacred representations in the crypt of St. Priscilla, known as the "Capella Greca", and shows their relation to the principal scene depicted in that chapel, the eucharistic, or sacred-banquet, scene of the apse, which he appropriately named "fractio panis", the Breaking of Bread. The signification of Orantes (praying) figures so frequently depicted on early Christian tombs was first satisfactorily explained by this writer in his "Cyclus christologischer Gemälde" (1891). His greatest work is his "Malereien der Katakomben Roms" (Freiburg, 1903). It consists of two folio volumes, one of plates reproducing more than six hundred catacomb frescoes, half of them in colours; the other of text, in which the author, after laying down his principles of interpretation, classifies and describes the various cycles of the cemeterial paintings and interprets their symbolical meaning. Another German priest resident in Rome, Mgr. de Waal, the founder and editor of the "Römische Quartalschrift", has written extensively on archæological subjects; one of his best known works is a description, with illustrations, of the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus (Rome, 1900).

The impetus given to the study of early Christian monuments by the discoveries and publications of De Rossi was immediately felt in every country of Europe. Two English priests, Northcote and Brownlow, were among the first to appreciate the importance of his work, which they popularized in their excellent "Roma Sotterranea" (London, 1869; second edition, 1878). Dr. Northcote also published a useful work on early Christian inscriptions under the title "Epitaphs of the Catacombs" (London, 1878). The former of these works was translated into French by Allard; Kraus's "Roma Sotterranea" was partly a translation of Northcote and Brownlow, and partly an original work. Smith and Cheetham's "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities" (London, 1875–80) is an evidence of the influence on English Protestants of the Roman explorations, and the recently published manual of Lowrie, "Monuments of the Early Church" (New York, 1901), bears witness to the intelligent interest of American Protestants in the most recent results of Christian archæological studies. Among the first in France to be influenced by the archæological revival of De Rossi was the Abbé Martigny, who in 1865 published his, for that time, remarkable "Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes" (third edition, Paris, 1889). Perret's "Catacombes de Rome" (Paris, 1851–55) is a pretentious work of little value; his illustrations are inaccurate, and his text unreliable. Desbassayns de Richemont's "Catacombes de Rome" appeared in 1870, and in the following year Allard's translation of Northcote and Brownlow. These works did good service as popular manuals, but original investigations of great importance were carried on by another French archæologist, Edmond Le Blant. The first volume of Le Blant's "Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule" appeared in 1856, the second in 1865, the third in 1892. These were followed by two volumes on the Christian sarcophagi of Arles and of France (Paris, 1878–86), and various studies on Christian epigraphy. At the present time (1906) a highly useful and excellent work in course of publication, is Cabrol and Leclercq's "Dictionnaire d'archéologie et de liturgie" (since 1903). The discoveries of Count de Vogüé in Central Syria ["La Syrie Centrale" (Paris, 1865)], and in the Holy Land ["Les églises de la Terre Sainte" (Paris, 1860)] were of great importance for the history of early Christian architecture. The writings of Père Delattre and of Stephen Gsell are indispensable for the study of the Christian monuments of North Africa. In Germany Professor Franz Xaver Kraus did more, probably, than any other writer to popularize the results of Christian archæological studies. Besides his "Roma Sotterranea" Kraus edited the excellent "Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer" (Freiburg, 1882–86, 2 vols.), and published (Freiburg, 1896–97), an (unfinished) history of Christian art in three volumes, of which only the first concerns Christian archæology. It is the most complete general work on this subject that has yet appeared. Kraus also published in two volumes (Freiburg, 1890–94), a collection of early Christian inscriptions from the Rhineland, besides a number of monographs of an archæological character. Among German Protestant archæologists may be mentioned Victor Schultze, whose studies on the catacombs of Naples and Syracuse, and "Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst" (Munich, 1895) are of importance. Of contemporary German writers on the monuments of Christian antiquity space will not permit more than the mention of a few of the principal: Müller, Ficker, Krumbacher, Strzygowski, Kirsch, Kaufmann, and Baumstark.

II. Literary Sources.—The knowledge of early Christian society derived from the study of the oldest existing Christian monuments has thrown light on many obscurities in the Church's early history, as it was known from the literature that has come down to us from the first age of Christianity. It is equally true that the study of Christian monuments would be impossible apart from the study of the various literary sources of Christian antiquity. Christian literature and Christian monuments supplement one another. First among the literary sources indis-

pensable for the study of the monuments is the Bible. Christian art from the first century was inspired by the Sacred Scriptures. After this primary source, the Acts of the Martyrs, Christian liturgies, certain liturgical prayers, particularly those relative to death, Church calendars, the so-called Pontifical Books, especially the famous Roman "Liber Pontificalis" (q. v.), ancient missals and sacramentaries, and in general all Christian literature, till well on in medieval times, have proved invaluable aids in the interpretation of the monuments. Especially useful were the medieval pilgrims' itineraries, the Baedekers of their time, because of the indications they contain relative to the topography of the ancient subterranean cemeteries of Christian Rome.

III. Character of the Earliest Monuments. Principal Results of Christian Archæological Investigations.—The principal monuments of the earliest Christian ages have been found in the subterranean cemeteries of Rome. The oldest portions of several of these cemeteries date from the first century of the Christian Era, so that, within their range, whatever information they supply bears the stamp of the Apostolic Age. The fact that these monuments are of a sepulchral character must always be borne in mind. No one would expect to find in the inscriptions and sculptures of a modern Catholic cemetery a complete exposition of Catholic theology; neither should such an exposition of dogma be looked for in the inscriptions and frescoes of the catacombs. Any information we might reasonably expect, therefore, from sepulchral monuments should have some relation to the ideas concerning death that were uppermost in the minds of those who erected them. Within this range, and to a certain extent beyond it, the monuments are perfectly clear. The inscriptions and paintings of the catacombs, as well as the sculptured sarcophagi of the fourth and subsequent centuries, exhibit in the most unequivocal manner the beliefs of their authors on the momentous question of existence beyond the grave.

IV. Inscriptions.—The earliest Christian inscriptions are simple in the extreme: they barely mention the name of the deceased, with a brief prayer for his soul—"Regina, mayest thou live in the Lord Jesus", "Peace be with you", "In peace", "In God". By the third century these formulæ had developed so far as to express belief in the Trinity and the communion of saints; the Sacrament of Baptism is implicitly alluded to in the mention of neophytes, and in such inscriptions as "Fidem accepit", "post susceptionem suam" (he received the Faith, after his reception); the Eucharist in the two famous epitaphs of Abercius of Hieropolis (q. v.) and Pectorius of Autun. The three highest orders of the hierarchy, and several of the minor orders, are also mentioned, as well as consecrated virgins and widows; frequent reference is, of course, made to the lay members of the community. Still more interesting, perhaps, are the deductions which may legitimately be drawn from certain peculiarities of these very early Christian memorials. The equality of all before God, for example, is taught by the eloquent silence of the epitaphs as to the worldly rank or titles of the deceased. Allusions to slaves and freedmen, so common in contemporary pagan inscriptions, are found in only a few instances on Christian epitaphs, and then in the kindliest manner. Even more remarkable, in an age when persecution was ever imminent, is the silence of Christian inscriptions on that subject. No thought was given to the persecutors; the attention of the followers of Christ was wholly absorbed by the world beyond the tomb. And with regard to this better world they entertained a perfect confidence; the very name of cemetery given by them to their last resting-place (κοιμητήριον, *dormitorium*, "a sleeping-place") reveals their confidence in the promises of the Saviour. The metrical inscriptions erected in the latter part of the fourth century by Pope Damasus (366–384) manifest the great veneration in which the martyrs were then held, and at the same time supply valuable data as to their history.

V. Paintings.—Following the custom then in vogue of decorating the tombs of deceased friends, the Christians of Rome, from the first century, began to adorn with frescoes the burial chambers of the catacombs. The catacombs were, therefore, "the cradle of Christian art". Although some of the early Christian writers looked upon artistic productions with suspicion, the Roman Church never seems to have had any misgivings in this regard. Art in itself was indifferent; why not adopt and purify it? This was precisely what was done. Even in the oldest paintings of the catacombs, which date from the end of the first century, the process of purification has already begun. The pictorial ornamentation of the Acilian and Flavian family tombs, which belongs to this period, though chiefly decorative in character, like that of contemporary pagan tombs, is yet wholly free from idolatrous or indelicate *motifs*. The foundations of a specifically Christian art were also laid in the first century, in a few frescoes representing Daniel in the lions' den, Noe in the ark, and the Good Shepherd. All of these subjects were symbols, and symbolism (q. v.) was the special characteristic of Christian art down to the fourth century. The source of inspiration of the symbolic paintings of the catacombs was the Bible. In selecting their subjects from the Sacred Writings the artists, or those who directed their operations, did not proceed at random, but followed certain definite regulations. These regulations were suggested by the fact that the frescoes were to form a sepulchral ornamentation. The dominant idea, therefore, in making a selection of subjects was that the latter, according to the views prevailing among Christians, should be adaptable, as symbols, to the condition after death of those on whose tombs they were to be erected. The funeral liturgies, consequently, prayers for the dying, and invocations of like tenor, served as guides in the choice of symbols. Thus, for example, in the Litany for a Soul Departing, still in use, we have the invocation "Deliver, O Lord, the soul of Thy servant, as Thou didst deliver Daniel from the den of the lions". The figure of Daniel standing between the two lions, so frequently depicted in the catacombs, is an early pictured form of this prayer. The cycles of sacred representations of the catacombs were, therefore, selected because of their appropriateness to the condition of the Christian soul after death. From the point of view of doctrine and discipline, many of them are of the greatest importance. For instance, with regard to the sacraments, the cycle of frescoes relative to baptism, some of which date from the early second century, show clearly that baptism was administered by affusion; while several of the cycle referring to the Eucharist indicate quite plainly a belief in the sacrificial character of the Mass. In numerous frescoes belief in the divinity of Christ is manifested; and the prominent place occupied by the Blessed Virgin in the thoughts of the Christians of the first three centuries is apparent in the many representations of Mary (the most ancient belongs to the first half of the second century), with the Infant Saviour in her arms. The gradual development of the idea of Mary's important place in the scheme of redemption is ascertained by comparison of the earlier with the later frescoes of the Mother and Child; a painting of the latter half of the third century in the catacomb of St. Priscilla represents her in the character of model for a virgin taking the

veil; while in a fresco of the middle of the fourth century, in the *Cœmeterium majus*, she is seen in the attitude of prayer, interceding, according to the interpretation of Wilpert, with her Divine Son, for the surviving friends of the deceased persons on whose tomb this representation appears. The dogma of the communion of saints is as clearly expressed in the paintings, as in the inscriptions of the catacombs. The various Orantes, or praying figures, are symbols of the deceased in heaven interceding with God for friends still members of the Church Militant. Other frescoes represent the particular judgment, with saints in the attitude of advocates pleading with the Judge for their admission to heaven. St. Peter and St. Paul were also favourite subjects with the Christian artists of Rome, especially in the fourth century. The earliest fresco of St. Peter, in the cemetery *Ad Duas Lauros*, represents the Prince of the Apostles reading from an open roll, in the character of "Legislator of the New Covenant". The high place in which the ecclesiastical authorities were held is indicated by the special garb in which they are represented; the priests administering baptism are clad in tunic and pallium, two articles of apparel which, with sandals, constituted the dress reserved to personages of a sacred character.

VI. Sculpture.—During the first age of the Church a specifically Christian sculpture was almost unknown. Many reasons have been given to account for this circumstance, the chief of which, besides that of cost, is the practical difficulty encountered in producing works distinctively Christian without the knowledge of a hostile public and Government. Only a few statues and sarcophagi with representations inspired by the Scriptures survive from the first three centuries. Christian sculpture, consequently, began its real development in the fourth century, in the age of peace inaugurated by Constantine. The principal sculptured monuments of this period consist of the many sarcophagi, mostly found in Rome, Ravenna, and in various parts of France, in which Christians of the Constantinian and post-Constantinian epochs were interred. Being sepulchral monuments, the symbolic subjects of the catacomb frescoes were equally appropriate on Christian sarcophagi. But Christian sculptors quickly felt the influence of the new development of Christian art first seen in the basilicas erected under Constantine. The triumphant symbols of the basilicas, and the historical scenes depicted on their walls, are also found on Christian sarcophagi, side by side with some of the earliest and most venerable symbols of the catacombs. The transition from symbolic to historic art is, consequently, nowhere better represented than in the carved sarcophagi of the fourth and following centuries.

VII. Basilicas.—According to the Acts of the Apostles the first Christians were accustomed to meet in private houses for the celebration of the liturgy: "Breaking bread from house to house" (Acts, ii, 46). The first separate places of worship of the Christians were, therefore, the homes of those among them which were sufficiently large to accommodate a considerable number of people. Down to the reign of Constantine the custom thus established in the Church of Jerusalem, of assembling for the celebration of the liturgy in private residences, seems to have been generally followed. It is very probable, however, that there were churches of the basilica type in Asia Minor before Constantine. The church at Nicomedia, destroyed in the persecution of Diocletian, was erected in the third century. According to an ancient tradition, the house of Senator Pudens at Rome, as well as that of Saint Cecilia, was used for such a purpose. The third-century romance known as the "Clementine Recognitions" has two references of interest in this regard: the author tells of a certain Maro who invited St. Peter to preach in a hall of his mansion, capable of holding five hundred persons (Recog., iv, 6), and, in another place, he speaks of a man named Theophilus who had a similar hall of his house consecrated as a church (ibid., x, 71). The Christian churches of the fourth century, known as basilicas (q. v.), derived their name, and some of their principal features, either from the public basilicas, like those of the Roman forum, or from the private basilicas of great mansions, such as the halls of Maro and Theophilus. These churches consisted of a large oblong hall, divided by columns into a central nave and two or four aisles. The apse at the extremity of the hall opposite the entrance derives, according to Kraus and others, from such early structures as the three-apsed cemeterial churches, two of which may still be seen in the cemetery of St. Callistus. The apse, however, is a feature of the two civil basilicas of Trajan and Maxentius. The atrium, or court-yard before the entrance, is a feature of the Christian basilica not seen in the civil basilicas, and is evidently a reminiscence of the *domus ecclesiæ* of the first three centuries.

The baptisteries (q. v.) erected adjacent to basilicas were, as a rule, circular or polygonal in form. Circular edifices were also erected as mausoleums; two of the best examples are the church of St. Costanza in Rome and the mausoleum of King Theodoric at Ravenna. Following the precedent of the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, circular or octagonal churches also were sometimes erected; the church of St. Vitale at Ravenna is the best known Western structure of this type. The interior decoration of the earliest Christian basilicas exhibits a new development in Christian art. The symbols depicted in the catacombs were perfectly appropriate for the purpose for which they were intended, but a different style of adornment was demanded in edifices whose object was not so immediately associated with death. Moreover, the Church of Christ had at length triumphed over paganism, and this triumph suggested to the Christian artists of the Constantinian Age the idea of commemorating the victory in the new basilicas. In this way a new symbolism, representing Christ triumphant on His throne, came into existence. Historical scenes from the life of Christ or from the Old Testament were frequently represented in the frescoes and mosaics of basilicas, and these served not only as an appropriate adornment, but also as an excellent illustration of the Sacred Scriptures.

VIII. The Minor Arts.—Under this heading are usually classified such remains of early Christian times as textile fabrics, liturgical clothing and implements, objects of devotion, domestic articles, coins and medals, and illustrations in miniature. The last named are of especial importance for the history of art in the Middle Ages. (See Catacombs, and De Rossi, Giovanni Battista.)

General Works.—Bosio, *Roma Sotterranea* (Rome, 1652); De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea* (Rome, 1864–77); *Bullettino d'archeologia cristiana* (Rome, 1863–94); *Nuovo Bullettino d'archeologia cristiana* (Rome, since 1894); Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea* (2d ed., London, 1878); *Römische Quartalschrift* (Rome, since 1887); Lowrie, *Monuments of the Early Church* (New York, 1901); Kraus, *Roma Sotterranea* (Freiburg, 1873, 2d ed., 1879); Idem, *Ueber Begriff, Umfang, Geschichte der christl. Archäologie* (Freiburg, 1879); Schultze, *Archäologie der altchristlichen Kunst* (Munich, 1895); Wilpert, *Principienfragen* (Freiburg, 1889); Kaufmann, *Die sepulcralen jenseitsdenkmäler der Antike und des Urchristentums* (Mainz, 1900); Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne* (Rome, 1899); Idem, *Le catacombe romane* (Rome, 1903); Armellini, *Lezioni di archeologia cristiana* (Rome, 1898); Pératé, *Archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1892); Allard, *Rome Souterraine* (Paris, 1877); Smith and Cheetham, *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (London, 1875–80); Kraus, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer* (Freiburg, 1882–86); Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes* (3d ed., Paris, 1889); Cabrol and Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie et de liturgie* (Paris, in course of publication since 1903).

Inscriptions.—De Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianæ urbis Romæ* (Rome, 1861–88); Kraus, *Inscriptiones Rhenanæ christianæ* (Freiburg, 1890–94); Hübner, *Inscriptiones Hispaniæ christianæ* (Berlin, 1871); Le Blant, *Recueil des inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule* (Paris, 1856–65); *Nouveau Recueil des inscriptions de la Gaule* (Paris, 1892); *Manuel d'épigraphie chrétienne* (Paris, 1869); Northcote, *Epitaphs of the Catacombs* (London, 1878); McCall, *Christian Epitaphs of the First Six Centuries* (London, 1869).

Christian Art and Architecture.—Wilpert, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms* (Freiburg and Rome, 1903); Id., *Die Katakombengemälde und ihre alten Kopien* (Freiburg, 1891); Id., *Fractio Panis* (Freiburg, 1895); Kraus, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst* (Freiburg, 1895–1900); Venturi, *Storia dell'arte Italiana* (Milan, 1901–3); Michel, *Histoire de l'art* (Paris, 1905); Garrucci, *Storia dell'arte cristiana* (Prato, 1875–81); Bayet, *Recherches pour servir à l'histoire de la peinture et de la sculpture chrétiennes en Orient* (Paris, 1879); Müntz, *Études sur l'histoire de la peinture et de l'iconographie chrétiennes* (Paris, 1886); De Rossi, *Mosaici delle chiese di Roma* (Rome, 1872–1906); Müntz, *La mosaïque chrétienne* (Paris, 1893); Kurth, *Wandmosaiken von Ravenna* (Leipzig, 1901); *The Lost Mosaics of Rome in Amer. Journal of Archæology*, (1900); De Vogüé, *Monuments de la Syrie Centrale* (Paris, 1865–77); Gsell, *Les monuments antiques de l'Algérie* (Paris, 1901); Butler, *Architecture and Other Arts* (New York, 1903); Dehio, *Kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes* (Stuttgart, 1892); Kirsch, *Die christlichen Kultus Gebäude im Altertum* (Cologne, 1893); Crostarosa, *Le basiliche cristiane* (Rome, 1892); Marucchi, *Eléments d'archéologie chrétienne—II. Basiliques* (Paris, 1902); Le Blant, *Etude sur les sarcophages chrétiens de la Gaule* (Paris, 1886); Grousset, *Etude sur l'histoire des sarcophages chrétiens* (Paris, 1885); De Waal, *Der Sarcophag des Junius Bassus* (Rome, 1900).

Minor Arts.—Förrer, *Römische und Byzant's Seidentextilien . . . von Achmim-Panopolis* (Strasburg, 1891); Wilpert, *Gewandung der Christen in der ersten Jahrhunderten* (Cologne, 1898); Strzygowsky, *Die Kalenderbilder des Chronographs von Jahre* 354 (Berlin, 1888); Nolhac, *Le Virgile du Vatican* (Paris, 1897); Hartel and Wickhoff, *Die Wiener-Genesis* (1895); Haseloff, *Codex purpureus Rossanensis* (Berlin, 1898); Tikkanen, *Die Psalter-Illustration im Mittelalter* (Helsingfors, 1895); Beissel, *Vaticanische Miniaturen* (Freiburg, 1893); Molinier, *Histoire des arts appliqués à l'industrie.*

Maurice M. Hassett.

Christian Architecture. See Ecclesiastical Art.

Christian Art is a term which, while it always applies to the fine arts and their creations only, is nevertheless used in more than one meaning which we must distinguish in this encyclopedia. Most frequently we designate by *Christian art*, the fine arts, inasmuch as we find them in the service of the Church, i. e. in so far as they serve either to construct or to embellish houses of worship, the homes of the consecrated servants of God, monasteries, convents, the last resting-places of the faithful, etc., or inasmuch as they beautify the rites and ceremonies of the Church. In this sense, Christian art is also called ecclesiastical art, and we find it convenient to treat this subject under the title Ecclesiastical Art (q. v.). But Christian art is sometimes also used to denote the fine arts and their creations, inasmuch as they are in harmony with Christian ideals and principles. In this regard Christian art will be treated under the several special headings into which its divisions naturally fall. (See Painting; Music; Sculpture, etc.)

Christian Brothers. See Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools.

Christian Brothers of Ireland, an institute founded at Waterford, Ireland, in 1802, by Edmund Ignatius Rice, a merchant of that city (q. v.). At the close of the eighteenth century a cloud of ignorance and misery hung over the Catholics of Ireland, the inevitable result of two centuries of dreadful penal enactments. During those unhappy years it was illegal either for a Catholic to educate his children as Catholics or for a teacher to undertake the work. The wretched state of the Catholic boys of Waterford excited the pity of Mr. Rice. He had some idea of joining a religious order on the Continent, but the miserable state of his surroundings decided his future course. The bishop of the diocese, the Most Reverend Dr. Hussey, warmly approved of his intention and promised him every support. Mr. Rice's career as a merchant came to an end in 1800, and his whole fortune and future life were devoted to the great work he had selected. In 1802, in Waterford, he opened his first school, assisted for a time by a few secular teachers. Soon after, some pious young men, drawn by the influence of his zeal and example, came to his assistance and in 1803 a monastery was built for them by the citizens of Waterford. As the number of assistants increased and the reputation of the school became known through the island, many applications for brothers reached Mr. Rice. Houses were soon opened in Carrick-on-Suir, Dungarvan, and Cork. The Most Rev. Dr. Moylan, then Bishop of Cork, summoned a meeting of the principal citizens and expressed to them a strong desire to procure similar advantages for that city. Two gentlemen offered to devote their lives and fortunes to the good work, and the first house was opened there in 1811. For almost a century the history of the Christian Brothers' schools of Cork has been one unbroken record of progress in primary, secondary, and technical education. The Most Rev. Dr. Murray, Archbishop of Dublin, in 1812, established a community in Dublin. A second community was founded in 1818, and in 1907 there were ten communities in Dublin, educating more than 6000 pupils. These establishments comprise not only extensive primary and secondary schools, but orphanages, industrial schools, and a large deaf and dumb institution. The Limerick community was founded in 1816, and enlargements were made in 1825 and 1828, while many houses were opened later on in the principal towns of the county.

In 1820 came the crowning of Mr. Rice's work in the Apostolic Brief by which the Holy See constituted his little band of workers into a religious institute of the Church. The Christian Brothers was the first Irish order of men formally approved by a charter from Rome. Encouraged by this great privilege from the Holy See and blessed by a regular succession of excellent members, the order gradually spread not only through the principal Irish towns, but also to Liverpool, London, and other large centres in England. Having gradually strengthened itself in the British Isles during the remaining years of the nineteenth century, the institute ultimately extended its influence into distant countries. In 1868 a colony was sent to Australia, and so fruitful was the effort that, out of a community of four, a province has grown up containing about fifty establishments, schools, colleges, orphanages, and a flourishing novitiate. Another extension of great importance was the opening of a school in St. John's, Newfoundland (1875). From the beginning the efforts of the brothers there have been very successful, and through the zeal and energy of the Benevolent Irish Society there are now five large institutions under their management. Between the regimental schools on one side and those of Anglicans and Methodists on the other, Catholic education was at a very low ebb in Gibraltar, when the Most Rev. Dr. Scandella introduced the brothers there in 1878. Soon the whole aspect was changed, and there are now on the Rock four establishments of the highest repute. From Gibraltar to New Zealand, from Australia to Newfoundland, the brothers had carried the standard of Irish monastic education when, in 1886, Cardinal Simeoni conveyed to the superior general the wish of the Holy Father that they should extend their influence to India. The superior at once complied, and at present there is a flourishing province there with many schools, orphanages, and colleges. Since receiving the Brief of approbation in 1820, no event in its history was of greater moment to the order than the request of the Holy Father, through Cardinal Jacobini, to the superior general, to send a community of brothers to Rome (1900). The proselytizing efforts of Anglican and American agencies had given the ecclesiastical authorities some anxiety, and

to counteract these insidious influences the Holy Father called the Irish brothers to his side. The result amply justified his confidence. A foundation was made in New York, the first in the United States, in 1906.

The schools of the Irish Christian Brothers are of many types, representing divers phases of educational work, primary, secondary and industrial, with orphanages and schools for the deaf and dumb. These various institutions are nearly all equipped with laboratories for the practical teaching of physical and chemical science, and in many cases with workshops for manual training. Their secondary schools and colleges crown the educational edifices, affording to clever boys, irrespective of their position in life, an opportunity of pursuing a course of higher studies which would be otherwise entirely denied them. In foreign countries provinces of the order are established with the sanction of the Holy See, but as prescribed by the Brief, the whole institute is governed by the superior general, who, with his assistants, resides at St. Mary's, Marino, Dublin.

J. L. Slattery.

Christian Charity, Sisters of, also called Daughters of the Immaculate Conception, an institute for teaching poor schools and for the care of the blind, founded at Paderborn, Germany, on 21 August, 1849, by Pauline von Mallinckrodt (b. 3 June, 1817, at Minden, Westphalia; d. 30 April, 1881), sister to the famous Hermann von Mallinckrodt. The institute, which was confirmed 7 Feb., 1888, by Leo XIII, had attained great success throughout Germany when, in 1873, its members were forced into exile by the persecution of the *Kulturkampf*. Some went to South America, where there are now many flourishing communities. Others emigrated to New Orleans, U. S. A., where, in April, 1873, they founded a house and took charge of a parochial school. Mother Pauline followed shortly after and established a new provincial mother-house, at Wilkesbarre, Pennsylvania. Since then these sisters have opened houses in the Archdioceses of Baltimore, Chicago, Cincinnati, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and St. Paul, and in the Dioceses of Albany, Belleville, Brooklyn, Detroit, Harrisburg, Newark, Sioux City, and Syracuse. They have in these establishments 668 sisters, 46 novices, 25 postulants, conducting 2 academies, 54 parochial schools, 2 orphan asylums, and 1 industrial school. In 1887 the sisters were allowed to return to Germany. The mother-house at Paderborn was reopened and the activities of the religious extended with their former success throughout Germany. They have houses in Belgium and Bohemia.

Hüffer, *Pauline von Mallinckrodt* (Münster, 1892); Beissel in *Kirchenlex.*, VII, 2001; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1897); *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, 1908).

F. M. Rudge.

Christian Doctrine, Confraternity of, an association established at Rome in 1562 for the purpose of giving religious instruction. Till about the thirteenth century, the Apostles' Creed and Paternoster formed the general basis of religious instruction; all the faithful had to know them by heart, and parish priests were commanded to explain them on Sundays and festivals. Then the range of instruction was widened to include the Commandments and sacraments, the virtues and vices. The Synod of Lambeth under Archbishop Peckham, in 1281, was content to order priests to explain the truths of faith four times a year, but the Provincial Council of Lavour, in 1368, commanded parish priests to give instruction on all Sundays and feast days. This council also published a catechism to serve as a textbook for the clergy in giving instructions in Christian doctrine, which was followed in all the dioceses of Languedoc and Gascony. Similar manuals were published elsewhere. The Council of Trent, seeing how multitudes had fallen from the Faith through ignorance of their religion, and recognizing the truth proclaimed by Gerson more than a century before, that church reform must begin with the religious instruction of the young, issued the "Catechismus ad Parochos", and decreed that throughout the Church instructions in Christian doctrine should be given on Sundays and festivals.

But the work of organizing religious instruction had already begun. In 1536 the Abbate Castellino da Castello had inaugurated a system of Sunday-schools in Milan. About 1560, a wealthy Milanese nobleman, Marco de Sadis-Cusani, having established himself in Rome, was joined by a number of zealous associates, priests and laymen, pledged to instruct both children and adults in Christian doctrine. Pope Pius IV in 1562 made the church of Sant' Apollinare their central institution; but they also gave instructions in schools, in the streets and lanes, and even in private houses. The association growing, it divided into two sections: the priests formed themselves into a religious congregation, "The Fathers of Christian Doctrine", while the laymen remained in the world as "The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine". Encouragement from the Holy See was quickly forthcoming. In 1571, Pope St. Pius V, in the Brief "Ex debito pastoralis officii", bore witness to the good already accomplished, and recommended bishops to establish it in every parish. Pope Paul V, by the Brief "Ex credito nobis", in 1607, erected it into an archconfraternity, with St. Peter's, Rome, as its head centre. A rescript of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, in 1686, urged its establishment wherever possible. From Rome it spread rapidly over Italy, France, and Germany. It found advocates in Cardinal Bellarmine, St. Francis of Sales, and St. Charles Borromeo, who drew up a code of rules and established it in every parish of his diocese.

The First Provincial Council of Westminster urged that its members should be utilized in both Sunday- and day-schools; but while Sunday-schools are plentiful, the confraternity is only sparsely established in England. Lastly, in 1905, Pope Pius X strictly ordained that "in each and every parish the society commonly called the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine shall be canonically erected". If the central confraternity in a diocese is affiliated to the Archconfraternity of Santa Maria del Pianto in Rome, all others participate in all the confraternity Indulgences.

Similar in scope and character to the above are the Pieuses Unions de la Doctrine Chrétienne, founded by the *Dames de l'Adoration Perpétuelle* at Brussels in 1851, for giving religious instruction to boys and girls. In Brussels they are found in about thirty parishes. In 1894 Leo XIII erected it into an archconfraternity for Belgium.

The Archconfraternity of Voluntary Catechists (*Œuvre des Catéchismes*) was founded to help parish priests in giving religious instructions to children attending the primary schools in Paris and other parts of France, after these had been laicized. In 1893 Leo XIII gave it the rank of an archconfraternity with power to affiliate all similar confraternities in France. The Indulgences granted to all these confraternities are very numerous.

Béringer, *Les Indulgences* (Paris, 1905); *Les Voies de Dieu: un Jubilé Eucharistique* (Tournai, 1898); Vaughan, *Manual of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine;* Mangenot in *Dict. de théol. cath.*, s. v. *Catéchisme* (Paris, 1903); Göbl in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Christenlehre.*

M. C. Glancey.

Christian Instruction, Brothers of, a congregation founded in 1817 at Saint-Brieuc, Côtes-du-Nord, France, by Jean-Marie-Robert de la Mennais (b. 1780; d. 1860), for the instruction of youth. The institute was founded primarily to supply the de-

ficiency left by the regulation of Blessed John Baptiste de la Salle forbidding members of his congregation to go on missions singly, whereas in many places there were need and means of maintenance for only one brother. The first novices, consequently, were trained under the Christian Brothers, whose rule was to a large extent adopted. The congregation was recognized by the Holy See in 1851 and canonically erected by Brief of Leo XIII, 13 March, 1891. The members are bound by the simple vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. From the mother-house at Ploërmel foundations were made in England, Africa, Asia, America, and Oceania. In 1886 the first brothers arrived in Montreal and were shortly afterwards introduced into the United States. Owing to the French Law of Associations of 1901, the mother-house was transferred to Taunton, England. In 1903 the congregation comprised 3000 members, with 420 educational institutions, including a number of orphanages, agricultural schools, trade schools, and boarding schools, the total number of students being 75,000.

KELLER, *Les congrégations religieuses en France* (Paris, 1880), 628 sqq.; HEIMBUCHER in *Kirchenlex.*, X, 1967; LAVEILLE, *Jean-Marie de la Mennais 1780–1860* (Paris, 1903).

F. M. RUDGE.

Christianity.—In the following article an account is given of Christianity as a religion, describing its origin, its relation to other religions, its essential nature and chief characteristics, but not dealing with its doctrines in detail nor its history as a visible organization. These and other aspects of this great subject will receive treatment under separate titles. Moreover, the Christianity of which we speak is that which we find realized in the Catholic Church alone; hence, we are not concerned here with those forms which are embodied in the various non-Catholic Christian sects, whether schismatical or heretical.

Our documentary sources of knowledge about the origin of Christianity and its earliest developments are chiefly the New Testament Scriptures and various sub-Apostolic writings, the authenticity of which we must to a large extent take for granted here, as with much less grounds we take for granted the authenticity of "Cæsar" when dealing with early Gaul, and of "Tacitus" when studying the growth of the Roman Empire. (Cf. Kenyon, "Handbook of the Textual Criticism of the N. T.") We have this further warrant for doing so, that the most mature critical opinions amongst non-Catholics, deserting the wild theories of Baur, Strauss, and Renan, tend, in regard to dates and authorship, to coincide more closely with the Catholic position. The Gospels, Acts, and most of the Epistles are recognized as belonging to the Apostolic Age. "The oldest literature of the Church", says Professor Harnack, "is, in the main points and in most of its details, from the point of view of literary history, veracious and trustworthy. . . . He who attentively studies these letters (those i. e. of Clement and Ignatius) cannot fail to see what a fullness of traditions, topics of preaching, doctrines, and forms of organization already existed in the time of Trajan [A. D. 98–117], and in particular churches had reached permanence" (Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur, Bk. I, pp. 8, 11). Other points will, of course, be touched on and other results assumed, which are more fully and formally treated under JESUS CHRIST; CHURCH; REVELATION; MIRACLES. For clearness' sake we shall arrange the subject under the following chief heads: I. ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY AND ITS RELATION WITH OTHER RELIGIONS; II. THE ESSENTIALS OF CHRISTIANITY; III. THE DIVINE PURPOSE IN CHRISTIANITY.

I. ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY AND ITS RELATION WITH OTHER RELIGIONS.—*Christianity* is the name given to that definite system of religious belief and practice which was taught by *Jesus Christ* in the country of Palestine, during the reign of the Roman Emperor, Tiberius, and was promulgated, after its Founder's death, for the acceptance of the whole world, by certain chosen men among His followers. According to the accepted chronology, these began their mission on the day of Pentecost, A. D. 29, which day is regarded, accordingly, as the birthday of the Christian Church. In order the better to appreciate the meaning of this event, we must first consider the religious influences and tendencies previously at work in the minds of men, both Jews and Gentiles, which prepared the way for the spread of Christianity amongst them. The whole history of the Jews as detailed in the Old Testament is seen, when read in the light of after events, to be a clear though gradual preparation for the preaching of Christianity. In that nation alone, the great truths of the existence and unity of God, His providential ruling of His creatures and their responsibility towards Him, were preserved unimpaired amidst general corruption. The ancient world was given to Pantheism and creature-worship; Israel only, not because of its "monotheistic instinct" (Renan), but because of the periodic interposition of God through His prophets, resisted in the main the general tendency to idolatry. Besides maintaining those pure conceptions of Deity, the prophets from time to time, and with ever increasing distinctness until we come to the direct and personal testimony of the Baptist, foreshadowed a fuller and more universal revelation—a time when, and a Man through Whom, God should bless all the nations of the earth. We need not here trace the Messianic predictions in detail; their clearness and cogency are such that St. Augustine does not hesitate to say (Retract., I, xiii, 3): "What we now call the Christian religion existed amongst the ancients, and was from the beginning of the human race, until Christ Himself came in the flesh; from which time the already existing true religion began to be styled Christian". And thus it has been remarked that Israel alone amongst the nations of antiquity looked forward to glories to come. All peoples alike retained some more or less vague recollection of a Paradise lost, a remote Golden Age, but only the spirit of Israel kept alive the definite hope of a world-wide empire of justice, wherein the Fall of Man should be repaired. The fact that, eventually, the Jews misinterpreted their oracles, and identified the Messianic Kingdom with a mere temporal sovereignty of Israel, cannot invalidate the testimony of the Scriptures, as interpreted both by Christ's own life and the teaching of His Apostles, to the gradual evolution of that conception of which Christianity is the full and perfect expression. Mistaken national pride, accentuated by their galling subjection to Rome led them to read a material significance into the predictions of the triumph of the Messias, and hence to lose their privilege of being God's chosen people. The wild olive in St. Paul's metaphor (Rom., xi, 17) was then grafted upon the stock of the Patriarchs in place of those rejected branches, and entered upon their spiritual inheritance.

We may trace, too, in the world at large, apart from the Jewish people, a similar though less direct preparation. Whether due ultimately to the Old Testament predictions or to the fragments of the original revelation handed down amongst the Gentiles, a certain vague expectation of the coming of a great conqueror seems to have existed in the East and to a certain extent in the Roman world, in the midst of which the new religion had its birth. But a much more marked predisposition to Christianity may be noticed in certain prominent features of the Roman religion after the downfall of the republic. The old gods of Latium had long ceased to reign. In their stead Greek philosophy occupied the minds of the cultured, whilst the populace were attracted by a variety of strange cults imported from Egypt and the East. Whatever their

corruption, these new religions, concentrating worship on a single prominent deity, were monotheistic in effect. Moreover, many of them were characterized by rites of expiation and sacrifice, which familiarized men's minds with the idea of a mediatorial religion. They combined to destroy the notion of a national *cultus*, and to separate the service of the Deity from the service of the State. Finally, as a contributory cause to the diffusion of Christianity, we must not fail to mention the widespread *Pax Romana*, resulting from the union of the civilized races under one strong central government.

Thus much may be said with regard to the remote preparation of the world for the reception of Christianity. What immediately preceded its institution, as it was born in Judaism, concerns the Jewish race alone, and is comprised in the teaching and miracles of Christ, His death and resurrection, and the mission of the Holy Spirit. During His whole mortal life on earth, including the two or three years of His active ministry, Christ lived as a devout Jew, Himself observing, and insisting on His followers observing, the injunctions of the Law (Matt., xxiii, 3). The sum of His teaching, as of that of His precursor, was the approach of the "Kingdom of God", meaning not only the rule of righteousness in the individual heart ("the kingdom of God is within you"—Luke, xvii, 21), but also the Church (as is plain from many of the parables) which He was about to institute. Yet, though He often foreshadowed a time when the Law as such would cease to bind, and though He Himself in proof of His Messiahship occasionally set aside its provisions ("For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath", Matt., xii, 8), yet, as, in spite of His miracles, He did not win recognition of that Messiahship, still less of His Divinity, from the Jews at large, He confined His explicit teaching about the Church to His immediate followers, and left it to them, when the time came, openly to pronounce the abrogation of the Law. (Acts, xv, 5–11, 28; Gal., iii, 19; 24–28; Eph., ii, 2, 14–15; Coloss., ii, 16, 17; Heb., vii, 12.) It was not so much, then, by propounding the dogmas of Christianity as by informing the Old Law with the spirit of Christian ethics that Christ found Himself able to prepare Jewish hearts for the religion to come. Again, the faith which He failed to arouse by the numerous miracles He wrought, He sought to provide with a further and stronger incentive by dying under every circumstance of pain, disgrace, and defeat, and then raising Himself from the dead in triumph and glory. It was to this fact rather than to the wonders He worked in His lifetime that His accredited witnesses always appealed in their teaching. On the marvel of the Resurrection is based in the counsels of God the faith of Christianity. "If Christ is not risen again, your faith is vain", declares the Apostle Paul (I Cor., xv, 17), who says no word of the other wonders Christ performed. By His death, therefore, and His return from the dead, Christ, as the event proved, furnished the strongest means for the effective preaching of the religion He came to found.

The third antecedent condition to the birth of Christianity, as we learn from the sacred records, was a special participation of the Holy Spirit given to the Apostles on the day of Pentecost. According to Christ's promise, the function of this Divine gift was to teach them all truth and bring back to their remembrance all that [Christ] had said to them (John, xiv, 26; xvi, 13). "I send the Promised of my Father upon you, but remain ye in the city till ye shall be clothed with power from on high" (Luke, xxiv, 49). "John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence" (Acts, i, 5). As a result of that Divine visitation we find the Apostles preaching the Gospel with wonderful courage, persuasiveness, and assurance in the face of hostile Jews and indifferent Gentiles, "the Lord working with them and confirming their words by the signs that followed" (Mark, xvi, 20).

We have now to consider the circumstances of Christianity at the outset, and to estimate to what extent it was affected by the already existing religious beliefs of the time. It took its rise, as we have seen, in Judaism: its Founder and His disciples were orthodox Jews, and the latter maintained their Jewish practices, at least for a time, even after the day of Pentecost. The Jews themselves looked upon the followers of Christ as a mere Israelitish sect (*αἵρεσις*) like the Sadducees or the Essenes, styling St. Paul "the instigator of the revolt of the sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts, xxiv, 5). The new religion was at first wholly confined to the synagogue, and its votaries had still a large share of Jewish exclusiveness; they read the Law, they practised circumcision, and they worshipped in the Temple, as well as in the upper room at Jerusalem. We need not wonder, then, that some modern rationalists, who reject its supernatural origin and ignore the operation of the Holy Spirit in its first missionaries, see in early Christianity Judaism pure and simple, and find the explanation of its character and growth in the pre-existing religious environment. But this theory of natural development does not fit the facts as narrated in the New Testament, which is full of indications that Christ's doctrines were new, and His spirit strange. Consequently, the records have to be mutilated to suit the theory. We cannot pretend to follow, here or in other places, the rationalists in their New Testament criticism. There is the less need of doing so that their theories are often mutually destructive. A dozen years ago an observer computed that since 1850 there had been published 747 theories regarding the Old and New Testaments, of which 608 were by that time defunct (see Hastings, "Higher Criticism"). The effect of these random hypotheses has been greatly to strengthen the orthodox view, which we now proceed to state.

Christianity is developed from Judaism in the sense that it embodies the Divine revelation contained in the latter creed, somewhat as a finished painting embodies the original rough sketch. The same hand was employed in the production of both religions, and by type and promise and prophecy the Old Dispensation points clearly to the New. But type, and promise, and prophecy as clearly indicate that the New will be something very different from the Old. No mere organic evolution connects the two. A fuller revelation, a more perfect morality, a wider distribution was to mark the Kingdom of the Messias. "The end [or object] of the Law is Christ", says St. Paul (Rom., x, 4), meaning that the Law was given to the Jews to excite their faith in the Christ to come. "Wherefore", he says again (Gal., iii, 24), "the law was our pedagogue unto Christ", leading the Jews to Christianity as the slave brought his charges to the school door. Christ reproached the Jews for not reading their Scriptures aright. "For if you believed Moses, you would perhaps believe me also; for he wrote of me" (John, v, 46). And St. Augustine sums the whole matter up in the striking words: "In the Old Testament, the New lies hidden; in the New, the Old is made manifest" (De catechiz. rud., iv, 8). But Christ claimed to fulfil the Law by substituting the substance for the shadow and the gift for the promise, and, the end having been reached, all that was temporary and provisional in Judaism came to a conclusion. Still, a direct Divine intervention was necessary to bring this about, just as, in any rational account of the theory of evolution, recourse must be had to supernatural power to bridge the gulf between being and non-being, life and non-life, reason and non-reason. "God, who, at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us

by his Son" (Heb., i, 1, 2), the message growing in clearness and in content with each successive utterance till it reached completion in the Incarnation of the Word. The Christianity, then, which the Apostles preached on the day of Pentecost was entirely distinct from Judaism, especially as understood by the Jews of the time; it was a new religion, new in its Founder, new in much of its creed, new in its attitude towards both God and man, new in the spirit of its moral code. "The law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John, i, 17). St. Paul, as was to be expected, is our clearest witness on this point. "If any man be in Christ", he says, "he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are new" (II Cor., v, 17). How new Christianity was, the Jews themselves showed by putting its Author to death and persecuting His adherents. Renan himself, who is not always consistent, admits that "far from Jesus being the continuer of Judaism, what characterizes His work is its breach with the Jewish spirit" (Vie de Jésus, c. xxviii). It may be granted that there is a certain resemblance between the Essene communities and the earliest Christian assemblies. But the resemblance is only on the outside. The spirit of the Essenes was intensely national; except in the matter of worship in the Temple, they were ultra-Jewish in their observance of external forms, ablutions, the Sabbath, etc., and their mode of life and discouragement of marriage were essentially anti-social. Harnack himself owns that Christ had no relations with this rigoristic sect, as was shown by His mixing freely with sinners, etc. (Das Wesen des Christenthums, Lect. ii, p. 33, tr.). But Christianity did not reject anything in Judaism that was of permanent value, and so the Jewish converts on the day of Pentecost could not have felt that they were abjuring their ancient faith, but rather that they were then for the first time entering upon the full understanding of it. More will be said on this point when we come to consider what is the essence of Christianity, but we may notice that the Church very early found it necessary to emphasize her distinctness from Judaism by abandoning the essentially Jewish rites of circumcision, Temple-worship, and observance of the Sabbath.

Judaism is not the only religious system that has been requisitioned by rationalistic writers to account for the appearance of Christianity. Points of similarity between the teaching of Christ and His Apostles and the great religions of the East have been taken to indicate a derivation of the latter system from the earlier, and the elaborate eschatology of the Egyptian religion has been quoted to account for certain Christian dogmas about the future life. It were a long and not very profitable task to state and refute these various theories in detail. Underlying all of them is the rationalistic postulate which denies the fact and even the possibility of Divine intervention in the evolution of religion. In virtue of that attitude rationalism is confronted with the impossible task of explaining how a universal religion like Christianity, with an extensive yet logical system of dogma, could have been evolved by a process of promiscuous borrowings from existing cults and yet preserve everywhere its unity and coherence. If the selection were made by Christ and His adherents, rationalists must tell us how these "ignorant and unlettered men" (Acts, iv, 13; cf. Matt., xiii, 54; Mark, vi, 2) knew the religions of the East, when it was a matter of astonishment to their contemporaries that they knew their own. Or, if the dogmas and practices under consideration were the additions of a later age, the questions arise, first, how to reconcile this statement with the fact that the essence of Christianity is discoverable in the earliest Christian witnesses and, secondly, how scattered communities composed of various nationalities and living under different conditions could have united in selecting and maintaining the same dogmas and rules of conduct. We may ask, furthermore, why Christianity which, on this hypothesis, only selected pre-existing doctrines, excited everywhere such bitter hostility and persecution. "About this sect", said the Roman Jews to St. Paul in prison, "we are informed that it meets with opposition everywhere" (Acts, xxviii, 22). Immense erudition has been wasted in the attempt to show that Buddhism (q. v.) in particular is the prototype of Christianity, but, apart from the difficulty of distinguishing the original creed of Gautama from later and possibly post-Christian accretions, it may be briefly objected that Buddhism is at best only an ethical system, not a religion, for it recognizes no God and no responsibility, that in so far as it emphasizes the comparative worthlessness of earthly things and the insufficiency of earthly delights it is in accord with the Christian spirit, but that in aim it is essentially diverse. The supreme aim of Christianity is eternal happiness in a state involving the employment of all the soul's activities, that of Buddhism the ultimate loss of conscious existence.

Let us grant, once for all, that God's intercourse with His creatures is not confined to the Old and New Covenants, and that Christianity includes many doctrines accessible to the unaided human reason, and advocates many practices which are the natural outcome of ordinary human activities. We thus expect to find that, human nature being the same everywhere, the various expressions of the religious sense will take similar shapes amongst all peoples. Accordingly, false religions may very well inculcate ascetic practices and possess the idea of sacrifice and sacrificial banquets, of a priesthood, of sin and confession, of sacramental rites like baptism, of the accessories of worship such as images, hymns, lights, incense, etc. Not everything in false religion is false, nor is everything in the true religion (or Christianity) supernatural. "We must not look", says M. Müller, "in the original belief of mankind for [distinctively] Christian ideas but for the fundamental religious ideas on which Christianity is built, without which as its natural and historical support, Christianity could not have become what it is" (Wissenschaft der Sprache, II, 395).

These remarks apply not only to the religious systems which are alleged to have influenced the conception of Christianity, but to those which it met as soon as it issued from Judaism, its cradle. Here, we are face to face with history, and not with mere hypothesis and assumption. For Christianity, on its first essaying to realize its destiny as the universal religion, did actually come in contact with two mighty religious systems, the religion of Rome, and the widespread body of thought, more of a philosophy than a creed, prevalent in the Greek-speaking world. The effect of the national religion of pagan Rome on early Christianity concerned rites and ceremonies rather than points of doctrine, and was due to the general causes just mentioned. With Greek philosophy, on the other hand, representing the highest efforts of the human intellect to explain life and experience, and to reach the Absolute, Christianity, which professes to solve all these problems, had, naturally and necessarily, many points of contact. It is on this connexion that modern rationalists have brought all their learning and research to bear in their effort to show that the whole later intellectual system of Christianity is something more or less alien to its original conception. It was the transference of Christianity from a Semitic to a Greek soil that explains, according to Dr. Hatch (Hibbert Lectures, 1888), "why an ethical sermon stood in the forefront of the teaching of Jesus, and a metaphysical creed in the forefront of the Christianity of the fourth century". Professor Harnack states the problem and solves it in similar fashion. He ascribes the change, as he conceives it, from a simple code of conduct to the Nicene Creed, to the three following causes: (1) The universal law in all development of

religion, that when the first generation of converts who have been in contact, more or less immediate, with the founder, and endowed with his spirit, have passed away, their successors, having no personal grasp of their creed, must depend on formulæ and dogmas; (2) the union of the Gospel with the Greek spirit (a) due to the conquests of Alexander and the consequent mingling of Jew and Gentile, (b) further strengthened about A. D. 130, when Greek converts brought into Christianity the philosophy in which they were educated, (c) again, about a century later, when Greek mysteries and Greek civilization in its widest range were admitted, and finally, (d) about the middle of the fourth century, when the Greek spirit finally prevailed and polytheism and mythology (i. e. the worship of the saints) were admitted; (3) the internal struggles with Gnosticism, which aimed at a synthesis of all existing creeds. "The struggle with Gnosticism compelled the Church to put its teaching, its worship, and its discipline into fixed forms and ordinances, and to exclude everyone who would not yield them obedience" (Das Wesen des Christenthums, Lect. xi, p. 210).

It is the second of these reasons for the birth and growth of dogma that concerns us immediately; but we may remark in regard to the first that it ignores the direct working of God on the soul of the individual, the perpetual renewal of fervour through prayer and the use of the sacraments, that have always marked the course of Christianity. Herein, the spirit of its first days is seen still to be energetic, notwithstanding the comparative elaborateness of creed and ritual of modern Christianity. The saints are admitted to be the most perfect exponents of practical Christianity; they are not exceptions or accidents or by-products of the system; yet they did not find dogma any hindrance to their perfect service of God and man. As regards the third cause above mentioned, we may grant that it has always been the providential function of heresy to bring about a clearer definition of the Christian creed, and that Gnosticism in its many varieties undoubtedly had this effect. But long before Gnosticism had sufficiently developed to necessitate the safeguarding of doctrine by conciliar definition, we find traces of an organized Church with a very definite creed. Not to mention the traditional "form of doctrine" spoken of by St. Paul (Rom., vi, 17) and the act of faith required by Philip from the eunuch (Acts, viii, 37), many critics, including the Protestants Zahn and Kattenbusch (Das Apostolische Symbol., Leipzig, 1894–1900),agree that the present Apostles' Creed represents a formula which took shape in the Apostolic Age and was uninfluenced by Gnosticism, which Protean heresy first became formidable about A. D. 130. And as regards organization, we know that the episcopate was a fully recognized institution in the time of Ignatius (c. 110), whilst the Canon of New Testament Scripture, the final establishment of which was undoubtedly helped by Gnosticism, was in process of recognition even in Apostolic times. St. Peter (assuming the Second Epistle to be his) classifies St. Paul's Epistles with the "other Scriptures" (II Pet., iii, 16), and St. Polycarp, early in the second century, quotes as Scripture nine of those thirteen Pauline documents.

Concerning the "union of the Gospel with the Greek spirit" which, according to Hatch and Harnack, resulted in such profound modifications of the former, we may admit many of the statements made, without drawing from them the rationalistic inferences. We readily grant that Greek thought and Greek culture had thoroughly permeated the society into which Christianity was born. Alexander's conquests had brought about a diffusion of Greek ideals throughout the East. The Jews were dispersed westwards, both from Palestine and from the towns of the Captivity, and established in colonies in the chief cities of the empire, especially in Alexandria. The extent of this dispersion may be gathered from Acts, ii, 9–11. Greek became the language of commerce and social intercourse, and Palestine itself, more particularly Galilee, was to a great extent hellenized. The Jewish Scriptures were best known in a Greek version, and the last additions to the Old Testament—the Book of Wisdom and the Second Book of Machabees —were entirely composed in that tongue. In addition to this peaceful permeation of the Hebraic by the Greek genius, formal efforts were made from time to time, both in the political and the philosophical sphere to hellenize the Jews altogether.

It is with the latter attempt that we are concerned; for the writings of Philo, its chief and earliest advocate, coincided with the birth of Christianity. Philo was a Jew of Alexandria, well versed in Greek philosophy and literature, and at the same time a devout believer in the Old Testament revelation. The general purpose of his principal writings was to show that the admirable wisdom of the Greeks was contained in substance in the Jewish Scriptures, and his method was to read allegory into the simple narratives of the Pentateuch. To the pure and certain monotheism of Judaism he wedded various ideas taken from Plato and the Stoics, trying thus to solve the problem, with which all philosophy is ultimately confronted, how to bridge the gulf between mind and matter, the infinite and the finite, the absolute and the conditioned. Philo's writings were, no doubt, widely known amongst the Jews, both at home and abroad, at the time when the Apostles began to preach, but it is extremely unlikely that the latter, who were not educated men, were acquainted with them. Not until the conversion of St. Paul and the beginning of his apostolate can Christianity be said to have come, in the mind of one of its chief exponents, into immediate contact with Greek religious and philosophical theories. St. Paul was learned, not only in Hebrew, but also in Hellenistic lore, and a singularly apt instrument in the design of Providence, on account of his Jewish origin and education, his Greek learning, and his Roman citizenship, to aid Christianity to throw off the swaddling-bands of its infancy and go forth to the conquest of the nations. But whilst recognizing this providential dispensation in the election of St. Paul, we cannot, in face of his own express and emphatic testimony, go on to assert that he universalized Christianity, as Philo attempted to universalize Judaism, by adding to its ethical content the merely natural religion of the Greek thinkers or his own more sublime and pure conceptions. In one of his earliest letters, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul rebukes their factious spirit, whereby some of them had styled themselves partisans of Apollos, a learned Alexandrian, and repudiates again and again that very attempt to make Christianity plausible by tricking it out in the garb of current speculations. "But *we* preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block, and to the Gentiles foolishness" (I Cor., i, 23; see chaps. i and ii, passim, and Col., ii, 8). St. Paul, at any rate, was not indebted for his Christology to Philo or his school, and any similarity of terminology which may occur in the works of the two authors may quite reasonably be ascribed to the metaphors already embodied in the language they both used.

More insistence has been laid, perhaps, on the resemblance between the Christology set forth by St. John in the opening chapters of his Gospel and in the Apocalypse, and the *Logos* theories which Philo elaborated, and which he is said to have taken from Greek sources. If he did so, we may remark, he neglected others older and nearer to hand, for the conception of a Divine Word of God, by which the Deity enters into relation with the created universe, is by no means exclusively or originally Greek. The

idea, expressed in the opening verses of Genesis, is frequently repeated in the rest of the Old Testament (see Pss., xxxii, 6; cvi, 20; cxlvii, 15; Prov., viii, 22; Wisdom, vii, 24–30, etc.). Philo, therefore, was not compelled to seek in the Platonic *Nous*, which is merely the directive cause of creation, or the Stoic *Logos*, as the rational soul of the universe, the foundations of his doctrine. His *Logos* theory is not at all clear or consistent, but, apparently, he conceives the Word to be a quasi-personal, subordinate, intermediate being between God and the world, enabling the Creator to come into contact with matter. He calls this *Logos* "the eldest" and the "first-born" son of God, and uses phrases that suggest the Fourth Gospel; but there is no resemblance in substance between the bold, clear, categoric statements of the inspired Apostle, and the misty, if poetical, conceptions of the Alexandrian philosopher. We may conjecture that St. John chose his language so as to impress the cultivated Greek mind with the true doctrine of the Divine Logos, thus connecting his teaching with the older revelation, and, at the same time, putting a check upon the Gnostic errors to which Philoism was already giving birth.

Abandoning the Apostolic Age, Harnack, in his "History of Dogma", ascribes the hellenization of Christianity to the apologists of the second century (1st German edit., p. 253). This contention can best be refuted by showing that the essential doctrines of Christianity are contained already in the New Testament Scriptures, while giving, at the same time, their due force to the traditions of corporate Christianity. If the Nicene Creed cannot be proved article by article from the sacred records, interpreted by the tradition that preceded them and determined their canon, then the rationalist assertion will have some support. But the point of comparison with the Creed must be not only the Sermon on the Mount, as Hatch desires, nor the merely verbal teaching of Christ, but the whole New Testament record. Christ taught by His life no less than by His words, and it was His actions and sufferings as well as His oral lessons that His Apostles preached. For the fuller exposition of this, see REVELATION. Here it suffices to note that Christian theology became, in the hands of the apologists the synthesis of all speculative truth. It met and conquered the various imperfect systems that possessed men's minds at its birth or arose after that event. The early heresies—Sabellianism, Arianism, and the rest—were but attempts to make Christianity one of a number of philosophies; the attempts failed, but the scattered truths that those philosophies contained were shown, as time went on, to exist and find their fulfilment in Christianity as well. "The Church", says Newman, "has been ever 'sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing and asking them questions'; claiming to herself what they said rightly, correcting their errors, supplying their defects, completing their beginnings, expanding their surmises, and thus gradually by means of them enlarging the range and refining the sense of her teaching" (Development of Doctrine, viii). In the same section Newman thus summarizes the battle and the triumph: "Such was the conflict of Christianity with the old established Paganism, which was almost dead before Christianity appeared; with the Oriental Mysteries, flitting wildly to and fro like spectres; with the Gnostics, who made Knowledge all in all, despised the many, and called Catholics mere children in the Truth: with the Neo-Platonists, men of literature, pedants, visionaries, or courtiers; with the Manichees, who professed to seek truth by Reason, not by Faith; with the fluctuating teachers of the school of Antioch, the time-serving Eusebians, and the reckless versatile Arians; with the fanatic Montanists and harsh Novatians, who shrank from the Catholic doctrine, without power to propagate their own. These sects had no stay or consistence, yet they contained elements of truth amid their error, and had Christianity been as they, it might have resolved into them; but it had that hold of the truth which gave its teaching a gravity, a directness, a consistency, a sternness, and a force to which its rivals, for the most part, were strangers" (ibid., viii).

II. THE ESSENTIALS OF CHRISTIANITY.—We have so far seen, in its origin and growth, the essential independence of Christianity of all other religious systems, except that of Judaism, with which, however, its relation was merely that of substance to shadow. It is now time to point out its distinctive doctrines. In early Christianity there was much that was transitory and exceptional. It was not presented full-grown to the world, but left to develop in accordance with the forces and tendencies that were implanted in it from the first by its Founder. And we, having His assurance that His Spirit would abide with it for all time, to inspire and regulate its human elements, can see in its subsequent history the working out of His design. Hence, it does not trouble us to find in primitive Christianity qualities which did not survive after they had served their purpose. Natural causes and the course of events, always under the Divine guidance, resulted in Christianity taking on the form which would best secure its permanence and efficiency. In Apostolic times, supreme authority as to faith and morals was vested in twelve representatives of Christ, each of whom was commissioned to proclaim and infallibly interpret His Gospel. The hierarchy was in an inchoate condition. Special *charismata*, like the gifts of prophecy and tongues, were bestowed on individuals outside the official teaching body. The Church was in process of organization, and the various Christian communities, united, doubtless, in a strong bond of charity, and in the sense that they had one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, were to a large extent independent of one another in the matter of government.

Such was the fashion in which Christ allowed His Church to be established. It has greatly changed in outward appearances during the ages. Has there been any corresponding change in substance? Are the essentials of Christianity the same now as they were then? We affirm that they are, and we prove our assertion by examining the main points of the teaching, both of Christ and His Apostles. We must look upon the matter as a whole. We cannot judge of Christianity properly before the coming of the Holy Spirit. The Gospels describe a process which was not consummated till after Pentecost. The Apostles themselves were not fully Christians till they knew through faith all that Christ was—their God and their Redeemer as well as their Master. And as Christianity furnishes a regulative principle for both mind and will, teaching us what to believe and what to do, faith no less than works must characterize the perfect Christian.

(1) Taking, then, first of all, *Christ's own dogmatic and moral teaching*, we may divide it into (a) what He did not reveal but only reaffirmed, (b) what He drew from obscurity, and (c) what He added to the sum total of belief and practice.

(a) The Jews, at the time of Christ, however worldly-minded, were at any rate free from their ancestral tendency to idolatry. They were strict monotheists, believing in the unity, power, and holiness of the Supreme Deity. Christ reaffirmed, purified, and confirmed the Jewish theology, both moral and dogmatic. He asserted the spiritual nature of the Godhead (John, i, 18; iv, 24), and insisted on the importance of worshipping Him in spirit, i. e. with more than merely external rites. And He exacted the same right dispositions of heart in the whole of God's service, showing how both guilt and merit depend on the will and intention (Matt., v, 28; xv, 18). He recalled the original unity and indissolubility of

the marriage-tie. He brought into prominence the immortality, and hence the transcendent importance, of the human soul (Matt., xvi, 20), as against the heresy of the Sadducees and the worldliness of the Jews in general. In all these points He fulfilled the Law by showing its real and full significance.

(b) But He did not stop here. Taking the great central precept of the Old Dispensation—the love of God—He pointed out all its implications and made clear that the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, so imperfectly grasped under the law of fear, was the immediate source of the doctrine of the brotherhood of men, which the Jews had never realized at all. He never tired of dwelling on the loving kindness and the tender providence of His Father, and He insisted equally on the duty of loving all men, summing up the whole of His ethical teaching in the observance of the law of love (Matt., v, 43; xxii, 40). This universal charity He designed to be the mark of His true followers (John, xiii, 35), and in it, therefore, we must see the genuine Christian spirit, so distinct from everything that had hitherto been seen on earth that the precept which inspired it He called "new" (John, xiii, 34). Christ's clear and definite teaching, moreover, about the life to come, the final judgment resulting in an eternity of happiness or misery, the strict responsibility which attaches to the smallest human actions, is in great contrast to the current Jewish eschatology. By substituting eternal sanctions for earthly rewards and punishments, He raised and ennobled the motives for the practice of virtue, and set before human ambition an object wholly worthy of the adopted sons of God, the extension of their Father's Kingdom in their own souls and in the souls of others.

(c) Among the doctrines added by Christ to the Jewish faith, the chief, of course, are those concerning Himself, including the central dogma of the whole Christian system, the Incarnation of God the Son. In regard to Himself, Christ made two claims, though not with equal insistence. He asserted that He was the Messias of the Jews, the expected of the nations, Whose mission it was to undo the effects of the Fall and to reconcile man with God; and He claimed to be Himself God, equal to, and one with, the Father. In support of this double claim, He pointed to the fulfilment of the prophecies, and He worked many miracles. His claim to be the Messias was not admitted by the leaders of His nation; had it been admitted, He would doubtless have manifested His Divinity more clearly. Most modern rationalists (Harnack, Wellhausen, and others) acknowledge that Christ from the beginning of His preaching knew Himself as the Messias, and accepted the various titles which belong in the Scripture to that personage—Son of David, Son of Man (Dan., vii, 13), the Christ (see John, xiv, 24; Matt., xvi, 16; Mark, xiv, 61, 62). In one passage—and a very significant one—He applies the name to Himself—"But this is eternal life: That they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent" (John, xvii, 3).

In regard to His Divinity, His claim is clear, but not emphasized. We cannot say that the title "Son of God", which is repeatedly given to Him in the Gospels (John, i, 34; Matt., xxvii, 40; Mark, iii, 12; xv, 39, etc.), and which He is described as taking to Himself (Matt., xxvii, 43; John, x, 36), necessarily of itself connotes a Divine personality; and in the mouths of several of the speakers, e. g. in the exclamation of Nathaniel, "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God", it presumably does not. But in the confession of St. Peter (Matt., xvi, 16) the circumstances point to more than a mere amplification of the Messianic title. That title was at that time in habitual use in regard to Jesus, and there would have been nothing significant in Peter's expression and in Christ's glad acceptance of it, if it had not gone further than the common belief. Christ hailed St. Peter's confession as a special revelation, not as a mere deduction from external facts. When we compare this with that other declaration narrated in the same Gospel (Matt., xxvi, 62–66), where, in answer to the high-priest's adjuration, "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us if thou be the Christ the Son of God", Jesus replied, "Thou hast said it" (i. e., "I am"; see Mark, xiv, 62), we cannot reasonably doubt that Christ claimed to be Divine. The Jews so understood this and put Him to death as a blasphemer.

Another prominent feature in the theology of Christ was His doctrine about the Paraclete. When, in St. John's Gospel (xiv, 16, 17), He says: "And I will ask the Father, and he shall give you *another* Paraclete, that he may abide with you forever, the spirit of truth", it is impossible to believe that what He promises is a mere abstraction, not a person like Himself. In verse 26, the personality is still more marked: "And the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father shall send in my name, He will teach you all things". (Cf. xv, 26, "But when the Paraclete shall come whom I shall send you from the Father, the Spirit of Truth who proceeds from the Father" etc.) It may be that the full meaning of those words was not realized till the Spirit did actually come; moreover, the revelation was made, of course, only to His immediate followers; still, no unbiased mind can deny that Christ here speaks of a personal influence as a distinct Divine entity; a distinction and a Divinity which is further implied in the baptismal formula He afterwards instituted (Matt., xxviii, 19).

Christ took up the burden of the preaching of His precursor and proclaimed the advent of the Kingdom of God, or the Kingdom of Heaven, a conception already familiar in the Old Testament [Ps. cxliv (A.V., cxlv), 11–13], but furnished with a wider and more varied content in the words of Christ. It may be taken to mean, according to the context, the Messianic Kingdom in its true spiritual sense, i. e. the Church of God which Christ came to found, wherein to store up and perpetuate the benefits of the Incarnation (cf. the parables of the wheat and the tares, the drag-net, and the wedding feast), or the reign of God in the heart that submits to His sovereignty (Luke, xvii, 21), or the abode of the blessed (Matt., v, 20 etc.). It was the main topic of His preaching, which was occupied in showing what dispositions of mind and heart and will, were necessary for entrance into "the Kingdom", what, in other words, was the Christian ideal. Regarded as the Church, He preached the Kingdom to the multitude in parables only, reserving fuller explanations to private intercourse with His Apostles (Acts, i, 3).

The last great dogma which we learn from the life, preaching, and death of Christ is the doctrine of Redemption. "For the Son of Man also came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a redemption for many" (Mark, x, 45). The sacrificial character of His death is clearly stated at the Last Supper: "This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins" (Matt., xxvi, 28). And He ordained the perpetuation of that Sacrifice by His Disciples in the words: "Do this in commemoration of me" (Luke, xxii, 19). Christ, knowing the counsels of His Father, deliberately set Himself to realize in His own person the portrait of the suffering servant of Jahveh, so vividly painted by Isaias (ch. liii), a Messias Who should triumph through death and defeat. This was a strange revelation to Israel and the world. What wonder that so novel an idea could not enter the Apostles' minds till it had actually been realized and further explained by the Divine Victim Himself (Luke, xxiv, 27, 45). Thus, first of all in action, Christ preached the great doctrine of the Atonement, and,

by raising Himself from the dead, He added another proof to those establishing His Divine mission and His Divine personality. But, naturally enough, He left the more explicit teaching on these points to His chosen witnesses, whose presentment of Christianity we shall presently examine.

To turn now to what is new in the moral teachings of Christ, we may say, once for all, that it embodied ethical perfection. There may be development of doctrine, but, after the Sermon on the Mount, there can be no further evolution of morals. God's own perfection is set as the standard (Matt., v, 48). Duty was the principal motive in the Old Dispensation; in the New this was sublimated into love. Men were taught to serve not on account of the penalties attached to non-service, but on principles of generosity. Before, God's will was to be the aim of the creature's performance; now, His good pleasure also was to be sought. "What things are pleasing to Him, these do I always" (John, viii, 29), and by action even more than by word Christ taught the lesson of voluntary self-sacrifice. Never till His time were the Evangelical counsels—voluntary poverty, perpetual chastity, and entire obedience—preached or practised. From no previous moral code, however exalted, could the Beatitudes have been evolved. Meekness and humility were unknown as virtues to the heathen, and despised by the Jew. Christ made them the groundwork of the whole moral edifice. To realize what new thing Christ's ethical teaching brought into the world and put within the grasp of everyone, we have only to think of the great host of the Christian saints. For they are the true disciples of the Cross, those who imbibed and expressed His spirit best, who had the courage to test the truth of that Divine paradox which forms the substance of Christ's moral message: "He that shall wish to save his soul shall lose it, but he that shall lose his soul on my account shall find it" (Matt., xvi, 25; cf. Mark, viii, 35; Luke, ix, 24; xvii, 33; John, xii, 25). That was the course He Himself adopted—the way of the Cross—and His disciples were not above their Master. Self-conquest as a preliminary to conquering the world for God—that was the lesson taught by Christ's life, and still more by His passion and death.

(2) *The Teaching of the Apostles.*—Does the Christianity presented to us in the rest of the writings of the New Testament differ from that described in the Gospels? And if so, is the difference one of kind or one of degree? We have seen that Christianity must not be judged in the making, but as a finished product. It was never meant to be fully set forth in the Gospels, where it is presented mainly in action. "I have yet many things to say to you: but you cannot bear them now", said Christ in His last discourse. "But when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will teach you all truth . . . and the things that are to come he shall show you" (John, xvi, 12, 13). We may presume that Christ Himself told them these many things when "He showed himself alive after his passion, by many proofs, for forty days appearing to them, and speaking of the kingdom of God" (Acts, i, 3), and that they were rendered permanent in the minds of the Apostles by the indwelling of the Spirit of Truth after Pentecost. Accordingly, we must expect to find in their teaching a more formal, more theoretic, and more dogmatic exposition of Christianity than in the drama of Christ's life. But what we have no right to expect, and what rationalists always do expect, is to find the whole of Christianity in its written records. Christ nowhere prescribed writing as a means of promulgating His Gospel. It was comparatively late in the Apostolic Age, and apparently in obedience to no preconceived plan, that the sacred books began to appear. Many Christians must have lived and died before those books existed, or without knowledge of them. And so we cannot argue from the non-appearance of any particular tenet to its non-existence, nor from its first mention to its first invention—fallacies which often vitiate the erudite researches of the rationalists.

The main heads of the Apostolic preaching, as far as we can gather from the records, vary with the character of the audiences they addressed. To the Jews they dwelt upon the marvellous fulfilment of the prophecies in Christ, showing that, in spite of the manner of His life and death, He was actually the Messias, and that their redemption from sin had really been accomplished by His sacrifice on the Cross. This was the burden of St. Peter's discourses (Acts, ii and iii) and those of St. Stephen and of all who addressed the Jews in their synagogues (cf. Acts, xxvi, 22–23). Once convinced of the reality of Christ's mission and the seal God set upon it by His Resurrection, they were received into the Christian body to discover more at leisure all the implications of their belief. In regard to the Gentiles, the same striking fact of the Resurrection was in the forefront of the Apostolic teaching, but more stress was laid upon the Divinity of Christ. Still, St. Paul, whose peculiar mission it was to approve the new revelation to those that sat in darkness and had no common ground of belief with the Jews, did not consider that his Gospel was anything different from that of the others. "I have laboured more abundantly than all they: yet not I, but the grace of God with me: for, *whether I, or they*, so we preach, and so you have believed" (I Cor., xv, 10, 11). This definiteness and uniformity of content in the Apostolic message, and this sense of responsibility in regard to its character, is still more strikingly emphasized by the same Apostle in his next Epistle, wherein, rebuking the Galatians for giving heed to innovators "who would pervert the Gospel of Christ", he exclaims: "Yet, though we ourselves or an angel from Heaven preach a gospel other than that we have preached to you, let him be accursed" (Gal., i, 7, 8). There is no trace here of uncertainty or ignorance as to what Christianity meant, or of any tentative groping in search of truth. Even then, when theological science was in its infancy, we find the Apostle exhorting Timothy to keep to the very phrases in which he has received the Faith, "the form of sound words", avoiding "profane novelties of expression" (I Tim., vi, 20; II Tim., i, 13). Once again, "Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle" (II Thess., ii, 14). And those traditions were directly communicated by Christ Himself to His Apostle, as he tells us in many passages—"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you" (I Cor., xi, 23), and again, "For I delivered unto you first of all what I received" (I Cor., xv, 3). Many rationalists have professed to discover in the Apostolic writings various kinds of Christianity mutually antagonistic and all alike illegitimate developments of the original Gospel. We have Pauline, Petrine, Joannine Christianity, as distinguished from the Christianity of Christ. But those theories which ignore Catholic tradition and supernatural guidance, and rest on the written records alone, are gradually being abandoned, helped to their disappearance by the critics themselves, who have little respect for each others' hypotheses. We may take the Apostolic messages as one self-consistent whole, any apparent discrepancies or want of coherence being amply accounted for by the different circumstances of their deliverance. This preaching, therefore, reduced to its simplest form, was: The Resurrection of Christ as a proof of His Divinity and Incarnation, a guarantee of His teaching, and a pledge of man's salvation. On the historic fact of the Resurrection the whole of Christianity is based. If He was not truly slain, Christ cannot have been man; if He did not rise again, He cannot have been God. St. Paul does not hesi-

tate to stake everything on the truth of this fact: "If Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God" (I Cor., xv, 14, 15). Consequently, God's providence has so arranged matters that the proofs of Christ's Resurrection place the fact beyond all reasonable doubt.

But if St. Paul is so emphatic about the foundation of the Christian Faith, he is also careful to erect the edifice upon it. It is to him that we owe the statement of the doctrine of grace, that wonderful gift of God to regenerate man. Christ had already taught, in the allegory of the vine and the branches (John, xv, 1–17), that there can be no salutary action on the part of the faithful without vital communication with Him. This great truth is expanded in many passages by St. Paul (Phil., ii, 13; Rom., viii, 9–11; I Cor., xv, 10; II Cor., iii, 5; Gal., iv, 5, 6) wherein regenerate man learns that he is God's adopted son and united with Him by the indwelling of His Holy Spirit. This privilege is what man gains by Christ's redemption, the benefits of which are applied to his soul by baptism and the other sacraments. And St. Paul is not only the chief exponent of this doctrine, but he alone of the Apostles promulgates anew the mystery of the Blessed Eucharist, the principal fountain of grace (I Cor., xi, 23, 24; cf. John, iv, 13, 14).

We need not pursue farther the development of doctrine amongst the Apostles. The Christianity they preached was received from Christ Himself, and His Spirit prevented them from misconceiving or misinterpreting it. On the strength of His commission they insisted on the obedience of faith, they denounced heresy, and with skill, incredible had it not been Divine, they preserved the truth committed to them in the midst of a perverse, subtle, and corrupt civilization. That same Divine skill has remained with Christianity ever since; heresy after heresy has attacked the Faith and been defeated, leaving the fortress all the more impregnable for its onset. The Christianity we profess to-day is the Christianity of Christ and His Apostles. Just as they were more explicit than He in its verbal formulation, so the Apostolic Church has ever since laboured to express more and more clearly the treasures of doctrine originally committed to her charge. In a sense, we may believe more than our first Christian ancestors, inasmuch as we have a more complete knowledge of the contents of our Faith; in a sense, they believed all that we do, for they accepted as we the principle of a Divinely-commissioned teaching authority, to whose dogmatic utterances they were ever prepared to give assent. The same essential oneness of faith and the same variety in its content for the individual exist side by side in the Church to-day. The trained theologian, deeply versed in the wonders of revelation, and the young or the uneducated who know explicitly little more than the bare essentials of Christianity, knowing the One True God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, believing in the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Church, are equally Christians, equally possessed of the integrity of faith.

III. The Divine Purpose in Christianity.—It remains now to set forth, as far as we can determine it from the sacred records and from the course of history itself, the purpose of God in establishing Christianity. We gather that the Divine Founder meant Christianity to be (1) a universal religion, (2) a perfect religion, (3) a visibly organized religion.

(1) Universality includes both space and time. As regards space, we see that Christianity is intended for the whole world (a) from the prophecies that foreshadowed it in the Old Testament. Among these were the promises made to Abraham and his descendants, the constantly recurring note of which is that in them "all the nations of the earth shall be blessed". (b) From the plainly expressed purpose of Christ Himself, who, while proclaiming that His personal mission concerned only the "lost sheep of the House of Israel" (Matt., xv, 24), announced the future extension of His Kingdom: "Other sheep I have who are not of this fold" (John, x, 16); "Many from the east and the west shall come and shall recline with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt., viii, 11); "And this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached throughout the whole world in testimony to all nations" (Matt., xxiv, 14); "Go ye and teach all nations" (Matt., xxviii, 19). (c) From the actual conduct of the Apostles, who, though they required the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit to bring home to them the practical bearing of this commission, did finally leave the synagogue and proclaim the Faith to all without distinction of race or country. The universality of Christianity, in time as well as space, is implied in Christ's promise, "Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt., xxviii, 20). It follows, furthermore, from the next element in God's purpose to be considered.

(2) Christianity is meant to be a perfect religion. *A priori*, we should expect that a religious system which was revealed and instituted, not by a prophet or even an angel, but by the personal action of God Himself, and was designed, moreover, to supplant an imperfect and provisional form of religion, would lack nothing of possible perfection in end or means. Christ's own teaching satisfied this expectation, and precludes the notion entertained by some early heretics, and still alive in the minds of men, of a fuller and more perfect revelation to come. First of all, He, its Founder, is God, and therefore had all the knowledge and all the power requisite to establish a perfect religion. Secondly, He promised His Apostles the abiding presence of the Spirit of Truth, who should teach them *all truth*. Thirdly, He promised that the body enshrining this deposit should never be vitiated by error—"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt., xvi, 18; cf. Ephes., v, 27). Fourthly, the same truth is insinuated by St. Paul's words: "God, who at sundry times . . . *last of all* . . . hath spoken to us by His Son" (Heb., i, 1), and by the expression, *the fulness of time*, used in Gal., iv, 4, to indicate the epoch of the Incarnation. Fifthly, by the character of the Christian revelation itself and the Christian ethical ideal which is the imitation of Christ, the Perfect Being. No possible development of mankind can be thought of which should not find all that it needs in Christ.

We are compelled, therefore, to believe that the Christian revelation closed with the death of the last of those originally commissioned to set it forth. We are thus brought counter to a modern view regarding revelation which has lately been condemned as heretical by Pius X (Encyclical, "Pascendi Gregis", Sept., 1907). It is to the effect that revelation is nothing external, but a clearer and closer apprehension of things Divine by the Christian consciousness, which in each particular age is the expression of the experience of the best men of that age. Consequently, revelation grows, like a material organism, by waste and renewed supply, and therefore what is truth for one age may be quite different from what is truth for another. The error which has these developments is ultimately philosophical, being based on the false assumption that the finite mind can know only the phenomenal and can have no certainty of what is beyond experience. Were that so, any external revelation would be impossible, for its guarantees—miracle and prophecy—could not be grasped by human intelligence. These errors were long ago exposed and condemned by the Vatican Council. The most casual glance at the history of Christianity shows that there has been development of doctrine; the Creed grew only gradually; but that development is

merely logical, produced by analysis of the content of the original deposit. (See DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.)

(3) God intended, in the third place, that Christianity should be a visible organization. Christ established a Church and, in a variety of parables, sketched many of the features of its character and history, all of which point to something external and perceptible by the senses. It is the "house built upon a rock" (Matt., vii, 24), showing the security and permanence of its foundation, and "the city set upon a hill" (Matt., v, 14), indicating its visibility. Its doctrine works in the three great races descended from Noe's sons like the leaven hidden in three measures of meal, silently, irresistibly (Matt., xiii, 33). It grows great from humble beginnings, like the mustard seed (Luke, xiii, 19). It is a vineyard, a sheep-fold, and finally a kingdom, all of which images are unintelligible if the bond that unites Christians is merely the invisible bond of charity. The old distinction between the body and soul of the Church is useful to prevent confusion of ideas. Christian baptism constitutes membership in the Visible Church; the state of grace, membership in the Invisible. It is obvious that one membership does not necessarily connote the other. Some of these parables apply only to the Church fully developed, and so they indicate Christ's ultimate purpose. History shows us that, in establishing Christianity as an institution, He was content that on its human side its organization should be subject to the same laws of growth and development as other human institutions. He did not give His Apostles a draft-scheme of the Church's constitution beforehand, to be worked out in the course of ages, prescribing the various stages of progress, and indicating the final term. But the organization which existed in germ in the consecrated hierarchy of the Apostles was left to unfold itself under the guidance of the abiding Spirit, according to the needs of time and place. The presence of the Holy Ghost and Christ's promise sufficiently guarantee that the result, however obtained, is in accordance with the original design. It may well be that the development was very largely natural, modelled, first of all, on the synagogue, and then on the existing civil government; its progress may have been hastened or retarded by the passions of individuals, but any account of it that ignores the directing finger of Providence cannot be true.

This, then, is Christianity, a supernatural religion and the only absolute one; in a sense (developed in the Epistle to the Hebrews), the oldest, for the Church is not an afterthought, but instituted by God in the fullness of time, and containing a revelation of Himself, which all to whom it has been adequately presented are bound under pain of eternal loss to accept (Mark, xvi, 16), offering to all, who are sincere in seeking, the solution of all the world's problems; enabling human nature to rise to the sublimest heights and "to play the immortal"; full itself of mysteries and Divine paradoxes, as bringing the Infinite into contact with the finite; the one bond of civilization, the one condition of progress, the one hope of humanity. Its fortunes have been the fortunes of its Founder; "not all obey the gospel" (Rom., x, 16). The Jews rejected Christ in spite of the evidence of prophecy and miracle; the world rejects the Church of Christ, the "city set upon a hill", conspicuous though she be through the notes that proclaim her Divine. What men call the failure of Christianity is no proof that it is not God's final revelation. It only makes evident how real is human liberty and how grave human responsibility. Christianity is furnished with all the necessary evidence to create conviction of its truth, given good will.—"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear".

Christianity is best studied in the New Testament Scriptures, authenticated and interpreted by the Church of Christ: of the uninspired literature on the subject only a small selection can be given here:

CATHOLIC.—A. WEISS, *Apologie des Christenthums* (3rd ed., Freiburg, 1894–8) (also in French tr.); COURBET, *Introduction scientifique à la foi chrétienne; Supériorité du Christianisme* (Paris, 1902); DE BROGLIE, *Problèmes et conclusions de l'histoire des religions* (4th ed., Paris, 1904); LINGENS, *Die innere Schönheit des Christenthums* (Freiburg, 1895); TURMEL, *Histoire de la théologie positive* (Paris, 1904); SCHANZ, *A Christian Apology* (Eng. tr., Dublin, 1891–2); NEWMAN, *Grammar of Assent;* IDEM, *Development of Christian Doctrine;* DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1906); LILLY, *The Claims of Christianity* (London, 1894); DEVAS, *The Key to the World's Progress* (London, 1906); HETTINGER, *Apologie des Christenthums* (9th ed., Freiburg, 1906); SEMERIA, *Dogma, Gerarchia e Culto nella Chiesa primitiva* (Rome, 1902); CHATEAUBRIAND, *Génie du Christianisme* (Eng. tr., Baltimore, 1856); C. PESCH, Articles in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, Vol. LX, 1901.

NON-CATHOLIC.—HARNACK, *Das Wesen des Christenthums* (Eng. tr., London, 1901); IDEM, *The History of Dogma;* PFLEIDERER, *Christian Origins* (London, 1906); PULLAN, *History of Early Christianity* (London, 1898); W. M. RAMSAY, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (London and New York, 1893); LOWRIE, *The Church and Its Organization; the Primitive Age* (London, 1904); WEIZÄCKER, *The Apostolic Age* (London, 1897); JOSEPH BUTLER, *Analogy of Religion* in *Works*, vol. I, ed. GLADSTONE (Oxford, 1896); WACE, *Christianity and Agnosticism* (London, 1904).

JOSEPH KEATING.

Christianity in Prehistoric America. See BRENDAN, SAINT; MEXICO; THOMAS, SAINT.

Christian Knowledge, SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING, the greatest and most important society within the Church of England. It was founded 8 March, 1698, when four laymen, Lord Guildford, Sir H. Mackworth, Justice Hook, and Colonel Colchester, and one clergyman, Dr. Thomas Bray, met on the initiative of the last-named and agreed among themselves "as often as we can conveniently to consult, under the conduct of the Divine providence and assistance, to promote Christian Knowledge". Dr. Bray had been the Bishop of London's Commissary in Maryland, and was a man of wide experience, energetic zeal, and ability for organization. The society soon received the countenance of several Anglican bishops, including Gilbert Burnet of Salisbury. Other well-known men also took a speedy interest in the work, such as Strype the antiquary, Gilbert White of Selborne, John Evelyn, and the Rev. Samuel Wesley, father of John and Charles Wesley. The first aim of the society was the education of poor children. Within two years they had founded six schools in London, and by 1704 there were 54 schools with over 2000 scholars. Eight years later the schools numbered 117, the scholars 5000. The movement spread, and by 1741 the charity-schools of the S. P. C. K. reached the number of nearly 2000. This educational work at length became so great that a new society, "The National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church", was formed to undertake it. Since 1870 this work has been done by the State, and the society has turned its educational efforts to the training of teachers. It entirely maintains St. Katharine's College, Tottenham, supports the various diocesan training-colleges, and contributes towards the foundation of Sunday-school buildings and mission-rooms. The educational branch of the society's work has not been confined to England, but in India it has founded scholarships for native Christians, both in the boys' colleges and in the schools provided for the higher education of women. It also provides technical training for the native Christians by means of industrial schools. The same work is being developed in Australia, Japan, Africa, Burma, and among the American Indians of the North-West. Besides providing for children, the society has done much for "unlettered adults". From almost the beginning of its existence it has established evening schools and provided for the instruction of prisoners in penitentiaries or prisons. For a time the society paid chaplains to help prisoners, in an age when the Government often neglected this duty.

Another branch of the society's activity is the hospital work. The members visit the sick and dying, and supply the hospitals with Bibles, prayer books, and other religious works. Important under this head are the medical missions, which aim at winning the soul of the heathen by caring for his body. These medical missions have been founded in Sierra Leone, Madagascar, South Africa, India, Palestine, China, Japan, Korea, and British Columbia. Students, male and female, are specially trained for this work, and hospitals are built and furnished.

Perhaps more widely known than any is the work of the S. P. C. K. as "the great publishing house" of the Church of England. Simultaneously with the foundation of its first schools it began to print and circulate cheap and good books. One of its first subscriptions was begun "for promoting Christian knowledge by raising Lending Libraries in the several Market Towns of the kingdom and by distributing good books". The first publication was an edition of 600 copies of Dr. Bray's "Discourse concerning Baptismal and Spiritual Regeneration" which appeared in 1699. The society, while maintaining its position as the great Bible and Prayer Book Society of the Church of England, has not confined itself to purely religious works. Its catalogue includes volumes of popular science, travel, biography, and fiction, as well as the special class devoted to theology and history. Even translations of Catholic books are not excluded, and though Catholics, objecting to publications such as Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons", in which misrepresentation becomes a fine art, cannot approve of much that is issued in the society's volumes, they can acknowledge the general good taste of the society's publications even when directed against themselves. They may also be excused for regarding as objectionable the versions of English church history which are popularized throughout the country, not only by attractively produced manuals, but also by popular lantern lectures. Besides the books published, popular tracts, pictures, and illuminated texts are issued in great numbers. The latest figures available show that, exclusive of Bibles, prayer books, and tracts, the circulation of the society's publications in 1905 amounted to 11,078,135.

An important development of recent growth is the organizing of lay help. In 1889 the society opened a Training College for Lay Workers, in Commercial Road, in the East End of London. Here there is accommodation for 40 students, who are trained to assist the parochial clergy in holding mission services, giving classes to adults and children, and conducting temperance and other meetings. Such students, on completion of their course, are formally set apart to the office of Reader in the Church, and are licensed for the work by their respective diocesans.

Yet another branch of work is concerned with emigrants. This was undertaken in 1836 at the request of Mr. Gladstone, who had been acting as Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and who was impressed by the spiritual destitution of the crowds of emigrants. The society's "port chaplains" undertake a systematic visitation of out-going vessels, and the chaplains at the ports of departure give letters of introduction to the chaplains at the ports of arrival, and often the long-voyage chaplains accompany the ships.

Missionary work was, from the first, aimed at by the S. P. C. K. Dr. Bray's personal experience of the condition of those members of the Church of England who were scattered through what are now the Northern and Southern States of the Union convinced him that the work to be done was so gigantic that it called for a special society, and therefore, in 1701, the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel" was founded. This did not prevent the parent-society helping on the work in every way. Since those days its field of labour has been extended to Canada and Australia, and it has been active in spreading the influence of the Church of England. During the reign of Queen Victoria the society expended £100,000 in helping to found and endow colonial and missionary bishoprics. Besides this, large sums have been voted for the building of colleges, churches, and schools. One aspect of this missionary work which calls for special notice is the translation of the Bible into foreign languages. Beginning in 1713 with a Bible in Welsh, it proceeded in 1720 to the dissemination of 10,000 Arabic New Testaments, and at the present day it claims to publish Bibles and other books in a hundred different languages and dialects. In regard to some of these the difficulties are great, as it sometimes happens that a dialect has never been reduced to writing, and the missionary has to put the syllables into some written form and send them home to be printed again and again until it is found that they finally represent the inflexions of the dialect and are capable of conveying the impressions desired. The society also supplies printing presses and types to missions which are in a position to use them. The first effort in this direction was the S. P. C. K. Press in Madras, founded in 1728, and now employing 400 work-people.

The organization and management of the society is efficient and vigorous, and there can be no doubt that it remains to-day one of the chief means of preserving for the Church of England its hold over the people. Remarkable, too, is the manner in which it has managed to keep on good terms with the various warring sections in the Anglican Church. A recent writer has observed, "The society comes in for a little friendly criticism from time to time from one side or the other of the Church, but it should be borne in mind that it has always striven to be the handmaid of the Church, not the tool of a section." (Cochrane, "An Important Chapter in English History", 13.) The influence of the society, especially displayed in the colonies, has also made itself felt in the drawing together of the entire Anglican episcopate. Speaking of the S. P. C. K. and the S. P. G., Dr. Lewis, the first Anglican Archbishop of Ontario, one of the originators of the Lambeth Conferences, declared that the influence of those two societies did much to make such conclaves possible. The magnitude of the work annually accomplished, of which the main branches have been here indicated to the exclusion of many minor activities, justified the eulogy by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Benson, when he wrote: "Of all our societies in England, this is the oldest and grandest, and its work the very largest ever conceived".

SEWELL, *The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge: a Short Account of its Work and Organisation* (London, 1885); *An Important Chapter in English Church History: S. P. C. K.*, 1698–1905 (London, 1905).

EDWIN BURTON.

Christian Names. See NAMES, CHRISTIAN.

Christian Retreat, CONGREGATION OF.—There are two branches of this congregation, the Fathers of Christian Retreat and the Sisters. It was founded on the 19th of November, 1789, at Fontenelle, Doubs, France, by Father Antoine-Silvestre Receveur, who was declared Venerable in 1883 by Pope Leo XIII. He had an extraordinary love of the Cross, and was fond of saying "it was a cross to be without one". The Revolution raging at the time of its birth caused the society to endure many privations and forced its members to make many sacrifices. For three years the sisters, who at that time numbered seventy, were subjected to great persecution, and then a revolutionary mob drove them out of their convent. The choice was given them of death or separation from Father Receveur, which would have involved abandoning the life they had adopted. The sisters unanimously chose death rather than give up their vocation, and their persecutors, touched by their bravery, allowed them to go into exile. After ten

years the storm of the Revolution subsided, they returned to France, and in 1800 the congregation received the approbation of Pius VII. Its work is the education of youth and the giving of spiritual retreats. The Fathers of Christian Retreat used to direct colleges in France, and still act as chaplains to the different convents of the congregation. The Sisters of Christian Retreat teach in elementary and secondary schools, and their rule allows them time and opportunity for higher studies. Those sisters who from age or ill-health are unable to teach spend the greater part of the day in silence and prayer for the members who are engaged in active work. They also do needlework and embroidery of every description. Seven times a day the rule calls all the members to the foot of the altar, and every night at midnight a bell is rung in all the convents to rouse the sisters to thank God for the grace of their vocations. On the 19th of November a special midnight service is held in memory of the entry at midnight into the first convent. A special service called the Adoration of the Cross is held every day in all the convents. There are no lay sisters; the work of the house is done by all the sisters according to the direction of the superior.

In 1902 the congregation had seventeen houses, thirteen in France, four in England, and more than a thousand members. There were then three novitiates, two in France and one in England, but all the French houses except one have since been confiscated under the Association Law. Convents were then opened in Belgium and Switzerland, and in England there are now seven convents, including a novitiate. The novitiate lasts two years; postulants without dowry, if qualified for teaching in secondary schools, can be received. The habit is of white serge, with a white cape and scapular; no veil or wimple is worn, but instead a white linen band across the forehead and a white serge cap. The sisters are not enclosed; when they go out they wear a black habit and a long black cloak. The government is under a mother-general. In England the convents are at Shepherd's Bush, near London; at Clapham; at Redhill, Surrey; at Cannock, Staffordshire, and three new foundations.

STEELE, *Convents of Great Britain* (London, St. Louis, 1902).

F. M. STEELE.

Christians, PERSECUTIONS OF THE. See PERSECUTIONS, CHRISTIAN.

Christian Science. See SUGGESTION.

Christians of St. Thomas. See INDIA; MALABAR.

Christie, ALEX. See PORTLAND, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Christina Alexandra, QUEEN OF SWEDEN, child of Gustavus Adolphus II of Sweden, b. at Stockholm, 8 December, 1626; d. at Rome, 19 April, 1689. Her father (d. 1632) was the famous soldier whose interposition in the Thirty Years' War wrought so much harm to Catholicism. Maria Eleonora of Brandenburg, her mother, had hoped for a son and was so disappointed at the birth of a daughter that she had little love for the child, who was left to the care of nurses. Gustavus Adolphus, however, was tenderly attached to his daughter; in 1630, when he sailed for Germany, he commended Christina to the loyalty of his people and put his sister Catherine, who held her court at Stegeborg, in charge of the child's education. Three years later Maria Eleonora brought back the body of her husband, Gustavus Adolphus, to Sweden. For a while after this her love seemed to be transferred to the child, but this affectionate relation did not last long. In obedience to the command of her father, Christina was brought up like a boy and received instruction in the various branches of learning from distinguished men, among whom was the learned Dr. Matthiæ, Bishop of Strengnäs. The princess was an indefatigable student, and a great reader of good books. Feminine occupations and amusements had no attraction for her, and she was indifferent to dress and finery of all kinds. The mother wished rather to see her daughter lead a life of pleasure, and encouraged her in the enjoyment of wine and other stimulating drinks, so that the country was alarmed for the morals of the heir to the throne, and Christina was sent again to her aunt. When the aunt died she was put under the care of the sister of the celebrated chancellor Axel Oxenstiern. In her new surroundings the great talents of Christina rapidly developed. She soon mastered several languages, gained a comprehensive knowledge of history and politics, and showed, in particular, a strong liking for theologico-philosophical speculations. At the same time the masculine qualities of her character grew steadily more evident. Her favourite amusement was bear-hunting, and she could outride most men. At eighteen (8 December, 1644) she was of age and entered on the duties of government with a strong hand. It was not, however, until two years later that she was crowned, the ceremony taking place with great pomp at Stockholm.

At first Christina devoted herself to the affairs of state with most laudable zeal. It was owing to her intervention that the peace negotiations at Münster and Osnabrück were more quickly concluded than had been expected. Christina strove to raise her people to a higher plane of civilization, to promote their welfare in every way, and to insure their prosperity. Without lowering the dignity suitable to her station she treated all her subjects with justice and condescension. She drew to Sweden artists and scholars, among whom were the philosopher Descartes, and Hugo Grotius, the expounder of international law; by the payment of large pensions she kept these men attached to her court. The praise with which these scholars repaid their royal patron was often immoderate. As time went on Christina gradually lost interest in the task of government and developed an intense desire for new and exciting pleasures, often for those of a most costly character. The health of the queen suffered from the changed method of her life, and it was with great difficulty that her French physician, Dr. Bourdelot, effected a cure. In the meantime the debts thus incurred rose to a huge amount. The Swedish people wished the queen to marry and to give them an heir to the throne, but Christina was not willing to hear of this as she desired to preserve her personal independence. She was much more inclined to abdicate her position and to become a ruler in the realm of genius and learning. At the same time she showed a continually growing inclination to the Catholic Church, for she took no pleasure in the simple forms of the Lutheran belief which was all-powerful in Sweden. It is not possible to prove positively whether Dr. Bourdelot or the Spanish ambassador, Pimentelli, influenced Christina's change of religious views. It is certain, however, that several members of the Society of Jesus, Fathers Macedo, Francken, Malines, and Casati, succeeded in removing her last doubts as to the truth of Catholicism. Christina perceived that she could not continue to reign in Sweden as a convert to Catholicism, and resigned the throne in favour of her cousin, Charles Gustavus of Pfalz-Zweibrücken, a member of the Wittelsbach family. On 6 June, 1654, at Upsala, she transferred her authority to him with much ceremony, and on the following day started on her travels. She bade farewell to her mother at Nyköping, then hastened to Halmstad, where she dismissed her retinue, and went to Brussels by way of Hamburg and Antwerp. At Brussels she made private confession of her belief in Catholicism; her public entrance into the Church took place in the beginning of November 1655, in the parish church of Innsbruck.

It was from Innsbruck that the European Courts were officially informed of her change of faith. On 23 December she reached the capital of Christendom, which was decorated in her honour. The pope came personally to meet her, administered the Sacrament of Confirmation, and added Alexandra to her name. At Rome Christina's home was the Palazzo Farnese; during her residence here she sought to satisfy her intellectual ambitions as well as the longings of her devout and loving heart. She visited the sacred places to pray, went as a ministering angel into the hovels of the poor, and devoted herself to the study of the collections of art and the libraries. She drew into the circle of her fascinations the leading families of the Eternal City, arranged concerts and plays, and

Monument of Christina of Sweden

knew how to delight everyone by her acuteness and learning. She was not willing, however, to drop rough Swedish customs, and allowed herself to display various peculiarities of dress and manner, so that many people avoided her. In 1656 and 1657 Christina went to France, the first time with a retinue, the second time incognito. On the latter trip her conduct excited much displeasure, as among other eccentricities she dressed as a man. Much more severe censure was aroused by the trial, without proper legal forms, of an old servant, Monaldeschi, and his subsequent execution, although as a sovereign she had the right to pronounce sentence of death, or at least believed herself entitled to this authority. Returned to Rome she gradually fell under the displeasure of the pope, for like a true daughter of Gustavus Adolphus she at times defied foreign laws and customs in too arrogant a fashion. Christina suffered much annoyance from the failure to receive with regularity from Sweden the income to which she was entitled; sometimes no money came at all. Moreover a woman so active intellectually had no taste or time for keeping accounts. Dishonesty in the management of her money affairs naturally followed, and the disorder in her finances was not overcome until the Curia through Cardinal Azzolini provided her with a competent bookkeeper.

After the death of Charles Gustavus (1660) she returned to Sweden to have her rights again legally confirmed. A second visit home (1667) was not of long duration as, in the pettiest manner, difficulties were thrown in the way of the exercise of her religion. After this for a time she lived at Hamburg, but she made her continued stay in that city, then very rigidly Lutheran, impossible by organizing festivities in honour of the newly-elected pope which ended in tumult and bloodshed. In 1668 she returned to Rome and never again left the Eternal City. Her new home was the Palazzo Riario, and she filled her residence with great collections of books and objects of art. Her palace became a centre both for the learned world and for artists and sculptors; to the latter Christina both gave aid and generously paid commissions. Her forethought and care were not limited to her acquaintances and the members of her household, the poor of Rome also found in her a charitable mother. As she grew older she fulfilled her religious duties with increasing intelligence and zeal, and the approach of death had no longer any terrors for her. Piously and bravely she prepared herself for the end; after arranging her worldly affairs she received the sacraments with humble devotion and died a true child of the Catholic Church. Against her express wish the pope had the body embalmed and brought to St. Peter's, where it was buried under the high altar. Her ostentatious but not prepossessing monument is the work of Carlo Fontana. Christina made Cardinal Azzolini her principal heir, while the Papal See and various Catholic sovereigns also received legacies. Unfortunately, after the death of Azzolini much of her valuable art collection passed into the hands of strangers; the greater part of her very rich library is, however, in the Vatican. Pictures and plastic art of various kinds have preserved the knowledge of Christina's features. Although not beautiful, yet in her youth her appearance must have been interesting. In later years she grew too stout to retain any trace of good looks. Only the flashing, piercing eye gave any evidence of the fiery spirit which the exterior concealed. In character the northern sovereign remained very much the same through life. Receptive for everything good and great, she unfalteringly pursued her quest after knowledge of the truth and after many wanderings found it in the bosom of the Catholic Church. She had a tender, sympathetic heart, yet was subject at times to fits of severity, even of cruelty. She was no saint, but was probably better than the members of her former confession pictured her. Any objective portrait of her will always bear out the judgment of Axel Oxenstiern, "After all she was the daughter of the Great Adolphus", both in her faults and in her virtues.

Weibull and Höjer, ed., *Sveriges historia från äldsta tider till våra dagar* (1611–1718), IV; Friis, *Dronning Christina af Sverrig*, 1626–1689 (Copenhagen, 1896), a work of Protestant tendencies; Bildt, *Drottning Kristinas sich ta dagar* (1897), vol. V of the "Skriften"; Woodhead, *Memoir of Christina, Queen of Sweden* (London, 1863), II; Bain, *Christina, Queen of Sweden* (London, 1890); Dentoche-Grauert, *Königin Christine von Schweden und ihr Hof* (Bonn, 1838–1842, 2 vols.); Busson, *Christine von Schweden in Tyrol* (Innsbruck, 1884); Fay, *Königin Christine von Schweden, Tochter Gustaf Adolfs* (Barmen, 1889); Daniels, *Christine von Schweden*, in *Preuss. Jahrbücher* (Berlin, 1899), XCVI–XCVII; Arckenholz, *Mémoires concernant Christine, reine de Suède* (Amsterdam, 1751–60), IV; *Pensées de Christine, reine de Suède* (Paris, 1825); Barine, *Christine de Suède*, in the *Revue des deux mondes* (October, 1888); Treatises in Italian by Campori, Malagola, Picenardi, Gratanelli, written in the years 1877, 1881, 1889, and 1896, on Christina's connexion with the House of Este, her stay at Bologna, Pisa, and Rome, especially Clarella, *La regina Christina di Suecia in Italia*, 1655–1689 (1892).

P. Wittmann.

Christine de Pisan, a French poetess and historiographer, b. at Venice, 1363; d. in France, 1430. Although an Italian by birth, she was French at heart as well as in education and fame. When she

was five years old she went to Paris with her father, Thomas de Pisan, who had been appointed astrologer and secretary to King Charles V. She was reared at the court, and educated in the ancient languages and literatures. At the age of fourteen she married a nobleman from Picardy, Etienne du Castel. When her husband died she was only twenty-five years old. Her father and her protector, King Charles, having died several years before, she found herself in straitened circumstances, with three children to provide for. Henry IV, King of England, and Galeazzo Visconti, Tyrant of Milan, each invited her to come and live at his court, but she refused to leave France, where she had been so well treated, and resolved to make a living with her pen. Her writings in prose and verse soon gained her great renown. Her contemporaries compared her eloquence with that of Cicero and her wisdom with that of Cato. Prompted by necessity she wrote incessantly. She declares herself that "in the short space of six years, between 1397 and 1403, she wrote fifteen important books, without mentioning minor essays, which, compiled, make seventy large copy-books." Among her works in prose we may cite: "Le Livre des Faitz et bonnes Mœurs du Saige Roy Charles", an elaborate biography, written at the solicitation of Philip of Burgundy, who was rearing her eldest son as his own child; this book is full of moral lessons, but its merit is somewhat impaired by a useless display of erudition and a diffuse style; "Le Livre de Paix", a treatise dealing with the education of princes, who, according to the author, should be trained in honesty and uprightness, rather than in diplomatic trickery; "Trésor de la Cité des Dames" and "Lettre à Isabeau de Bavière", in which she endeavours to rehabilitate the character of a woman who had been defamed by the "Roman de la Rose".

Her poetical works consist mostly of long poems, such as "Le Livre des Mutations de Fortune", "Le Chemin de Longue Etude", "Le Livre des cent Histoires de Troie", etc. These are ambitious and heavy compositions. Her ballades, rondeaux, and lesser poems are more commendable; they are clear and graceful. As a complete edition of Christine's works is being made, her talent will no longer be judged from extracts and separate poems. Though she is by no means a great poetess, she was mentioned with praise eighty years after her death by Marot. She is superior to Eustache Deschamps, her master.

PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française* (Paris, 1896), XI; PARIS, *La littérature française au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1890); ROBINEAU, *Christine de Pisan* (Saint-Omer, 1882); ROY, *Œuvres de Christine de Pisan* (Paris, 1895), 3 vols.; MINTO, *Christine de Pisan, a Medieval Champion of her Sex*, in *Macmillan's Magazine* (1886), LIII, 264; TOYNBEE, *Christine de Pisan* and *Sir John Mandeville* in *Romana* (1892) XXI, 228–39.

LOUIS N. DELAMARRE.

Christine of Stommeln, BLESSED, b. at Stommeln near Cologne, in 1242; d. 6 November, 1312. Stommeln, called in the fourteenth century Stumbeln, is situated about nine miles north-west of Cologne and about six miles west of the Rhine. Christine's father was a well-to-do peasant named Heinrich Bruso; the name of her mother was Hilla. When five years old Christine had visions of the Christ Child to whom she was mystically married in her tenth year. When eleven years old she learned to read the Psalter, but could not write. When twelve her parents wished to give her in marriage, but she went to the convent of the Beguines at Cologne, where she led a life of severe penance, spent much time in prayer, and often fell into convulsions. In her fifteenth year she received the stigmata on her hands and feet and the marks of the Crown of Thorns on the head. She suffered many assaults of the devil, had many trials of her faith, and was tempted to suicide. The Beguines thought her crazy and treated her with contempt, so she went back home. As early as 1267 the parish priest, Johannes, took Christine into his house, where she made the acquaintance of Peter of Dacia, a Dominican from Gotland who was at Cologne as a pupil of St. Albert the Great. A mystical bond of devotion, the object of which was God, was formed between the two. Peter visited Christine in 1270 on his way back from Paris to Gotland, and again in 1279; in his account of her he mentions altogether fifteen visits. Christine's brother followed Peter to Gotland and entered the Dominican Order. Peter became lector and in 1283 was prior in Gotland, where he died in 1288. In this same year the torments which Christine suffered through the devil ceased, and she lived a peaceful life, wearing always the dress of the Beguines, until her death. Her body was first buried in the churchyard at Stommeln and then in the church itself; in 1342 her remains were carried to Niedeggen in the Eifel; a couple of centuries later, 22 June, 1569, they were transferred to Jülich, where a monument to her still exists. At Jülich are also to be seen the notes made by Peter of Dacia and the collection of her letters which the Bollandists have published under the date of 22 June (IV, 271–430). It is difficult to decide just how much literal truth exists in Christine's visions and apparitions from Purgatory. But even Renan did not doubt the purity of her life (Hist. litt. de la France, XXVIII, 1–26). The veneration of the Church has not been granted to Christine; however, the anniversary of her death, 6 November, is observed in Jülich.

WOLLERSHEIM, *Das Leben der ekstatischen und stigmatischen Jungfrau Christina von Stommeln* (Cologne, 1859); PAULSON edited the Latin life (Gotaburg, 1896); BONE in *Kirchenlex.*, III, 236; MICHAEL, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, III, 165–167.

GABRIEL MEIER.

Christmas.—The word for Christmas in late O. E. is *Cristes Maesse*, the Mass of Christ, first found in 1038, and *Cristes-messe*, in 1131. In Dutch it is *Kerst-misse*, in Lat. *Dies Natalis*, whence Fr. *Noël*, and Ital. *Il natale;* in Ger. *Weihnachtsfest*, from the preceding sacred vigil. The term *Yule* is of disputed origin. It is unconnected with any word meaning "wheel". The name in A. S. was *geol*, feast: *geola*, the name of a month (cf. Icel. *ïōl*, a feast in December).

EARLY CELEBRATION.—Christmas was not among the earliest festivals of the Church. Irenæus and Tertullian omit it from their lists of feasts; Origen, glancing perhaps at the discreditable imperial *Natalitia*, asserts (in Lev. Hom. viii in Migne, P. G., XII, 495) that in the Scriptures sinners alone, not saints, celebrate their birthday; Arnobius (VII, 32 in P. L., V, 1264) can still ridicule the "birthdays" of the gods. The first evidence of the feast is from Egypt. Clement of Alexandria, c. 200 (Strom., I, xxi in P. G., VIII, 888), says that certain Egyptian theologians "over curiously" assign, not the year alone, but the day of Christ's birth, placing it on 25 Pachon (20 May) in the twenty-eighth year of Augustus. [Ideler (Chron., II, 387, n.) thought they did this believing that the ninth month, in which Christ was born, was the ninth of their own calendar.] Others reached the date of 24 or 25 Pharmuthi (19 or 20 April). With Clement's evidence may be mentioned the "De paschâ computus", written in 243 and falsely ascribed to Cyprian (P. L., IV, 963 sqq.), which places Christ's birth on 28 March, because on that day the material sun was created. But Lupi has shown (Zaccaria, Dissertazioni ecc. del p. A. M. Lupi, Faenza, 1785, p. 219) that there is no month in the year to which respectable authorities have not assigned Christ's birth. Clement, however, also tells us that the Basilidians celebrated the Epiphany (q. v.), and with it, probably, the Nativity, on 15 or 11 Tybi (10 or 6 January). At any rate this double commemoration became popular, partly because the apparition to the shepherds was considered as one manifestation of Christ's glory,

and was added to the greater manifestations celebrated on 6 January; partly because at the baptism-manifestation many codices (e. g. Codex Bezæ) wrongly give the Divine words as σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε (Thou art my beloved Son, this day have I begotten thee) in lieu of ἐν σοι εὐδόκησα (in thee I am well pleased), read in Luke, iii, 22. Abraham Ecchelensis (Labbe, II, 402) quotes the Constitutions of the Alexandrian Church for a *dies Nativitatis et Epiphaniæ* in Nicæan times; Epiphanius (Hær., li, ed. Dindorf, 1860, II, 483) quotes an extraordinary semi-Gnostic ceremony at Alexandria in which, on the night of 5–6 January, a cross-stamped Korê was carried in procession round a crypt, to the chant, "To-day at this hour Korê gave birth to the Eternal"; John Cassian records in his "Collations" (X, 2 in P. L., XLIX, 820), written 418–427, that the Egyptian monasteries still observe the "ancient custom"; but on 29 Choiak (25 December) and 1 January, 433, Paul of Emesa preached before Cyril of Alexandria, and his sermons (see Mansi, IV, 293; appendix to Act. Conc. Eph.) show that the December celebration was then firmly established there, and calendars prove its permanence. The December feast therefore reached Egypt between 427 and 433.

In Cyprus, at the end of the fourth century, Epiphanius asserts against the Alogi (Hær., li, 16, 24 in P. G., XLI, 919, 931) that Christ was born on 6 January and baptized on 8 November. Ephraem Syrus (whose hymns belong to Epiphany, not to Christmas) proves that Mesopotamia still put the birth feast thirteen days after the winter solstice, i. e. 6 January; Armenia likewise ignored, and still ignores, the December festival. (Cf. Euthymius, "Pan. Dogm.", 23 in P. G., CXXX, 1175; Niceph., "Hist. Eccl.", XVIII, 53 in P. G., CXLVII, 440; Isaac, Catholicos of Armenia in eleventh or twelfth century, "Adv. Armenos", I, xii, 5 in P. G., CXXII, 1193; Neale, "Holy Eastern Church", Introd., p. 796.) In Cappadocia, Gregory of Nyssa's sermons on St. Basil (who died before 1 January, 379) and the two following, preached on St. Stephen's feast (P. G., XLVI, 788; cf. 701, 721), prove that in 380 the 25th of December was already celebrated there, unless, following Usener's too ingenious arguments (Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, Bonn, 1889, 247–250), one were to place those sermons in 383. Also, Asterius of Amaseia (fifth century) and Amphilochius of Iconium (contemporary of Basil and Gregory) show that in their dioceses both the feasts of Epiphany and Nativity were separate (P. G., XL, 337, XXXIX, 36). In 385, Silvia of Bordeaux (or Etheria, as it seems clear she should be called) was profoundly impressed by the splendid Childhood feasts at Jerusalem. They had a definitely "Nativity" colouring; the bishop proceeded nightly to Bethlehem, returning to Jerusalem for the day celebrations. The Presentation was celebrated forty days after. But this calculation starts from 6 January, and the feast lasted during the octave of that date. (Peregr. Sylv., ed. Geyer, pp. 75 sqq.) Again (p. 101) she mentions as high festivals Easter and Epiphany alone. In 385, therefore, 25 December was not observed at Jerusalem. This checks the so-called correspondence between Cyril of Jerusalem (348–386) and Pope Julius I (337–352), quoted by John of Nikiu (c. 900) to convert Armenia to 25 December (see P. L., VIII, 964 sqq.). Cyril declares that his clergy cannot, on the single feast of Birth and Baptism, make a double procession to Bethlehem and Jordan. (This later practice is here an anachronism.) He asks Julius to assign the true date of the nativity "from census documents brought by Titus to Rome"; Julius assigns 25 December. Another document (Cotelier, Patr. Apost., I, 316, ed. 1724) makes Julius write thus to Juvenal of Jerusalem (c. 425–458), adding that Gregory Nazianzen at Constantinople was being criticized for "halving" the festival. But Julius died in 352, and by 385 Cyril had made no change; indeed, Jerome, writing about 411 (in Ezech., P. L., XXV, 18), reproves Palestine for keeping Christ's birthday (when He hid Himself) on the Manifestation feast. Cosmas Indicopleustes suggests (P. G., LXXXVIII, 197) that even in the middle of the sixth century Jerusalem was peculiar in combining the two commemorations, arguing from Luke, iii, 23 that Christ's baptism day was the anniversary of His birthday. The commemoration, however, of David and James the Apostle on 25 December at Jerusalem accounts for the deferred feast. Usener, arguing from the "Laudatio S. Stephani" of Basil of Seleucia (c. 430.—P. G., LXXXV, 469), thinks that Juvenal tried at least to introduce this feast, but that Cyril's greater name attracted that event to his own period.

In Antioch, on the feast of St. Philogonius, Chrysostom preached an important sermon. The year was almost certainly 386, though Clinton gives 387, and Usener, by a long rearrangement of the saint's sermons, 388 (Religionsgeschichtl. Untersuch., pp. 227–240). But between February, 386, when Flavian ordained Chrysostom priest, and December is ample time for the preaching of all the sermons under discussion. (See Kellner, Heortologie, Freiburg, 1906, p. 97, n. 3.) In view of a reaction to certain Jewish rites and feasts, Chrysostom tries to unite Antioch in celebrating Christ's birth on 25 December, part of the community having already kept it on that day for at least ten years. In the West, he says, the feast was thus kept, ἄνωθεν; its introduction into Antioch he had always sought, conservatives always resisted. This time he was successful; in a crowded church he defended the new custom. It was no novelty; from Thrace to Cadiz this feast was observed—rightly, since its miraculously rapid diffusion proved its genuineness. Besides, Zachary, who, as high-priest, entered the Temple on the Day of Atonement, received therefore announcement of John's conception in September; six months later Christ was conceived, i. e. in March, and born accordingly in December.

Finally, though never at Rome, on authority he knows that the census papers of the Holy Family are still there. [This appeal to Roman archives is as old as Justin Martyr (Apol., I, 34, 35) and Tertullian (Adv. Marc., IV, 7, 19). Julius, in the Cyrilline forgeries, is said to have calculated the date from Josephus, on the same unwarranted assumptions about Zachary as did Chrysostom.] Rome, therefore, has observed 25 December long enough to allow of Chrysostom speaking at least in 388 as above (P. G., XLVIII, 752, XLIX, 351). In 379 or 380 Gregory Nazianzen made himself ἔξαρχος of the new feast, i. e. its initiator, in Constantinople, where, since the death of Valens, orthodoxy was reviving. His three Homilies (see Hom. xxxviii in P. G., XXXVI) were preached on successive days (Usener, op. cit., p. 253) in the private chapel called Anastasia. On his exile, in 381, the feast disappeared.

According, however, to John of Nikiu, Honorius, when he was present on a visit, arranged with Arcadius for the observation of the feast on the Roman date. Kellner puts this visit in 395; Baumstark (Oriens Chr., 1902, 441–446), between 398 and 402. The latter relies on a letter of Jacob of Edessa quoted by George of Beeltân, asserting that Christmas was brought to Constantinople by Arcadius and Chrysostom from Italy, where, "according to the histories", it had been kept from Apostolic times. Chrysostom's episcopate lasted from 398 to 402; the feast would therefore have been introduced between these dates by Chrysostom bishop, as at Antioch by Chrysostom priest. But Lübeck (Hist. Jahrbuch., XXVIII, 1, 1907, pp. 109–118) proves Baumstark's evidence invalid. More important, but scarcely better accredited, is Erbes' contention (Zeitschrift f.

Kirchengesch., XXVI, 1905, 20–31) that the feast was brought in by Constantine as early as 330–35.

At Rome the earliest evidence is in the Philocalian Calendar (P. L., XIII, 675; it can be seen as a whole in J. Strzygowski, Kalenderbilder des Chron. von Jahre 354, Berlin, 1888), compiled in 354, which contains three important entries. In the civil calendar 25 December is marked "Natalis Invicti". In the "Depositio Martyrum" a list of Roman or early and universally venerated martyrs, under 25 December is found "VIII kal. ian. natus Christus in Betleem Iudeæ". On "VIII kal. mart." (22 February) is also mentioned St. Peter's Chair. In the list of consuls are four anomalous ecclesiastical entries: the birth and death days of Christ, the entry into Rome, and martyrdom of Saints Peter and Paul. The significant entry is "Chr. Cæsare et Paulo sat. XIII. hoc. cons. Dns. ihs. XPC natus est VIII Kal. ian. d. ven. luna XV," i. e. during the consulship of (Augustus) Cæsar and Paulus Our Lord Jesus Christ was born on the eighth before the calends of January (25 Dec.), a Friday, the fourteenth day of the moon. The details clash with tradition and possibility. The epact, here XIII, is normally XI; the year is A. U. C. 754, a date first suggested two centuries later; in no year between 751 and 754 could 25 December fall on a Friday; tradition is constant in placing Christ's birth on Wednesday. Moreover the date given for Christ's death (*duobus Geminis coss.*, i. e. A. D. 29) leaves Him only twenty-eight and one-quarter years of life. Apart from this, these entries in a consul list are manifest interpolations. But are not the two entries in the "Depositio Martyrum" also such? Were the day of Christ's birth in the flesh alone there found, it might stand as heading the year of martyrs' spiritual *natales;* but 22 February is there wholly out of place. Here, as in the consular *fasti*, popular feasts were later inserted for convenience' sake. The civil calendar alone was not added to, as it was useless after the abandonment of pagan festivals. So, even if the "Depositio Martyrum" dates, as is probable, from 336, it is not clear that the calendar contains evidence earlier than Philocalus himself, i. e. 354, unless indeed pre-existing popular celebration must be assumed to render possible this official recognition. Were the Chalki MS. of Hippolytus genuine, evidence for the December feast would exist as early as c. 205. The relevant passage [which exists in the Chigi MS. without the bracketed words and is always so quoted before George Syncellus (c. 1000)] runs: *Ἡ γὰρ πρώτη παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἡ ἔνσαρκος [ἐν ᾗ γεγέννηται] ἐν Βεθλεέμ, ἐγένετο [πρὸ ὀκτὼ καλανδῶν ἰανουαρίων ἡμέρᾳ τετράδι] βασιλεύοντος Αὐγούστου [τεσσαρακοστὸν καὶ δεύτερον ἔτος, ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀδὰμ] πεντακισχιλιοστῷ καὶ πεντακοσιοστῷ ἔτει· ἔπαθεν δὲ τριακοστῷ τριτῷ [πρὸ ὀκτὼ καλανδῶν ἀπριλίων, ἡμέρᾳ παρασκευῇ, ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει Τιβηρίου Καίσαρος, ὑπατεύοντος Ῥούφου καὶ Ῥουβελλίωνος]* (Comm. in Dan., iv, 23; Brotke, 19)—"For the first coming of Our Lord in the flesh [in which He has been begotten], in Bethlehem, took place [25 December, the fourth day] in the reign of Augustus [the forty-second year, and] in the year 5500 [from Adam]. And He suffered in His thirty-third year [25 March, the paraseeve, in the eighteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, during the consulate of Rufus and Rubellio]." Interpolation is certain, and admitted by Funk, Bonwetsch, etc. The names of the consuls [which should be Fufius and Rubellius] are wrong; Christ lives thirty-three years; in the genuine Hippolytus, thirty-one; minute data are irrelevant in this discussion with Severian millenniarists; it is incredible that Hippolytus should have known these details when his contemporaries (Clement, Tertullian, etc.) are, when dealing with the matter, ignorant or silent; or should, having published them, have remained unquoted. (Kellner, op. cit., p. 104, has an excursus on this passage.)

St. Ambrose (de virg., iii, 1 in P. L., XVI, 219) preserves the sermon preached by Pope Liberius in St. Peter's, when, on *Natalis Christi*, Ambrose' sister, Marcellina, took the veil. This pope reigned from May, 352 until 366, except during his years of exile, 355–357. If Marcellina became a nun only after the canonical age of twenty-five, and if Ambrose was born only in 340, it is perhaps likelier that the event occurred after 357. Though the sermon abounds in references appropriate to the Epiphany (the marriage at Cana, the multiplication of loaves, etc.), these seem due (Kellner, op. cit., p. 109) to sequence of thought, and do not fix the sermon to 6 January, a feast unknown in Rome till much later. Usener, indeed, argues (p. 272) that Liberius preached it on that day in 353, instituting the Nativity feast in the December of the same year; but Philocalus warrants our supposing that it preceded his pontificate by some time, though Duchesne's relegation of it to 243 (Bull. crit., 1890, 3, pp. 41 sqq.) may not commend itself to many. In the West the Council of Saragossa (380) still ignores 25 December (see can. xxi, 2). Pope Siricius, writing in 385 (P. L., XIII, 1134) to Himerius in Spain, distinguishes the feasts of the Nativity and Apparition; but whether he refers to Roman or to Spanish use is not clear. Ammianus Marcellinus (XXI, ii) and Zonaras (Ann., XIII, 11) date a visit of Julian the Apostate to a church at Vienne in Gaul on Epiphany and Nativity respectively. Unless there were two visits, Vienne in A. D. 361 combined the feasts, though on what day is still doubtful. By the time of Jerome and Augustine, the December feast is established, though the latter (Epp., II, liv, 12, in P. L., XXXIII, 200) omits it from a list of first-class festivals. From the fourth century every Western calendar assigns it to 25 December. At Rome, then, the Nativity was celebrated on 25 December before 354; in the East, at Constantinople, not before 379, unless with Erbes, and against Gregory, we recognize it there in 330. Hence, almost universally has it been concluded that the new date reached the East from Rome by way of the Bosphorus during the great anti-Arian revival, and by means of the orthodox champions. De Santi (L'Orig. delle Fest. Nat., in Civiltà Cattolica, 1907), following Erbes, argues that Rome took over the Eastern Epiphany, now with a definite Nativity colouring, and, with an increasing number of Eastern Churches, placed it on 25 December; later, both East and West divided their feast, leaving Epiphany on 6 January, and Nativity on 25 December, respectively, and placing Christmas on 25 December and Epiphany on 6 January. The earlier hypothesis still seems preferable.

ORIGIN OF DATE.—Concerning the date of Christ's birth the Gospels give no help; indeed, upon their data contradictory arguments are based. The census would have been impossible in winter: a whole population could not then be put in motion. Again, in winter it must have been; then only field labour was suspended. But Rome was not thus considerate. Authorities moreover differ as to whether shepherds could or would keep flocks exposed during the nights of the rainy season. Arguments based on Zachary's temple ministry are unreliable, though the calculations of antiquity (see above) have been revived in yet more complicated form, e. g. by Friedlieb (Leben J. Christi des Erlösers, Münster, 1887, p. 312). The twenty-four classes of Jewish priests, it is urged, served each a week in the Temple; Zachary was in the eighth class, Abia. The Temple was destroyed 9 Ab, A. D. 70; late rabbinical tradition says that class 1, Jojarib, was then serving. From these untrustworthy data, assuming that Christ was born A. U. C. 749, and that never in seventy turbulent years the weekly succession failed, it is calculated that the eighth class was serving 2–9 October, A. U. C. 748, whence Christ's conception falls in March, and birth presumably in December. Kellner (op. cit., pp. 106,

107) shows how hopeless is the calculation of Zachary's week from any point before or after it. It seems impossible, on analogy of the relation of Passover and Pentecost to Easter and Whitsuntide, to connect the Nativity with the feast of Tabernacles, as did, e. g., Lightfoot (Horæ Hebr. et Talm., II, 32), arguing from O. T. prophecy, e. g. Zach., xiv, 16 sqq.; combining, too, the fact of Christ's death in Nisan with Daniel's prophecy of a three and one-half years' ministry (ix, 27), he puts the birth in Tisri, i. e. September. As undesirable is it to connect 25 December with the Eastern (December) feast of Dedication (Jos. Ant. Jud., XII, vii, 6). The well-known solar feast, however, of Natalis Invicti, celebrated on 25 December, has a strong claim on the responsibility for our December date. For the history of the solar cult, its position in the Roman Empire, and syncretism with Mithraism, see Cumont's epoch-making "Textes et Monuments" etc., I, ii, 4, 6, p. 355. Mommsen (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 1^2, p. 338) has collected the evidence for the feast, which reached its climax of popularity under Aurelian in 274. Filippo del Torre in 1700 first saw its importance; it is marked, as has been said, without addition in Philocalus' Calendar. It would be impossible here even to outline the history of solar symbolism and language as applied to God, the Messiah, and Christ in Jewish or Christian canonical, patristic, or devotional works. Hymns and Christmas offices abound in instances; the texts are well arranged by Cumont (op. cit., addit. note C, p. 355).

The earliest *rapprochement* of the births of Christ and the sun is in Cypr., "De pasch. comp.", xix, "O quam præclare providentia ut illo die quo natus est Sol . . . nasceretur Christus."—"O, how wonderfully acted Providence that on that day on which the Sun was born . . . Christ should be born."—In the fourth century, Chrysostom, "de Solst. et Æquin." (II, p. 118, ed. 1588), says: "Sed et dominus noster nascitur mense decembris . . . VIII Kal. ian. . . . Sed et Invicti Natalem appellant. Quis utique tam invictus nisi dominus noster? . . . Vel quod dicant Solis esse natalem, ipse est Sol iustitiæ."—"But Our Lord, too, is born in the month of December . . . the eighth before the calends of January [25 December] . . . But they call it the 'Birthday of the Unconquered'. Who indeed is so unconquered as Our Lord . . . ? Or, if they say that it is the birthday of the Sun, He is the Sun of Justice." Already Tertullian (Apol., 16; cf. ad. Nat., I, 13; Orig. c. Cels., VIII, 67, etc.) had to assert that Sol was not the Christians' God; Augustine (Tract xxxiv, in Joan. in P. L., XXXV, 1652) denounces the heretical identification of Christ with Sol. Pope Leo I (Serm. xxvii in nat. dom., VII, 4; xxii, II, 6 in P. L., LIV, 218 and 198) bitterly reproves solar survivals—Christians, on the very doorstep of the Apostles' basilica, turn to adore the rising sun. Sun-worship has bequeathed features to modern popular worship in Armenia, where Christians had once temporarily and externally conformed to the cult of the material sun (Cumont, op. cit., p. 356). But even should a deliberate and legitimate "baptism" of a pagan feast be seen here no more than the transference of the date need be supposed. The "mountain-birth" of Mithra and Christ's in the "grotto" have nothing in common: Mithra's adoring shepherds (Cumont, op. cit., I, ii, 4, pp. 304 sqq.) are rather borrowed from Christian sources than vice versa.

The origin of Christmas should not be sought in the Saturnalia (1–23 December) nor even in the midnight holy birth at Eleusis (see J. E. Harrison, Prolegom., p. 549) with its probable connexion through Phrygia with the Naasene heretics, or even with the Alexandrian ceremony quoted above; nor yet in rites analogous to the midwinter cult at Delphi of the cradled Dionysus, with his revocation from the sea to a new birth (Harrison, op. cit., 402 sqq.). Duchesne (Les origines du culte chrétien, Paris, 1902, 262 sqq.) advances the "astronomical" theory that, given 25 March as Christ's death-day [historically impossible, but a tradition old as Tertullian (Adv. Jud., 8)], the popular instinct, demanding an exact number of years in a Divine life, would place His conception on the same date, His birth 25 December. This theory is best supported by the fact that certain Montanists (Sozomen, Hist. Eccl., VII, 18) kept Easter on 6 April; both 25 December and 6 January are thus simultaneously explained. The reckoning, moreover, is wholly in keeping with the arguments based on number and astronomy and "convenience", then so popular. Unfortunately, there is no contemporary evidence for the celebration in the fourth century of Christ's conception on 25 March. The present writer is inclined to think that, be the origin of the feast in East or West, and though the abundance of analogous midwinter festivals may indefinitely have helped the choice of the December date, the same instinct which set Natalis Invicti at the winter solstice will have sufficed, apart from deliberate adaptation or curious calculation, to set the Christian feast there too.

Liturgy and Custom.—The fixing of this date fixed those too of Circumcision and Presentation; of Expectation and, perhaps, Annunciation B. V. M.; and of Nativity and Conception of the Baptist (cf. Thurston in Amer. Eccl. Rev., December, 1898). Till the tenth century Christmas counted, in papal reckoning, as the beginning of the ecclesiastical year, as it still does in Bulls; Boniface VIII (1294-1303) restored temporarily this usage, to which Germany held longest. Codex Theod., II, 8, 27 (cf. XV, 5, 5) forbids, in 425, circus games on 25 December; though not till Codex Just., III, 12, 6 (529) is cessation of work imposed. The Second Council of Tours (can. xi, xvii) proclaims, in 566 or 567, the sanctity of the "twelve days" from Christmas to Epiphany, and the duty of Advent fast; that of Agde (506), in can. lxiii, lxiv, orders a universal communion, and that of Braga (563) forbids fasting on Christmas Day. Popular merry-making, however, so increased that the "Laws of King Cnut", fabricated c. 1110, order a fast from Christmas to Epiphany. The Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries give three Masses to this feast, and these, with a special and sublime martyrology, and dispensation, if necessary, from abstinence, still mark our usage. Though Rome gives three Masses to the Nativity only, Ildefonsus, a Spanish bishop, in 845, alludes to a triple Mass on Nativity, Easter, Whitsun, and Transfiguration (P. L., CVI, 888). These Masses, at midnight, dawn, and *in die*, were mystically connected with the aboriginal, Judaic, and Christian dispensations, or (as by St. Thomas, Summa Theol., III, Q. lxxxiii, a. 2) to the triple "birth" of Christ: in Eternity, in Time, and in the Soul. Liturgical colours varied: black, white, red, or (e. g. at Narbonne) red, white, violet were used (Durand, Rat. div. off., VI, 13). The Gloria was at first sung only in the first Mass of this day. The historical origin of this triple Mass is probably as follows (cf. Thurston, in Amer. Eccl. Rev., January, 1899; Grisar, Anal. Rom., I, 595; Geschichte Roms . . . im Mittelalter I, 607, 397; Civ. Catt., 21 September, 1895, etc.): The first Mass, celebrated at the *Oratorium Præsepis* in St. Mary Major—a church probably immediately assimilated to the Bethlehem basilica—and the third, at St. Peter's, reproduced in Rome the double Christmas Office mentioned by Etheria (see above) at Bethlehem and Jerusalem. The second Mass was celebrated by the pope in the "chapel royal" of the Byzantine Court officials on the Palatine, i. e. St. Anastasia's church, originally called, like the basilica at Constantinople, Anastasis, and like it built at first to reproduce the Jerusalem Anastasis basilica—and like it, finally, in abandoning the name "Anastasis" for that of the martyr St. Anastasia (q. v.). The second Mass would therefore

be a papal compliment to the imperial church on its patronal feast. The three stations are thus accounted for, for by 1143 (cf. Ord. Romani in P. L., LXXVIII, 1032) the pope abandoned distant St. Peter's, and said the third Mass at the high altar of St. Mary Major. At this third Mass Leo III inaugurated, in 800, by the coronation of Charlemagne, the Holy Roman Empire. The day became a favourite for court ceremonies, and on it, e. g., William of Normandy was crowned at Westminster.

The history of the dedication of the *Oratorium Præsepis* in the Liberian basilica, of the relics there kept and their imitations, does not belong to this discussion [cf. articles, CRIB; RELICS. The data are well set out by Bonaccorsi (Il Natale, Rome, 1903, ch. iv)], but the practice of giving dramatic, or at least spectacular, expression to the incidents of the Nativity early gave rise to more or less liturgical mysteries. The *ordinaria* of Rouen and of Reims, for instance, place the *officium pastorum* immediately after the Te Deum and before Mass (cf. Ducange, Gloss. med. et inf. Lat., s. v. Pastores); the latter Church celebrated a second "prophetical" mystery after Tierce, in which Virgil and the Sibyl join with O. T. prophets in honouring Christ. (For Virgil and Nativity play and prophecy see authorities in Comparetti, "Virgil in Middle Ages", p. 310 sqq.) "To out-herod Herod", i. e. to over-act, dates from Herod's violence in these plays. St. Francis of Assisi in 1223 originated the crib of to-day by laicizing a hitherto ecclesiastical custom, henceforward extra-liturgical and popular. The presence of ox and ass is due to a misinterpretation of Is., i, 3, and Hab., iii, 2 ("Itala" version), though they appear in the unique fourth-century "Nativity" discovered in the St. Sebastian catacombs in 1877. The ass on which Balaam rode in the Reims mystery won for the feast the title *Festum Asinorum* (Ducange, op. cit., s. v. Festum; see ASSES, FEAST OF). The degeneration of these plays in part occasioned the diffusion of noels, pastorali, and carols, to which was accorded, at times, a quasi-liturgical position. Prudentius, in the fourth century, is the first (and in that century alone) to hymn the Nativity, for the "Vox clara" (hymn for Lauds in Advent) and "Christe Redemptor" (Vespers and Matins of Christmas) cannot be assigned to Ambrose. "A solis ortu" is certainly, however, by Sedulius (fifth century). The earliest German Weihnachtslieder date from the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the earliest noels from the eleventh, the earliest carols from the thirteenth. The famous "Stabat Mater Speciosa" is attributed to Jacopone da Todi (1230-1306); "Adeste Fideles" is, at the earliest, of the seventeenth century. These essentially popular airs, and even words, must, however, have existed long before they were put down in writing.

Pagan customs centring round the January calends gravitated to Christmas. Tiele (Yule and Christmas, London, 1899) has collected many interesting examples. The *strenæ* (*étrennes*) of the Roman 1 January (bitterly condemned by Tertullian, de Idol., xiv and x, and by Maximus of Turin, Hom. ciii, de Kal. gentil., in P. L., LVII, 492, etc.) survive as Christmas presents, cards, boxes. The calend fires were a scandal even to Rome, and St. Boniface obtained from Pope Zachary their abolition. But probably the Yule-log in its many forms was originally lit only in view of the cold season. Only in 1577 did it become a public ceremony in England; its popularity, however, grew immense, especially in Provence; in Tuscany, Christmas is simply called *ceppo* (block, log —Bonaccorsi, op. cit., p. 145, n. 2). Besides, it became connected with other usages; in England, a tenant had the right to feed at his lord's expense as long as a wheel, i. e. a round, of wood, given by him, would burn; the landlord gave to a tenant a load of wood on the birth of a child; *Kindsfuss* was a present given to children on the birth of a brother or sister, and even to the farm animals on that of Christ, the universal little brother. (Tiele, op. cit., p. 95 sqq.) Gervase of Tilbury (thirteenth century) says that in England grain is exposed on Christmas night to gain fertility from the dew which falls in response to "Rorate Cœli"; the tradition that trees and flowers blossomed on this night is first quoted from an Arab geographer of the tenth century, and extended to England. In a thirteenth-century French epic, candles are seen on the flowering tree. In England it was Joseph of Arimathea's rod which flowered at Glastonbury and elsewhere; when 3 September became 14 September, in 1752, 2000 people watched to see if the Quainton thorn (*cratægus præcox*) would blow on Christmas New Style; and as it did not, they refused to keep the New Style festival. From this belief of the calends practice of greenery decorations (forbidden by Archbishop Martin of Braga, c. 575, P. L., LXXIII—mistletoe was bequeathed by the Druids) developed the Christmas tree, first definitely mentioned in 1605 at Strasburg, and introduced into France and England in 1840 only, by Princess Helena of Mecklenburg and the Prince Consort respectively. Only with great caution should the mysterious benefactor of Christmas night—Knecht Ruprecht, Pelzmärtel on a wooden horse, St. Martin on a white charger, St. Nicholas and his "reformed" equivalent, Father Christmas—be ascribed to the stepping of a saint into the shoes of Woden, who, with his wife Berchta, descended on the nights between 25 December and 6 January, on a white horse to bless earth and men. Fires and blazing wheels starred the hills, houses were adorned, trials suspended, and feasts celebrated (cf. Bonaccorsi, op. cit., p. 151). Knecht Ruprecht, at any rate (first found in a mystery of 1668 and condemned in 1680 as a devil) was only a servant of the Holy Child. But no doubt aboriginal Christian *nuclei* attracted pagan accretions. For the calend mumming; the extraordinary and obscene *Modranicht;* the cake in honour of Mary's "afterbirth", condemned (692) at the Trullan Council, can. lxxix; the Tabulæ Fortunæ (food and drink offered to obtain increase, and condemned in 743), see Tiele, op. cit., ch. viii, ix—Tiele's data are perhaps of greater value than his deductions—and Ducange (op. cit., s. vv. Cervula and Kalendæ). In England, Christmas was forbidden by Act of Parliament in 1644; the day was to be a fast and a market day; shops were compelled to be open; plum puddings and mince pies condemned as heathen. The conservatives resisted; at Canterbury blood was shed; but after the Restoration Dissenters continued to call Yuletide "Fooltide".

Besides the works mentioned in the article see also, *Die Geschichte des deutschen Weihnachts* (Leipzig, 1893); MANNHARDT, *Weihnachtsblüthen in Sitte u. Sage* (Berlin, 1864); RIETSCHEL, *Weihnachten in Kirche, Kunst u. Volksleben* (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1902); SCHMID, *Darstellung der Geburt Christi in der bildenden Kunst* (1890); MÜLLER, *Le costumanzi del Natale* (Rome, 1880); CORRIERI, *Il Natale nelle letterature del Nord* in *Cosmos Cath.* (December, 1900); ERBES, *Das Syrische Martyrologium*, etc., in *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* (1905), IV (1906), I; BARDENHEWER, *Mariä Verkündigung* (Freiburg, 1905); DE KERSAINT-GILLY, *Fêtes de Noël en Provence* (Montpellier, 1900); DE COUSSEMAKER, *Drames liturgiques du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1861); DOUHET, *Dict. des mystères* in MIGNE, *Nour. encycl. théol.*, XLIII; PÉREMÈS, *Dict. de Noëls*, ibid, LXIII; SMITH AND CHEETHAM, *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*, s. v. *Christmas.*

CYRIL MARTINDALE.

Christology. See JESUS CHRIST.

Christopher, SAINT (Gr. *χριστός*, Christ, *φέρειν*, to bear. Lat. *Christophorus*, i. e. Christbearer), a martyr, probably of the third century. Although St. Christopher is one of the most popular saints in the East and in the West, almost nothing certain is known about his life or death. The legend says: A heathen king (in Canaan or Arabia), through the prayers of his wife to the Blessed Virgin, had a son, whom he called Offerus (Offro, Adokimus, or Reprebus) and dedicated to the gods Machmet and Apollo.

Acquiring in time extraordinary size and strength, Offerus resolved to serve only the strongest and bravest. He bound himself successively to a mighty king and to Satan, but he found both lacking in courage, the former dreading even the name of the devil, and the latter frightened at the sight of a cross by the roadside. For a time his search for a new master was in vain, but at last he found a hermit (Babylas?) who told him to offer his allegiance to Christ, instructed him in the Faith, and baptized him. Christopher, as he was now called, would not promise to do any fasting or praying, but willingly accepted the task of carrying people, for God's sake, across a raging stream. One day he was carrying a child who continually grew heavier, so that it seemed to him as if he had the whole world on his shoulders. The child, on inquiry, made himself known as the Creator and Redeemer of the world. To prove his statement the child ordered Christopher to fix his staff in the ground. The next morning it had grown into a palm-tree bearing fruit. The miracle converted many. This excited the rage of the king (prefect) of that region (Dagnus of Samos in Lycia?). Christopher was put into prison and, after many cruel torments, beheaded.

The Greek legend may belong to the sixth century; about the middle of the ninth we find it spread through France. Originally, St. Christopher was only a martyr, and as such is recorded in the old martyrologies. The simple form of the Greek and Latin *passio* soon gave way to more elaborate legends. We have the Latin edition in prose and verse of 983 by the subdeacon Walter of Speyer, "Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus" (Augsburg, 1721-23), II, 27-124, and Harster, "Walter von Speyer" (1878). An edition of the eleventh century is found in the Acta SS., and another in the "Golden Legend" of Jacob de Voragine. The idea conveyed in the name, at first understood in the spiritual sense of bearing Christ in the heart, was in the twelfth or thirteenth century taken in the realistic meaning and became the characteristic of the saint. The fact that he was frequently called a great martyr may have given rise to the story of his enormous size. The stream and the weight of the child may have been intended to denote the trials and struggles of a soul taking upon itself the yoke of Christ in this world.

The existence of a martyr St. Christopher cannot be denied, as was sufficiently shown by the Jesuit Nicholas Serarius, in his treatise on litanies, "Litaneutici" (Cologne, 1609), and by Molanus in his history of sacred pictures, "De picturis et imaginibus sacris" (Louvain, 1570). In a small church dedicated to the martyr St. Christopher, the body of St. Remigius of Reims was buried, 532 (Acta SS., 1 Oct., 161). St. Gregory the Great (d. 604), speaks of a monastery of St. Christopher (Epp., x, 33). The Mozarabic Breviary and Missal, ascribed to St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636), contains a special office in his honour. In 1386 a brotherhood was founded under the patronage of St. Christopher in Tyrol and Vorarlberg, to guide travellers over the Arlberg. In 1517, a St. Christopher temperance society was established in Krain; a similar society existed in Carinthia, Styria, in Saxony, and at Munich. Great veneration was shown to the saint in Venice, along the shores of the Danube, the Rhine, and other rivers where floods or ice-jams caused frequent damage. The oldest picture of the saint, in the monastery on Mount Sinai dates from the time of Justinian (527-65). Coins with his image were cast at Würzburg, in Würtemberg, and in Bohemia. His statues were placed at the entrances of churches and dwellings, and frequently at bridges; these statues and his pictures often bore the inscription: "Whoever shall behold the image of St. Christopher shall not faint or fall on that day." The saint, who is one of the fourteen Holy Helpers, has been chosen as patron by Baden, by Brunswick, and by Mecklenburg, and several other cities, as well as by bookbinders, gardeners, mariners, etc. He is invoked against lightning, storms, epilepsy, pestilence, etc. His feast is kept on 25 July; among the Greeks, on 9 March; and his emblems are the tree, the Christ-child, and a staff. St. Christopher's Island (commonly called St. Kitts), lies 46 miles west of Antigua in the Lesser Antilles.

ERSKINE, *Symbols and Stories of the Saints* (Boston, 1886); *Analecta Bollandiana*, I, 121; 10, 393; KERLER, *Die Patronate der Heiligen* (Ulm, 1905); GÜNTER, *Legenden Studien* (Cologne, 1906); LINDEMANN, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (Freiburg im Br., 1906).

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Christopher, POPE (903–904). Some hold that Christopher, once Cardinal-Priest of the Title of St. Damasus, a Roman and son of Leo, was an antipope. But though his manner of taking possession of the papacy was wholly uncanonical, he appears to have been subsequently recognized as pope. Hence we find his name included in all the more or less contemporary catalogues of the popes (Liber Pontificalis, II, ed. Duchesne; Watterich, Pontificum Romanorum Vitæ, I; and Origines de l'église romaine, I, par les membres de la communauté de Solesmes, Paris, 1836). His portrait figures among the other likenesses of the popes in the church of St. Paul Outside the Walls, at Rome, and among the frescoes of tenth-century popes painted in the thirteenth century on the walls of the ancient church of San Pier-in-Grado, outside Pisa. He was, moreover, acknowledged as pope by his successors; for, in confirming the privileges of the Abbey of Corbie in France, St. Leo IX mentioned the preceding grants of Benedict and Christopher (Jaffé, Regesta RR. Pont., I, n. 4212). This privilege is the only one of Christopher's acts which is extant (ibid., 3532, 2d ed.). He became pope by forcibly dethroning his predecessor, Leo V, and putting him into prison, seemingly about October, 903. As Leo appears to have soon died in his prison, Christopher may be regarded as pope after his death. One writer, indeed, Eugenius Vulgarius, who was interested in blackening the character of Sergius III, pretends that he murdered both Leo V and Christopher. But his evidence is unsatisfactory in itself, and is opposed to evidence better substantiated. At this period, however, the darkest ever known in papal Rome, when its barons were making and unmaking popes at their pleasure, and when both Italy and Rome were in such a state of turmoil that men could find no leisure to write history, we have to grope about in the dark and when we have grasped some detail we can scarcely tell whether it is fact or fiction. A Greek eleventh-century document (Mon. Græca ad Photium pertinent., p. 160, ed. Hergenröther, Ratisbon, 1869) says that Christopher was the first pope who, in his profession of faith which he sent according to custom to Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, stated that the Holy Ghost proceeded "from the Father and from the Son". The difficulty in the way of accepting this statement is that there was no Patriarch Sergius at this time. Christopher was driven from the Chair of Peter by his successor, Sergius III (Jan., 904), and compelled to end his days as a monk (Chronicle of Hermannus Contractus, ad an. 904), though Vulgarius says he was strangled in prison [Dümmler, Auxilius und Vulgarius (Leipzig, 1866), 160, 135].

JAFFÉ, *Regesta RR. Pont.* (2d ed.), I, 444 sq.; MIGNE, *P. L.*, CXXXI, 45; MANN, *Lives of the Popes*, IV; DUCHESNE, *Liber Pontificalis*, II, 235.

HORACE K. MANN.

Chrodegang, SAINT (called also CHRODEGAND, GODEGRAND, GUNDIGRAN, RATGANG, RODIGANG, and SIRIGANG), Bishop of Metz, b. at the beginning of the eighth century at Hasbania, in what is now Belgian

Limburg, of a noble Frankish family; d. at Metz, 6 March, 766. He was educated at the court of Charles Martel, became his private secretary, then chancellor, and in 737 prime minister. On 1 March, 742, he was appointed Bishop of Metz, retaining his civil office at the request of Pepin. In his influential position St. Chrodegang laboured earnestly for the welfare of Church and State, and was ever solicitous to strengthen the bonds of union between the temporal and spiritual rulers. In his diocese he introduced the Roman Liturgy and chant, community life for the clergy of his cathedral, and wrote a special rule for them. He founded (748) the Abbey of Gorze (near Metz), and remained its friend and protector. He also established St. Peter's Abbey, on the Moselle, and did much for Gengenbach and Lorsch. For the latter he is said to have obtained the relics of St. Nazarius, and for Gorze those of St. Gorgonius. In 753 he was sent by Pepin to Pope Stephen III to assure him of the sympathy of the Frankish rulers against the inroads of Aistulf, King of the Lombards. He accompanied the pope to Ponthieu. After the death of St. Boniface, Pope Stephen conferred the pallium on St. Chrodegang (754–55), thus making him an archbishop, but not elevating the See of Metz. St. Chrodegang was buried in the Abbey of Gorze. He was a man of imposing appearance, of a mild, though firm character, of great liberality to the poor, and of more than ordinary ability, well versed in Latin and German. The rule containing thirty-four chapters which he gave his clergy (c. 755) was modelled according to the rules of St. Benedict and of the Canons of the Lateran (Mansi, XIV, 313; Hardouin, IV, 1181; Migne, P. L., LXXXIX, 1097). Through it he gave a mighty impulse to the spread of community life among the secular clergy. It was later increased to eighty-six chapters (D'Achery, Spicilegium, I, 565). In 762, during a dangerous illness, he introduced among his priests a confraternity of prayer known as the League of Attigny.

Mon. Germ. Hist., II, 276, X, 562; *Acta SS.*, March, I, 453; HEIMBUCHER, *Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1896), I, 389; BUTLER, *Lives of the Saints*, 6 March.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Chromatius, SAINT, Bishop of Aquileia, d. about 406–407. He was probably born at Aquileia, and in any case grew up there. He became a priest of that church and about 387 or 388, after the death of Valerianus, bishop of that important city. He was one of the most celebrated prelates of his time and was in active correspondence with his illustrious contemporaries, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and Rufinus. Himself a scholarly theologian, he urged these three friends to the composition of many learned works. St. Ambrose was encouraged by him to write exegetical works; St. Jerome dedicated to him different translations and commentaries, which he had written at his suggestion (translations of the Books of Paralipomenon, Tobias, the books of Solomon, commentaries on the Prophecy of Habacuc). In the bitter quarrel between St. Jerome and Rufinus concerning Origenism, Chromatius, while rejecting the false doctrines of Origen, attempted to make peace between the disputants. He always maintained ecclesiastical communion with Rufinus and induced him not to answer the last attack of St. Jerome, but to devote himself to new literary works, especially to the translation of the "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius. Chromatius opposed the Arian heresy with much zeal and rooted it out in his diocese. He gave loyal support to St. John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople, when unjustly oppressed, and wrote in his favour to Honorius, the Western emperor, who sent this letter to his brother, Arcadius. This intercession, however, availed nothing. Chromatius was also active as an exegete. There are preserved seventeen treatises by him on the Gospel according to St. Matthew (iii, 15-17; v-vi, 24), besides a fine homily on the Eight Beatitudes (counted as an eighteenth treatise). His feast is celebrated 2 December.

P. L., XX, 236 sqq.; FONTANINI, *Histor. litterar. Aquileien.*, 122–148 in *P. L.*, XX, 375–406; DE RUBEIS, *Monumenta eccles. Aquileien.* (Strasburg, 1740), I, 90–113 in *P. L.*, XX, col. 407–430; TILLEMONT, *Mém. d'hist. ecclés.* (ed. 1706), XI, 534 sqq., 652–653; FESSLER-JUNGMANN, *Institutiones Patrologiæ* (Innsbruck, 1892), II, i, 215–217.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Chronicon Paschale (PASCHAL CHRONICLE), the name ordinarily given to a valuable Byzantine chronicle of the world written in the seventh century, so designated because, like many other chronicles of the Middle Ages, it follows a system of Christian chronology based on the paschal canon, or cycle. It is also indicated at times under other titles, as: *Chronicon Alexandrinum, Antiochenum, Casaubonianum, Constantinopolitanum,* or *Fasti Siculi.* The anonymous author who wrote the chronicle called it, however: *Ἐπιτομὴ Χρόνων τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου ἀνθρώπου ἕως κ' ἔτους τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρακλείου τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ μετὰ ὑπατείαν ἔτους ιθ' καὶ ιη' ἔτους τῆς βασιλείας Ἡρακλείου νέου Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ αὐτοῦ υἱοῦ ἰνδικτιῶνος γ'.* [Summary (or epitome) of the ages from Adam the first man to the 20th year of the reign of the most august Heraclius, and the 19th consulat (18th regnal) year of his son Constantine, the third indiction.] It is, therefore, one of those numerous universal chronicles which imitate the method of Eusebius. Being a Byzantine chronicle, it shows all the peculiarities of this branch of the literature of the Eastern Empire. The Byzantine chroniclers were devoted especially to universal history, began with the Creation, and carried the narrative down to their own epoch. Ordinarily they ended their histories with the beginning of the imperial reign in which they wrote. These histories were intended to be popular narratives; the authors introduce many trifling anecdotes, stop with pleasure to describe the physical and intellectual qualities of the chief personages, and at times execute careful portraits of them, like those miniatures of old manuscripts in which the hero of the story is elaborately depicted. The writers enjoy describing extraordinary events, such as earthquakes and the appearance of comets. They regarded most events from the point of view of church history, with which the chronological plan of the Bible was made to agree. The idiom used was that of common life, little polished, but finically ornate. Thus these productions were intended for the mass of the people, and above all for the countless monks of the Eastern Empire, eager to learn the ordinary and extraordinary occurrences of the world's history. Sempronius Asellius himself points out this difference in the public appealed to and in the style of composition which distinguished the chroniclers (*Annales*) from the historians (*Historia*) of Byzantium.

The "Chronicon Paschale", an example of this type of composition, has for its basis a chronological list of events extending from the creation of Adam to the year A. D. 629. At least this is the ground it covers in the principal manuscript, the Codex Vaticanus græcus 1941 of the tenth century; this codex is damaged at the beginning and end and stops at A. D. 627. The chronicle proper is preceded by an introduction which contains some reflections on Christian chronology and on the calculation of the paschal cycle. The author was a contemporary of the Emperor Heraclius (610–41), and was probably a cleric attached to the suite of the œcumenical Patriarch Sergius. The work was probably written during the last ten years of the reign of Heraclius. It was formerly maintained that it had been originally begun in the time of Constantine the Great, then brought down to 354, and finally revised under Heraclius. This view has been solidly refuted by Gelzer in his work on Sextus Julius Africanus.

The "Chronicon Paschale" is a huge compilation. For the earlier part of his history the author follows the antediluvian chronology of the work of Sextus Julius Africanus. In his genealogies he makes use of the Bible, quoting passages from it, and also employs another, unknown, source. After reaching the history of Abraham he follows the "Chronicle" of Eusebius (always bearing in mind his ecclesiastical purpose) and another authority which probably agreed with the old Byzantine chronicles of Panodorus (395–408) or Annanius (412). He also makes use of the "Chronographia" (Χρονογραφία) of Malalas (537) in its most complete text. When he reaches the history of the Roman Republic he depends for his authorities on the *Fasti consulares* (register of events, the dates being indicated by the respective consuls) and on the so-called *Annales consulares*. Here the author gives in Greek the version of the *Fasti* which the chronicle of Hydatius gives in Latin. But, as Frick has pointed out, the "Chronicon Paschale" combines what it borrows from the *Fasti*, or from their source, with extracts from Eusebius and especially from Malalas. For certain chronological annotations the writer may have made use of the Easter tables of the Dioceses of Alexandria and Antioch. In recounting the events of ecclesiastical history the principal sources used by the writer are the "Chronicle" and the "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius and the "Chronographia" of Malalas. He also employs the Acts of the martyrs and the Περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν (On measures and weights) of Epiphanius of Cyprus (d. 403). From 532 until about the close of the reign of the Emperor Maurice (582–602) the Chronicle gives little information and contains nothing more than the *Fasti consulares*. On the other hand, from 600 to 627, that is, for the last years of the Emperor Maurice, the reign of Phocas, and the first seventeen years of the reign of Heraclius, the author is a contemporary historian, and his narrative is in every way quite interesting.

The chronology of the writer is based on the figures of the Bible and begins with 21 March, 5507. It is the first attempt at chronology of the so-called Byzantine, or Roman, Era followed by the Greek Church until modern times. For its influence on Greek Christian chronology, also, and because of its wide scope, the "Chronicon Paschale" takes its place beside Eusebius, and the chronicle of the monk Georgius Syncellus which was so important in the Middle Ages; but in respect of form it is far inferior to these works.

Where the chronicle treats of Julius Cæsar a later hand has inserted a list of the Roman and Byzantine Emperors, the latter ending with Constantine Monomachus (1042). In the Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians (Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantiæ, Bonn, 1828–78, II, 90) this addition is rightly rejected and put in an appendix.

The best edition is that of DINDORF, taken from the Vatican codex, in the second volume of the *Corpus Script. Historiæ Byzantiæ* (2 vols., Berlin, 1832), and reproduced in *P. G.*, XCII, 1–1158. The most important work on the subject is GELZER, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* (Leipzig, 1885), II, 138–176. Cf. IDELER, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* (Berlin, 1826), II, 350, 459–465; VON GUTSCHMID, *Zur Kritik des Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς* in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* (1858), new series, XIII, 377–408; DULAURIER, *Recherches sur la chronologie arménienne* (Paris, 1859), p. vii, and 167 sqq.; MOMMSEN, *Römische Chronologie* (2d ed., Berlin, 1859), 113; HOLDER-EGGER, *Untersuchungen über einige annalistischen Quellen des V. und VI. Jahrhunderts*, in *Neues Archiv* (1877), II, 59–86; MOMMSEN, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Auc. Antiq.* (1891–92), IX, pt. I, 119–247, 272–301; FRICK, *Die Fasti Idatiani und das Chronicon paschale*, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1892), I, 283–292; IDEM, *Chronica minora* (Leipzig, 1893), I, p. XC sqq.; WACHSMUTH, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1895), 195 sqq.; KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches, 527-1453* (2d ed., Munich, 1897), 337–39. For the editions and the manuscripts cf. KRUMBACHER, op. cit., 339; POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi* (2d ed., Berlin, 1896), 282; BARRY, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London, 1900).

L. VAN DER ESSEN.

Chronology, BIBLICAL, deals with the dates of the various events recorded in the Bible. It has to consider how far the Bible contains a chronology at all; to what extent the Sacred Writers aimed at exactness, or were satisfied with round numbers; whether, and to what extent, textual errors and other sources of corruption have crept into the numbers of the Bible; and finally, what relation exists between the chronologies that have been handed down by neighbouring nations and that which exists in the Bible. "There is no Chronology of the Bible", wrote Silvester de Sacy; and, though this saying is too sweeping, it may be said with truth that for large parts of the Bible there is little to guide us to an exact determination as to when the events related happened. It is not merely that in the matter of numbers the Hebrew text has not always reached us incorrupt (cf. the differences between the Hebrew, Septuagint, and Samaritan Pentateuchs), but the Books of Scripture, moreover, are not a mere history. Some of them, as the Psalms, are in no sense such. And even those that are so, are not written primarily from the point of view of history. Else, e. g., why two parallel histories of the kingdom—Kings and Chronicles? It is because, as Father Cornely says of the Book of Kings ("Introductio", Vol. II, i, p. 284), it had a higher end than the historical, viz., to show the peoples of Israel and of Juda that it was their wickedness that brought destruction on them, and, by setting before them the proofs of God's mercy, to lead them back to the observance of the Law. On the other hand, the Book of Chronicles (D.V. Paralipomenon) written after the Exile, by setting forth the splendours of ancient ritual, sought to move them to the worthy celebration of Divine worship (op. cit., p. 324). What complicates the earlier periods of Bible history is the fact that there was no recognized era (such as the Dionysian Era of our own times) to reckon events from, though for the Roman world the founding of Rome in the eighth century B. C. gradually began to be recognized as such, and, in later times, among the Jews, the date of the defeat of Nicanor by Seleucus Nicator, and the establishment of the Seleucid domination in Syria (312 B. C.) came to be looked upon as a fixed era.

In this article the data that exist for the formation of a chronology of the Bible will be briefly discussed under the following heads: (1) Creation of the World; (2) Creation of Man; (3) Creation of Man to the Flood; (4) Flood to the Birth of Abraham; (5) Birth of Abraham to the Exodus; (6) Exodus to the building of Solomon's Temple; (7) Building of the Temple to Fall of Jerusalem; (8) Destruction of Jerusalem to Jesus Christ; (9) Date of the Nativity; (10) Beginning of the Ministry; (11) Duration of the Ministry; (12) Date of the Crucifixion; (13) The Acts of the Apostles.

(1) *Creation of the World.*—In an article on Biblical chronology it is hardly necessary in these days to discuss the date of the Creation. At least 200 dates have been suggested, varying from 3483 to 6934 years B. C., all based on the supposition that the Bible enables us to settle the point. But it does nothing of the sort. It was natural that in the early days of the Church, the Fathers, writing with little scientific knowledge, should have had a tendency to explain the days of Genesis, i, as natural days of twenty-four hours. Still, they by no means all did so. Thus the Alexandrian Fathers (St. Clement, Origen, St. Athanasius, and St. Cyril) interpreted the days of Creation ideally, and held that God created all things simultaneously. So did St. Augustine; and St. Thomas Aquinas hesitated between idealism and literalism. The literal interpretation has now been entirely abandoned; and the world is admitted to be of im-

mense antiquity. Professor Dana declares its age to be fifty millions of years; others suggest figures still more startling (cf. Guibert, "In the Beginning"; Molloy, "Geology and Revelation"; Hummelauer, "Genesis"; Hastings, "Dictionary of the Bible"; Mangenot in Vig., "Dict. de la Bible"; Driver, "Genesis". Perhaps the words of Genesis (i, 2): "The earth was void and empty, and darkness was on the face of the deep", refer to the first phase of the Creation, the astronomical, before the geological period began. On such questions we have no Biblical evidence, and the Catholic is quite free to follow the teaching of science.

(2) *Creation of Man.*—The question which this subject suggests is: Can we confine the time that man has existed on earth within the limits usually assigned, i. e. within about 4000 years of the birth of Christ?—The Church does not interfere with the freedom of scientists to examine into this subject and form the best judgment they can with the aid of science. She evidently does not attach decisive influence to the chronology of the Vulgate, the official version of the Western Church, since in the Martyrology for Christmas Day, the creation of Adam is put down in the year 5199 B. C., which is the reading of the Septuagint. It is, however, certain that we cannot confine the years of man's sojourn on earth to that usually set down. But, on the other hand, we are by no means driven to accept the extravagant conclusions of some scientists. As Mangenot says (Vig., Dict. de la Bible, II, 720 sq.), speaking of the right of Catholics to follow the teaching of science:—"certains tenants de l'archéologie préhistorique ont abusé de cette liberté et assigné une antiquité très reculée à l'humanité" (certain champions of prehistoric archæology have abused this liberty and assigned to the human race an extremely remote antiquity). Thus Guibert writes (op. cit., p. 28): "Haeckel names more than 100,000 years; Burmeister supposed Egypt was peopled more than 72,000 years ago; Draper attributes to European man more than 250,000 years; according to M. Joly, certain geologists accord to the human race 100,000 centuries; and G. de Mortillet shows that man's existence reaches to about 240,000 years." He adds, however: "These numbers have been built up on such arbitrary and fragile bases, that true science could not tolerate them long." In fact, M. Guibert is of opinion that with our present knowledge there is nothing compelling us to extend the existence of man beyond 10,000 years. Such questions as the antiquity of civilization, which had reached a high pitch in Babylonia and Egypt 4000 years B. C., the radical differences of language at the same early period, differences of race (cf. the white, black, and yellow races), which do not seem to have been modified within the historic period, and the remains of human workmanship going back to a very remote antiquity—all these things seem to lead to the conclusion that the existence of man on earth goes back far beyond the traditional 4,000 years. Professor Driver says ("Genesis", p. xxxvi): "Upon the most moderate estimate it cannot be less than 20,000 years."

(3) *Creation to the Flood.*—The period from the Creation to the Flood is measured by the genealogical table of the ten patriarchs in Genesis, v, and Genesis, vii, 6. But the exact meaning of chapter v has not been clearly defined. Critical writers point out that the number *ten* is a common one amongst ancient peoples in the list of their prehistoric heroes, and that they attribute fabulous lengths to the lives of these men; thus, the Chaldeans reckon for their first ten heroes, who lived in the period from the Creation to the Flood, a space of 432,000 years. This seems to point to some common nucleus of truth or primitive tradition which became distorted and exaggerated in the course of ages. Various explanations have been given of chapter v to explain the short time it seems to allow between the Creation and the Flood. One is that there are lacunæ in it, and, though it is not easy to see how that can be, still it has to be remembered that they exist in St. Matthew (i, 8) in precisely similar circumstances. That there are difficulties about the genealogical table in chapter v, we know; for, as may be seen from the accompanying table, the total number of years in the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint differs, in the Hebrew, it being 1656, in the Samaritan, 1307, and in the Septuagint, 2242.

Names of the Patriarchs	Age at birth of son:—		
	Hebrew	Samaritan	Sept.
Adam	130	130	230
Seth	105	105	205
Enos	90	90	190
Cainan	70	70	170
Malaleil	65	65	165
Jared	162	62	162
Enoch	65	65	165
Mathusalem	187	67	167
Lamech	182	53	188
Noe	500	500	500
From Noe to Flood	100	100	100
Creation to Flood	1656	1307	2242

From an inspection of the above table it is obvious that the diversity is due to systematic change—whether to increase the total length of the period or to reduce the age at which the patriarchs had children or for some other reason, we know not. One thing can be confidently asserted, that the length of time between the creation of Adam and the Flood cannot be restricted within the period traditionally set down. It may also be said that "for this period the chronology of the Bible is quite uncertain" (Vigouroux, Dict., 273), and that the freedom of the Catholic in investigating the chronology of this period is quite unrestricted.

(4) *The Flood to the Birth of Abraham.*—The years between the Flood and Abraham are computed in the Book of Genesis by the genealogy of chapter xi (10–26).

Names of the Patriarchs	Age at birth of son:—		
	Hebrew	Samaritan	Sept.
Sem (father of Arphaxad)	102	102	102
Arphaxad (father of Cainan)	35	135	135
Cainan (father of Sale)			130
Sale (father of Heber)	30	130	130
Heber (father of Phaleg)	34	134	134
Phaleg (father of Reu)	30	130	130
Reu (father of Sarug)	32	132	132
Sarug (father of Nachor)	30	130	130
Nachor (father of Thare)	29	79	79
Thare (father of Abraham	70	70	70
Years from birth of Sem to birth of Abraham	392	1042	1172
Deduct years of Sem's age at time of flood	100	100	100
	292	942	1072
Add for age of Abraham at time of his call	75	75	75
Hence, number of years from Flood to Call of Abraham	367	1017	1147

Again, however, the numbers in the table above differ in the Hebrew, Samaritan, and Septuagint, being respectively 367, 1017, and 1147; and it will be observed

that, as a rule, the Greek and Samaritan agree against the Hebrew. Indeed they are identical, except that the name of Cainan, whose age at the birth of Sale is given as 130 years, is to be found in the Greek only. Whether or not the original table contained the name Cainan, we cannot tell. Some hold that it was introduced into the Septuagint to increase the length of time between the Flood and Abraham, or again to make the number of the patriarchs between the Flood and Abraham equal to that of those between Adam and the Flood. At any rate this genealogy gives rise to many questions, thus: Is the name Cainan a later insertion, or has it dropped out from the Hebrew? It is given by St. Luke (iii, 36). Again, are there any lacunæ? For, according to science, the length of this period was much greater than appears from the genealogical table. There is no difficulty in admitting such lacunæ, for we know that St. Matthew (i, 8) says:—"Joram begot Ozias", though between the two intervened Ochozias, Joab, and Amasias. For, as Professor Sayce says (Early History of the Hebrews, 144), "son in Semitic idiom was frequently equivalent to descendant". We have also instances of similar omissions in I Chron., vi, 1, and in I Esdr., vii, 1–5. With critical scholars the Flood was a very partial affair. It is not, however, the business of the chronologist to enter into a discussion of that matter. In any case, whether we follow the traditional or critical view, the numbers obtained from the genealogy of the Patriarchs in chapter xi must be greatly augmented, in order to allow time for such a development of civilization, language, and race type as had been reached by the time of Abraham.

(5) *Birth of Abraham to the Exodus.*—At the birth of Isaac, Abraham is said to have been 100 years old (Gen., xxi, 5); Isaac was sixty at the birth of Jacob (Gen., xxv, 26); Jacob arrived in Egypt, at the age of 130 (xlvii, 9). These figures, added, give 290; add to this 430 (the number of years spent by Israel in Egypt) and we get 720 years, which would be the length of time between the birth of Abraham and the Exodus. A difficulty arises, since the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint read in Exodus, xii, 40: "The abode of the Children of Israel that they made in Egypt and the land of Canaan was 430 years." If this be correct, then only 215 years are left for the sojourn in Egypt, 215 years being required for the sojourn in Canaan, as we have to subtract 75, the age of Abraham when he came to Canaan, from 290 (see above). Still, not all the MSS. of the Septuagint adopt this reading; and, in any case, we are only face to face with another such diversity between the Greek and Hebrew as is to be found in the genealogies of the Patriarchs.

Let us now bring these facts into relation with the Christian Era. For (III Kings, vi, 1) the fourth year of King Solomon is said to have fallen in the 480th year after the Exodus; and Ussher dates the reign of King Solomon from 1014-975 B. C. But as the Temple was begun in the fourth year of that king, or in 1010, the Exodus took place in the year 1490 B. C. How do these results square with the teaching of science? Professor Sayce, from the connexion of Abraham with Amraphel in the episode related in Genesis, xiv, says that "we can approximately fix the period when the family of Terah migrated from Ur of the Chaldees. It was about 2300 B. C., if the chronology of the native Babylonian historians is correct" (Early History of the Hebrews, 12). Then again he tells us that "Chanaan could not have been invaded by the Israelites until after the fall of the eighteenth dynasty. When Khu-n-aten died it was still an Egyptian province, garrisoned by Egyptian troops" (Higher Criticism and the Monuments, 241). This we learn from the Tel-el-amarna tablets. So we are taken to a period after the death of Ramses II in 1281 B. C. for the date of the Exodus, which most likely took place in the reign of Meneptah, son and successor of Ramses, earlier than the year 1200 B. C. This is not the traditional date of the Exodus, but as Father Hummelauer (Genesis, p. 29) says, it is the conclusion of most men in these days. Nor is there anything to prevent the student of the Old Testament from endeavouring to throw all the light he can upon the vexed question of Biblical chronology, considering how involved it often is in obscurity.

(6) *The Exodus to the Building of Solomon's Temple.*—The Third Book of Kings (vi, 1) states that Solomon began to build the Temple in the 480th year (the Septuagint gives 440 years) after the Exodus. For the Catholic, that passage seems to settle the question. But a difficulty arises from the fact that there is almost a consensus of scientific opinion that the Exodus from Egypt took place in the reign of Meneptah, or, possibly, that of his successor, Seti II. Moreover we are driven to a date later than the year 1400 for the Exodus, since up to that date, Assyriologists and Egyptologists agree, Palestine was an Egyptian province, with an Egyptian governor (Driver, "Genesis", p. xxix). Ramses II, the builder of Pithom and Raamses, was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and as he reigned from 1348-1281 (Sayce) we have to descend to one of his successors to find the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Hence we are driven to his immediate successor, Meneptah, at earliest, and to about the year 1277 (Early History of the Hebrews, 150) for the date of the Exodus. On the other hand, the date of the building of the Temple cannot be put later than the middle of the tenth century B. C. But if we take the time between these two dates, we are left with only about 327 years, as against 480 required by III Kings, vi, 1. Wellhausen does not treat the chronology seriously (Prolegomena, 229), but, in company with many other critics, pronounces it to be merely artificial. They say that the number 480 is made up of twelve times 40; forty being taken as a generation; and so the number 40 predominates amongst chronological numbers in this part of Scripture. Thus the time in the desert was 40 years; Othoniel, Debora, Gedeon, each ruled for 40 years. Aod ruled for twice 40, or 80 years; the land was under the Philistines 40 years, and David reigned for the same period. But the following facts must be taken into consideration. Professor Sayce points out that "40 years in Hebrew idiom merely signified an indeterminate and unknown period of time, and the Moabite Stone shows that the same idiom existed also in the Moabite language" (Early History of the Hebrews, 146). Chronology in those days was in its infancy; and that the dates were only roughly given is obvious from the recurrence of round numbers. If we were to write down all the numbers that occur during this period, as Father Hummelauer does in his commentary on Judges (p. 12), we should find that the number 40 recurs by no means as often as we are led to suppose. The difficulty remains that III Kings, vi, 1, gives for the length of this period 480 years; science seems to say "not more than 327". But we have to notice the uncertainties that surround the chronology of this period. We have also to point out that Wellhausen and Stade regard chapter vi, 1, as a late insertion (Burney, "Hebrew Text of Kings", 58). If this were the case it would meet the difficulty; and perhaps it is rendered more likely by the fact that in the Greek this verse is inserted before 31 and 32 of chapter v, and also that it reads 440 instead of 480. We conclude, therefore, that the date of the Exodus was about 1277, the monarchy was founded by Saul, 1020; David mounted the throne, 1002; Solomon in 962, and the Temple was begun, 958 B. C.

(7) *Building of the Temple to its Destruction.*—"On le voit", says Mangenot (in Vig., Dict. de la Bible, s. v. "Chronologie", 732), "la chronologie de l'époque des rois d'Israël et de Juda n'est pas aussi ferme et aussi

assurée qu'on le croit communément. Elle aurait besoin d'être raccordée avec la chronologie assyrienne" (It is plain that the chronology of the period of the kings of Israel and Juda is not so settled and ascertained as is commonly supposed. It must be made to accord with the Assyrian chronology). There are certainly textual errors among the numbers. Comparing IV Kings, viii, 26, with II Chron. (D. V. Paral.), xxii, 2, we find that in the former, Ochozias is said to have been twenty-two years old when he began to reign, in the latter, forty-two. Nor can a critical writer say that the chronicler was ill-informed; one of the principles of Wellhausen and all his school is that Kings was the principal source of Chronicles. Is not this an obvious case of text-corruption? How else, too, can we account for the fact that the Book of Kings gives the sum of the reigns of the kings who reigned from Roboam to the death of Ochozias as 95, whereas it gives the sum of the years from Jeroboam to the death of Joram as ninety-eight, though Jeroboam came to the throne the same year as Roboam, and Ochozias died the same day as Joram? For if the writer of Kings made use of all the clever artificial devices, with which he is credited by critical writers, it is quite incredible that such an obvious error should have been committed by him. And so it may be said of his giving as the sum of the years from the accession of Jehu of Israel to the fall of Samaria as 143 years, whilst he gives the interval between the accession of Athalia of Juda (who began her reign in the same year as Jehu) and the same event as 165 years.

A development in the method of recording dates seems to have taken place among the Jews during this period. Events were dated in Babylonia by the reign of the kings; in Assyria, regular officials were appointed every year, called *limmi*, by whose name the year was known, just as the consuls in Rome and the eponymous archons in Athens. Lists of the *limmi* for the years 909–666 B. C. have been discovered (Sayce, "Early History of the Hebrews", 147). This chronological system affected the Jews; records or chronicles were thus kept among them, and are frequently referred to in the Book of Kings. So, too, we read, among the lists of royal officials, of a recorder or chronicler. It is true an objection is sometimes raised (cf. Hastings, Dict., I, 400), that the references are not to the Chronicles themselves, but to works based in some way upon them. This, however, seems a purely gratuitous assertion. That the references are to the Book of Chronicles, and not simply to the chronicles, would seem to imply no more than that the chronicles of the different kings were in some way united so as to form a single volume, of which it is quite possible that copies were made. Nor is it extravagant to suppose that great efforts would have been made to save the royal records at the destruction of Samaria, especially as there was a royal official, called the chronicler, who would have had care of them.

If we come now to the actual figures themselves, there is not a serious divergency between them and the results of profane history, whilst in many cases they correspond exactly. What we should naturally expect is, that the farther back we go, the more general would be the knowledge of chronology shown, and so we find it is in regard to the history of the kings. That for the most part fractions of a year are neglected, makes it clear that the writer dealt in round numbers. And yet we find that from the death of Solomon to the accession of Athalia and Jehu, who began to reign in the same year, there is only a divergency of three years in 90 between the Kingdoms of Juda and Israel; whilst from that date to the destruction of Samaria the difference is only 21 years on the other side. So that the total difference, in a period of about 255 years, is one of only 19 years. But then it cannot be admitted that this is a pure error. Many writers say that the deficiency in the length of the years of the kings of Israel is to be supplied by the introduction of two interregnums in the list of the kings of Israel, perhaps one after Jeroboam II, the other after Phacee; or again, that two of the kings of Juda reigned contemporaneously with their fathers. It cannot be pretended that the true explanation has been found. The practical point is that the student is at liberty to throw what light he can on the problem from external sources; and that the chronology of the Book of Kings, as it now stands, is quite adequate for the purposes for which it was supplied. One thing is certain, that the equation of Cheyne's "Encyclopædia Biblica" (I, 779) is a mere caricature: "This table shows that at the end of the 258th year after the division of the kingdom, there had elapsed 258 synchronistic years, $241\frac{1}{2}$ years of reign in Israel, and 260 such years in Juda; and we have thus the singular equation $258 = 241\frac{1}{2} = 260$." No doubt this is very clever; whether it is equally instructive, from the point of view of serious history, is another matter. Let one illustration show: in III Kings, xv, 1, we are told that Abiam reigned over Juda in the eighteenth year of Jeroboam, King of Israel. In verse 9 we are told that, after his death, recorded in verse 8, Asa his son became king, in the twentieth year of Jeroboam. In the second verse we read of Abiam that "he reigned three years in Jerusalem". Now what does Cheyne's "Encyclopædia" do in the "singular equation"? Computing the years from the eighteenth to the twentieth year of Jeroboam, according to the modern fashion, it puts them down under one heading of the equation as two years, then under another heading it gives the same period, computed, as is known perfectly well, according to the old Jewish fashion, as three years; and, having finally drawn up in this way three different lists of figures, it works out "a singular equation".—No wonder; yet the writer, apart from the passage in question, must have known that from the fourth to the sixth year of Ezechias was counted as three years by the Jews (IV Kings, xviii, 9, 10), and that from Friday to Sunday was likewise reckoned as three days (Luke, xxiv, 7).

In places the chronology of the kings is far from clear. What light is thrown upon it by the chronology of the surrounding nations? Egypt may be left out, because little help can be got from it. Sayce says of its chronology that "it is more disputable even than that of Israel." ("Hebrews", 453.) But bringing to our help the fragment of the Tyrian annals quoted by Josephus, the foundation of the Temple may be fixed, according to Sayce, for about the year 969, which would be very near the date given above. Having fixed the year when the Temple was begun, we know that Solomon reigned from 973 to 936, and David from 1013 to 973. So, to speak roughly, the revolt of the Ten Tribes must have taken place somewhere about the year 936.

Although St. Jerome says, in writing to the priest Vitalis, that to dwell on such matters is rather for a man of leisure than for a studious person, still we must confess it would be satisfactory to know how the general discrepancy arose between the Biblical dates and the corresponding Assyrian dates—from the accession of Roboam to the taking of Samaria. We have fixed roughly the date of the revolt of the Ten Tribes for the year 936 B. C. But the traditional date is 975, and if we follow the dates for the kings down to the taking of Samaria, it will be found that the usual interpretation of the Biblical chronology makes those dates about 40 years earlier than is possible according to the Assyrian chronological canon. Thus King Achab of Israel reigned from 918 to 896; but in the Assyrian inscriptions he is said to have been present at the Battle of Karkar in 854. Ozias

was King of Juda from 810 to 758, but, according to the inscriptions, he was at war with Tiglath-pileser about the year 741. Again, Manahen's reign over Israel extended from 770 to 759, but on the monuments he is inscribed as a tributary of Tiglath-pileser in 738. These examples seem to show that, according to the traditional interpretation, the dates of the kings are about 40 years too high.

On the other hand, it has to be remembered that there is no fixed Bible chronology, though there are synchronisms and lengths of reigns given in the Books of Kings. There are, moreover, textual errors, uncertainty in regard to pre-dating and post-dating, unreliability as to the accuracy and interpretation of names on the Assyrian tablets. So that, as we should expect, "few tables of dates furnished by Old Testament chronologists exactly agree" (Hastings, "Bible Dict.", I, 403). Another point has to be remembered. Elaborate artificial explanations of the chronology of the Bible from the building of the Temple to the fall of Jerusalem are given. These explanations embrace not only the period from Solomon to Achaz (741 B. C.), but down from that time to the fall of Jerusalem (586 B. C.). But it is certain that the chronology of the Books of Kings from Achaz to the destruction of Jerusalem, a period of 155 years, is not artificial (cf. Hastings, 401); it is in agreement with the Assyrian chronology. And does not this fact throw considerable doubt upon the whole theory of artificiality?

Finally, the Moabite Stone, referred to above, states that Israel dwelt in Medeba during the days of Omri and half the days of his son—altogether 40 years. Of this Professor Sayce says: "The real length of time was not more than 15 years" (Early History of the Hebrews, 146). Now, if this be so, may we not at least argue that either the Moabite Stone is accurate or not? If it is accurate, then the number 40 was used in a most loose fashion as a round number in those days; if inaccurate, then it is clear that even the contemporary stone records of the age of the kings cannot be always trusted. How does this affect the Babylonian tablets and their evidence?

We conclude then that the Temple was built about 969. The secession of the Ten Tribes took place about 937. The fall of Samaria in 722 or 721, and the destruction of Jerusalem 536 B. C.

(8) *From the Destruction of Jerusalem to the Birth of Jesus Christ.*—The two great authorities for Jewish chronology after the destruction of Jerusalem are the Books of Esdras and the First Book of Machabees. There are other books too, but their evidence is so uncertain, and in certain cases so much disputed, that we do not propose to make use of them. Such are, for instance, the prophecy of Daniel and the prophecies of Aggeus and Zacharias. In the First Book of Machabees and the Books of Esdras we have generally admitted first-rate authorities. Thus Cheyne's "Encyclopædia" (III, 2865) writes of Machabees I, "The book has proved itself worthy to hold the highest rank as trustworthy chronology", and again, "The accuracy of the dates given being in the main beyond all question". The book embraces the years 175–135 B. C., and the chief events are dated according to the Seleucid Era, 312 B. C. Of the Books of Esdras, Batten says, in Hastings, "The historical value of these books is very great". Difficulties exist in regard to the names of Darius and Artaxerxes. Is the Darius referred to Darius I or Darius II?—Without much doubt, Darius I.—Van Hoonacker is inclined to identify the Artaxerxes of chapter vii with the second of that name, and so would place the return of Esdras to Jerusalem under Artaxerxes II, in 404, contrary to the view of most commentators. Nehemias, he says, returned under Artaxerxes I in 444. But it is commonly held that Esdras returned in 457 and Nehemias in 444 B. C. The first band of captives returned to Jerusalem under Zorobabel in the first year of Cyrus, i. e. 536 B. C. They laid the foundation of the Temple, which was finished in 516.

We know nothing of the chronology of the Jews after this till the time of the Machabees. But the First Book of Machabees gives information about the period 174–135; it opens with a description of the position of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes. Then comes an account of the rising under Mathathias, in 167, and his death. Next followed his son Judas who continued the struggle till he died in 161. Jonathan, Judas's brother, was the next leader till 143. In the following year the Jews recovered their independence under Simon. Simon was made ruler in 141, was murdered in 135, and was succeeded by his son John Hyrcanus in the same year.

(9) *Date of the Nativity of Jesus Christ.*—At first sight it seems a simple thing to fix the date of the birth of Jesus Christ. Was it not in the beginning of the first year of the Christian Era? It was a monk of the sixth century, named Dionysius Exiguus (the Little) who fixed our present Christian Era, laying down that Jesus Christ was born on the 25th of December, A. U. C. 753, and commencing the new era from the following year, 754. That date, as we shall see, cannot be correct and, instead of being an improvement on, is farther from the truth than the dates assigned by the early Fathers, St. Irenæus and Tertullian, who fixed the date of the Nativity in the 41st year of Augustus, that is to say, 3 years B. C., or A. U. C. 751. We must note first that St. Matthew says (ii, 1) that Our Saviour was born "in the days of King Herod". Josephus tells us (Antiquities, XVII, viii, 1), that Herod died "having reigned 34 years *de facto* since the death of Antigonus, and 37 years *de jure* since the Roman decree declaring him king". We know also that he began to reign in the consulship of Domitius Calvinus and Asinius Pollio, 40 B. C., in the 184th Olympiad (Ant., xiv, 5); and that he became king *de facto* in the consulship of Marcus Agrippa and Canidius Gallus, in the 185th Olympiad (Ant., XIV, xvi, 4). These calculations do not make it sure whether Herod died in the year 3, 4, or 5 B. C., but it is most probable that it was in the year 4 B. C. That date is corroborated by an eclipse of the moon which occurred (Ant., XVII, vi, 4) on the very night that Herod burnt Matthias alive, a few days before his own death; for there was an eclipse of the moon from 12 March to 13 March, 4 B. C. All this points to the fact that Herod died in the year 4 B. C., and that so Our Saviour must have been born before that date. In May, October, and December of the year 7 B. C., a conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn took place. Kepler, the astronomer, suggested that perhaps this phenomenon was connected with the star seen by the Magi (Matt., ii, 2). But this idea is altogether too uncertain to be entertained seriously, or to form a basis for any reliable chronology. Nor can we come to any more definite conclusion from what St. Matthew says of the sojourn of the child Jesus in Egypt (ii, 14, 19, 22), where he remained till the death of Herod. Herod ordered a massacre of the children up to two years old according to the information about the date of the Nativity which he had received from the Magi. In itself there is nothing unlikely in that, for we know that Herod was a most cruel and whimsical man, having, for instance, summoned to his bedside all the principal men of the Jewish nation with a view to having them shot with darts at the moment of his death, so that there might be universal lamentation when he left this life. We do not, however, know what information Herod possessed as to the date of the Nativity, whether the Magi gave him accurate information, or whether they possessed it themselves; what the incident would seem to show was, that Our Saviour was born some time before Herod's death, probably two years or more. So that,

if Herod died in the year 4 B. C., we should be taken to 6 or 7 B. C. as the year of the Nativity.

But a difficulty is raised as to the date of the Nativity in connexion with the Roman census mentioned in the second chapter of St. Luke. The Nativity took place after a decree had gone forth from Cæsar Augustus that the whole Roman Empire should be enrolled. The words, "This enrolling was first made by Cyrinus, the governor of Syria" (verse 2), or, more correctly, "This first census was taken whilst Quirinius was governor of Syria", are the source of the difficulty. For we know that Publius Sulpicius Quirinius was governor of Syria, and that a census was made in A. D. 7, about eleven years after Herod's death, and it is not denied that Cyrinus was Quirinius. Schürer, in "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ" (Div. I, Vol. II, 105-143), endeavours to prove that the statement is an inaccuracy on the part of St. Luke, and, with more or less emphasis, practically all the critical school takes up the same attitude. But prima facie we are not disposed to accept the contention that St. Luke was in ignorance on such a very elementary subject. C. H. Turner, in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible", thinks he may have been misinformed, since "his acquaintance with Palestine was perhaps limited to the two years' imprisonment of St. Paul in Cæsarea". Such an idea seems most unlikely. St. Luke had made careful inquiry about the facts he relates in his Gospel; he had "diligently attained to all things from the beginning", and that too from those who "were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (i, 2, 3). For such a man it seems incredible that he should not have taken the trouble to inquire, not as to some petty Jewish custom, but as to such a public and important event as a Roman census, and to have made himself acquainted with the name of the Roman governor at the time.

At the same time it is not clear what the explanation of the note about Quirinius is. Some suggest that πρώτη has, as it undoubtedly has sometimes in classical Greek, the force of πρότερα, so that the sense of the passage would be: "This census was held before that which took place when Quirinius was governor of Syria". But there is another explanation. It is true the writer of the article on Chronology in Cheyne's "Encyclopædia" says, with characteristic positiveness, that "any census in Judea before the well-known one in the year A. D. 7, is impossible". But on the other hand, Turner, in Hastings' "Dictionary", thinks that there is no inherent improbability in the hypothesis of a census in Judea somewhere within the years 8-5 B. C. There is very little doubt, from an inscription found at Tivoli in 1764, that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria; once, as is well known, from A. D. 6-11, but also once at an earlier period. Not at the time of Herod's death, for Quinctilius Varus was then governor; and before him came Sentius Saturninus from 9-6 B. C., before him Titius. But there is no reason why Quirinius should not be placed after Varus. In that case Saturninus would have been the one to begin the census; it would have been suspended for a time, on account of the death of Herod, and then continued and completed under Quirinius, so that his name would have been associated with it. Perhaps this may explain why Tertullian speaks of a census made by Sentius Saturninus under Augustus (Adv. Marcionem, iv, 19); but it is hardly likely, if he had found another and, apparently, a wrong name in St. Luke, that he would not have taken any notice, or given any explanation of it.

From the evidence it seems that the date of the Nativity given by Dionysius Exiguus is not the right one, for it is after Herod's death. Tertullian and Irenæus are nearer to the truth with the years 2 or 3 B. C.; but it must be placed still further back, and probably the year 7 B. C. will not be found to be much astray.

(10) *Date of the Beginning of the Ministry.*—There is reason to suppose that the early Fathers (such as St. Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian) and later writers (as Dionysius Exiguus), in trying to fix a date for the Nativity, argued back from the synchronisms connected with the beginning of Our Saviour's public life, joined with St. Luke's statement, "And Jesus himself was beginning about the age of thirty years" (iii, 23;—αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα); for they took that passage to mean that Jesus Christ had not completed thirty years, but was in the beginning of his thirtieth year (cf. Epiphanius, "Hær.", li, 16). But ἀρχόμενος does not bear such a meaning here; it is not immediately connected with the phrase ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, which means "about thirty years", and might without any straining of its sense be used for a year or two more or less than thirty. So that, to determine the date of Our Lord's baptism from this passage, we should have to add on about thirty years to the date of the Nativity (about 7 years B. C.), which would leave us with the indefinite result that it might have taken place anywhere between A. D. 23 and 27. But in the Gospel of St. John (ii, 20), shortly before the Pasch, and after the miracle of Cana, Jesus cast the buyers and sellers out of the Temple; and the Jews in upbraiding Him used the words, τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος (Six and forty years has this temple been a-building), meaning, that at that time the Jews had been forty-six years at work building the Temple. In that passage is contained a clear mark of time. For though Josephus tells us in one place (Bell. Jud., I, xxi, 1), that the Temple was begun in the fifteenth year of Herod, and in another (Ant., XV, ii, 1) in the eighteenth, still in all probability, as Turner says in Hastings (p. 405), the former is a correction of the latter date, and the fact is that the Temple was begun in the eighteenth year of Herod's *de facto* reign (which began in 37 B. C.), or in other words, that it was begun in 19 B. C. We should thus arrive at the year A. D. 27, for the date of the Pasch following Our Saviour's baptism. Again, St. Luke (iii, 1), assigning a date to the beginning of St. John the Baptist's mission, says it was "in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar". The fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar would be A. D. 28, and would make it necessary for us, if correct, to alter the date fixed for Our Saviour's baptism. But Professor Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveller, p. 387) thinks the fifteenth year of Tiberius is reckoned from A. D. 12, when he was associated with Augustus in the government of the empire. That would take us to A. D. 6 for the beginning of St. John's ministry, and would allow enough time for the baptism of Our Lord in A. D. 27.

(11) *Duration of the Ministry.*—Various periods have been defended for the length of Christ's ministry. St. Irenæus (Hær., II, xxii, 3–6) goes so far as to suggest a period of fifteen years. On the other hand, many of the early Fathers, as well as many writers of our own time, confine the public life of Jesus to one year. Thus von Soden, in Cheyne's "Encyclopædia", says, "The evidence here points on the whole to one year". The difference of opinion is based, for the most part, upon the different accounts given by St. John and the Synoptists of Christ's public life. Whilst the Fourth Gospel indicates three or even more paschs, it is not so easy to deduce even two from the Synoptist narrative. It would be possible to interpret St. John's Gospel so as to fit in with the theory of there being only one year's ministry, provided we could omit, with Westcott and Hort, the words τὸ πάσχα from the passage (vi, 4), ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Now the pasch, the festival day of the Jews, was near at hand). But even the great names of these two textual critics cannot outweigh the fact that all the MSS. and versions, and nearly all the Fathers, contain τὸ πάσχα.

Accordingly, St. John mentions at least three paschs in the course of the ministry. One (ii, 13) shortly after the baptism, another of which we have just been speaking (vi, 4), and the third, at the time of the Passion (xi, 55). So that the simplest explanation of the length of the ministry would be to say it extended over two years. But how does that conclusion fit in with the narrative of the Synoptists? The difficulty is that St. Mark, the most complete witness of what is called the "synoptic tradition", does not take much account of time. As Papias said, "he wrote accurately, if not orderly" (*ἀκριβῶς ἔγραφεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει.*—Eus., III, xl). Still, even if St. Mark does not make mention of paschs, it does not follow that there were none. Thus, we know that there was a pasch shortly after our Saviour's baptism (John, ii, 13), and yet St. Mark does not mention it. He does, however, mention one in xiv, 1, the Pasch of the Passion. And if he does not mention another pasch, he makes remarks from which we can infer the existence of one. Thus in ii, 23, he speaks of the plucking of the ears of corn and evidently refers to the early summer, whilst vi, 39, with its allusion to the green grass, seems to take us to the spring-time. From the events related between these two points it seems clear that a year intervened, and so, as in St. John, we have to find room for another pasch. Our conclusion is that the most natural explanation of St. Mark would lead us to a duration of two years for the ministry.

(12) *Date of the Crucifixion.*—It is clear that the Crucifixion took place under Pontius Pilate, and hence Our Saviour must have died between A. D. 26 and 36 (Ant., XVIII, iv, 2). It is also clearly laid down in the Gospels that the Crucifixion took place on a Friday. For we are told that the Resurrection took place on Sunday, and also that it occurred three days after the Crucifixion, but according to the Greek and Jewish mode of reckoning, the third day is what we should call the second day. A difficulty is, however, raised as to whether Our Saviour died on the 14th or 15th of Nisan. Some are of opinion that, whilst St. John held the Crucifixion to have been on the 14th (xix, 31), the Synoptists were in favour of the 15th (Mark, xv, 42). But it does not seem possible that either St. John or St. Matthew, who were so intimately connected with the facts related, should have been mistaken in this matter, or that, in the same way, either the Synoptists or the Fourth Gospel erred. Nor are we without explanations to reconcile the apparent differences between the Gospels. St. John, we know, favours the 14th of Nisan. But St. Mark, too, tells us how Simon of Cyrene helped Christ to carry the Cross (xv, 21), and how Joseph of Arimathea buried the Body—facts which seem to tell against the Festival Day (xv, 43 sqq.). Besides, the weight of Christian antiquity is in favour of the 14th of Nisan, as are such competent modern scholars as Professor Sanday and the late Bishop Westcott.

If we could make up our mind fully that the Crucifixion took place on the 14th of Nisan, it would help us to determine in what year it happened. For though we cannot always be certain whether a Friday fell on the 14th or 15th of Nisan, still we can be fairly satisfied that the years 29, 30, and 33 fulfilled the necessary conditions, though von Soden, in Cheyne's "Encyclopædia", is of opinion that the year 29 does not do so. It has already been seen that the Crucifixion must have happened somewhere between 26 and 36. It may also be taken that it did not occur after 33, because in the next year Caiphas was deposed from the high-priesthood by Vitellius. We are left, then, with the years 29, 30, and 33 to choose between for the death of Jesus Christ. We cannot be certain in our choice. But naturally we should expect the date of such an important event to be handed down by tradition; and we find a very ancient tradition, going back to A. D. 150, for the date A. D. 29, in the consulship of the Gemini. In favour of it are Clement of Alexandria, Origen, the Apocryphal Acts of Pilate, Hippolytus, and the Pseudo-Tertullian.

(13) *The Apostles.*—Frederick Blass (Acta Apostolorum, p. 21) tells us of the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles that we cannot be certain of our dates within a less period than about ten years. That is a strong statement, but nothing will bring home to us better how ambiguous the chronology is than the large number of different systems that have been adopted by interpreters of this book.

Taking the year 29 as that of the Crucifixion, three other dates are at once fixed. For the Resurrection took place three days after the Crucifixion; the Ascension 40 days after that, and ten days later the Holy Ghost descended on the Apostles. Other dates are not so simple. In Acts, xii, 1–25, is given an account of Herod's persecution, the martyrdom of St. James, St. Peter's miraculous liberation from prison, the death of Herod, and the return of Sts. Paul and Barnabas from Jerusalem, whither they had travelled to convey the alms of the Church in Antioch (xi, 30). All these events seem closely connected with the death of Herod (xii, 23); and from what Josephus says, and the evidence of the coinage, we cannot be far wrong in placing that event in the year 44. From the date of the recall of Felix, governor of Judea, and the arrival of his successor, Festus, we ought to be able to decide the year of the end of St. Paul's career, as sketched in the Acts. For shortly after the arrival of Festus, St. Paul was sent a prisoner to Rome. Harnack places this event in 57, Lightfoot in 61, Ramsay in 60. Perhaps we may say 62, for he was sent to Rome by Festus, shortly after his arrival in Judea. But this was not long before the death of Pallas in A. D. 62 (Tac., Ann., XIV, lxv). In Rome St. Paul remained two years, hence till 64 (Acts, xxviii, 30). The Acts end here, but tradition says that St. Paul was released at the end of two years' captivity in Rome, and paid his long-contemplated visit to Spain (St. Clement, Muratorian Fragment, etc.). He also visited Southern Gaul and, as we learn from the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, among other places, Crete, Macedonia, and Miletus. This expedition would have taken about three years.

St. Paul's recorded missionary journeys, which began when he and Barnabas were sent forth by the Holy Ghost to preach (xiii, 4), ended with his arrest in Jerusalem in the year 59 (xxii) before his imprisonment at Cæsarea and Rome. The third missionary journey (xviii, 23–xxi, 15) must have occupied quite four years, for he spent over two years at Ephesus (xix, 10), besides passing through Macedonia and Greece, going slowly through Macedonia and spending three months in Corinth. This journey would have begun, as far as we can see, in the summer of 55. The second journey (xv, 36–xviii, 22), a work mostly of revisiting churches (xv, 36), ended not very long before the third missionary expedition began, probably in 54, and began about three years previously, in 51. The first 29 verses of chapter xv are taken up with the Council of Jerusalem. There is much difference of opinion as to the date to be assigned to it. Thus Harnack places it in 47, Lightfoot in 51, Ramsay in 50. It would seem most likely to have occurred in 51, the year of the beginning of the second missionary journey, for it was concluded only "some days" (xv, 36) before that expedition was begun. Having fixed the date of the Council of Jerusalem, we are in a position to settle the date of St. Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion. For (Gal., ii, 1) it was 14 years before the council, or in the year 37. From the same Epistle (i, 18) we know that St. Paul's conversion took place three years previously, in 34. We may place the martyrdom of St. Stephen a year earlier (i. e. in 33) not more; for Saul was still "breathing out threatenings and slaughter" (Acts, ix, 1) at the date

of his conversion. The date of the first missionary journey (xiii, 1; xiv, 26) still remains to be dealt with. Herod Agrippa died in 44, and St. Paul's first journey did not begin till after that event. Moreover, it was finished before the Council of Jerusalem (51). There is no indication in the Acts sufficiently definite to settle the question. It can, however, be safely stated that the journey must have been finished some time previous to the council; because between the two events Paul and Barnabas "abode no small time with the disciples" (xiv, 27).

It may be well to explain here that the uncertainties which surround its chronology in no way detract from the trustworthiness of the Bible as an historical document, or from its authority as an inspired record. The further back we go, the more general and in outline are our ideas of history; and so, in Genesis, the whole history of the world to the Flood is contained in a few brief chapters. As it is with the narrative of events, so it is with chronology. Coming farther down in Jewish history, it is obvious that in regard to numbers the text is often at fault, equally obvious that the inspired writer often only wishes to place before us round numbers. Of the latest period the evidence we possess for fixing the chronology of the Bible is often inconclusive. It may be safely affirmed that the time has not yet come to fix an authoritative chronology of the Bible. A good deal of obscurity and uncertainty remains to be removed. But when the time does come, it may be confidently asserted that the ultimate result will contain nothing derogatory to the authority of the Bible.

HUMMELAUER, *Genesis* (Paris, 1895); *Judges* (1888); *Samuel* (1886); CORNELY, *Introductio* (Paris, 1886); VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible* (Paris, 1899); DRIVER, *Genesis* (London, 1904); BURNEY, *Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford, 1903); SAYCE, *Early History of the Hebrews* (London, 1897); SAYCE, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments* (London, 1894); GIGOT, *Introduction* (New York, 1900); WELLHAUSEN, *Prolegomena* (tr. Edinburgh, 1885); HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible* (Edinburgh, 1898); CHEYNE, *Encyclopædia Biblica* (London, 1899); VAN HOONACKER, Various works about the return from exile (Paris and Ghent); LENORMANT, *The Beginnings of History* (Eng. tr., London, 1893); RAMSAY, *St. Paul the Traveller* (London, 1895); RAMSAY, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (London, 1895); SCHÜRER, *Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (tr. Edinburgh, 1906); BLASS, *Acta Apostolorum* (Göttingen, 1895). See also works referred to in article.

J. A. HOWLETT.

Chronology, GENERAL (Gr. χρόνος, time, λόγος, discourse), the science of time-measurement, has two branches: (1) Mathematical Chronology, which determines the units to be employed in measuring time, and (2) Historical Chronology, of which we here treat, and which fixes in the general course of time the position of any particular occurrence, or, as it is generally termed, its date. It is thus for history what latitude and longitude are for geography. The first requisite in any system of historical chronology is an era, that is to say a fixed point of time, the distance from which shall indicate the position of all others. The term *era*, the derivation of which is not certainly known, appears first to have been employed in France and Spain to signify a number or rule. Since the need of a definite system of chronology was first recognized by mankind, many and various eras have been employed at different periods and by different nations. For practical purposes it is most important to understand those which affect Christian history.

CHRISTIAN ERA.—Foremost among these is that which is now adopted by all civilized peoples and known as the Christian or Vulgar Era, in the twentieth century of which we are now living. This was introduced about the year 527 by Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian monk resident at Rome, who fixed its starting point in the year 753 from the foundation of Rome, in which year, according to his calculation, the birth of Christ occurred. Making this the year 1 of his era, he counted the years which followed in regular course from it, calling them years "of the Lord", and we now designate such a date A. D. (i. e. *Anno Domini*). The year preceding A. D. 1 is called *Ante Christum* (A. C.) or Before Christ (B. C.). It is to be noted that there is no year 0 intervening, as some have imagined, between B. C. and A. D. It is supposed by many that the calculation of Dionysius was incorrect, and that the birth of Christ really occurred three years earlier than he placed it, or in the year of Rome 750, which he styles 3 B. C. This, however, is immaterial for the purposes of chronology, the first year of the Christian Era being that fixed, rightly or wrongly, by Dionysius. His system was adopted but gradually, first in Italy, then in other parts of Christendom. England would appear to have been among the earliest regions to have made use of it, under the influence of the Roman missioners, as it is found in Saxon charters of the seventh century. In Gaul it made its appearance only in the eighth, and its use did not become general in Europe until after A. D. 1000; accordingly in French the term *millésime* was frequently used to signify a date A. D. In Spain, although not unknown as early as the seventh century, the use of the Christian Era, as will presently be shown, did not become general until after the middle of the fourteenth century.

PRE-CHRISTIAN CHRONOLOGY.—Of the chronological systems previously in use it will be sufficient to briefly describe a few. The Greeks dated events by *Olympiads*, or periods of four years intervening between successive celebrations of the Olympic games, and this mode of computation, having been largely adopted at Rome, continued to be frequently used in the first centuries of Christianity. The Olympiads started from 776 B. C., and consequently A. D. 1 was the fourth year of the 194th Olympiad. The Romans frequently reckoned from the traditional foundation of their city (*ab urbe conditâ*—A. U. C.), which date, as has been said, coincided with 753 B. C. They likewise often designated years by the names of the consuls then in office (e. g. *consule Planco*). Sometimes the Romans dated by post-consular years (i. e. so long after the consulate of a well-known man). Naturally the regnal years of Roman emperors presently supplanted those of consuls, whose power in later times was merely nominal, and from the emperors this method of describing dates was imitated by popes, kings, and other rulers, with or without the addition of the year A. D. It became in fact universal in the Middle Ages, and it subsists in documents, both ecclesiastical and civil, down to our own day.

REGNAL YEARS.—The pontifical years of the popes are historically important (see chronological list in article POPE). Care must be taken, of course, in the case of such dates, to observe from what point of time each reign is reckoned. In an elective monarchy like the papacy there is necessarily an interval between successive reigns, which is occasionally considerable. Moreover, the reckoning is sometimes from the election of a pontiff, sometimes from his coronation.

In determining dates by the regnal years of other sovereigns there are of course various points to which attention must be paid. Confining ourselves to English history, the earlier kings after the Norman Conquest dated their reigns only from their coronation, or some other public exhibition of sovereignty, so that there was sometimes an interval of days or even weeks between the close of one reign and the commencement of the next. Only from the accession of Richard II (22 June, 1377) was the reign of a monarch held to begin with the death or deposition of his predecessor. Even subsequently to this it was reckoned sometimes from the day itself upon which the preceding monarch ceased to reign, sometimes from the day following. Not till the first year of Queen Elizabeth was it enacted that the former should be the rule. In certain particular instances the matter was still fur-

ther complicated. King John dated his reign from his coronation, 27 May, 1199, but this being the Feast of the Ascension, his years were counted from one occurrence of this festival to the next, and were accordingly of varying length. Edward I dated from noon, 20 November, 1272, and in consequence this day in each year of his reign was partly in one regnal year and partly in another. In the civil wars of York and Lancaster, Henry VI and Edward IV equally ignored the period during which his rival assumed or recovered power, and counted their years continuously onwards from the time when they mounted the throne. Charles II, though he began to reign *de facto* only at the Restoration (29 May, 1660), reckoned his years, *de jure*, from his father's execution, 30 January, 1648–9, ignoring the Commonwealth and Protectorate. Queen Mary Tudor reckoned her reign from the death of Edward VI, 6 July, 1553, but the interval until 19 July of the same year being occupied by the abortive reign of Lady Jane Grey, public documents in her name commence only with the latter date. William III and Mary II began to reign 13 Feb., 1688–9, as "William and Mary". Mary died 28 December, 1694, when the style was altered to "William" alone; but no change was made in the computation of regnal years. Within the year, it was long usual to specify dates by reference to some well-known feast in the ecclesiastical calendar, as, for instance, "the Friday before Pentecost" or "the day of St. John the Baptist".

INDICTIONS.—In papal and other documents, another epoch is often added, namely, the *Indiction*. This had originally been a period of fifteen years, at the close of which the financial accounts of the Roman Empire were balanced; but for purposes of chronology the indictions are conventional periods of fifteen years, the first of which began in the reign of Constantine the Great. Unlike the Olympiads, the indictions themselves were not numbered, but only the place of a year in the indiction in which it fell. Thus *indictione quartâ* signifies not "in the fourth indiction", but "in the fourth year of its indiction", whatever this was. It was obvious that such an element of computation could serve only to verify more precisely the date of a year already approximately known. Moreover, the indictions were calculated on different systems, which have to be understood and distinguished: (1) The Greek, Constantinian, or Constantinopolitan Indictions were reckoned from 1 September, 312. These were chiefly used in the East. (2) The Imperial, Cæsarean, or Western Indictions commenced with 24 September, 312. These were usually adopted in Western Christendom. They appear to have been of Anglo-Saxon origin, and to have owed their popularity to the authority of the Venerable Bede. The day he chose for the starting point was due to an erroneous astronomical calculation which made the autumnal equinox fall on 24 September. Further confusion was caused by the mistake of some chroniclers who wrongly began the indictional cycle a year late—24 September, 313. (3) The Roman, Papal, or Pontifical Indictions, introduced in the ninth century, made the series start from the first day of the civil year, which was in some cases 25 December, in others 1 January. This system was also common in Western Christendom, but in spite of its appellation it was by no means exclusively used in papal documents.

BEGINNING OF THE YEAR.—The date at which the year commenced varied at different periods and in different countries. When Julius Cæsar reformed the calendar (45 B. C.) he fixed 1 January as New Year's Day, a character which it seems never quite to have lost, even among those who for civil and legal purposes chose another starting point. The most common of such starting points were 25 March (Feast of the Annunciation, "Style of the Incarnation") and 25 December (Christmas Day, "Style of the Nativity"). In England before the Norman Conquest (1066) the year began either on 25 March or 25 December; from 1087 to 1155 on 1 January; and from 1155 till the reform of the calendar in 1752 on 25 March, so that 24 March was the last day of one year, and 25 March the first day of the next. But though the legal year was thus reckoned, it is clear that 1 January was commonly spoken of as New Year's Day. In Scotland, from 1 January, 1600, the beginning of the year was reckoned from that day. In France the year was variously reckoned: from Christmas Day, from Easter eve, or from 25 March. Of all starting points a movable feast like Easter is obviously the worst. From 1564 the year was reckoned in France from 1 January to 31 December. In Germany the reckoning was anciently from Christmas, but in 1544 and onwards, from 1 January to 31 December. In Rome and a great part of Italy, it was from 25 December, until Pope Gregory XIII reformed the calendar (1582) and fixed 1 January as the first day of the year. The years, however, according to which papal Bulls are dated, still commence with Christmas Day. Spain, with Portugal and Southern France, observed an era of its own long after the rest of Christendom had adopted that of Dionysius. This era of Spain or of the Cæsars, commenced with 1 January, 38 B. C., and remained in force in the Kingdom of Castile and Leon till A. D. 1383, when a royal edict commanded the substitution of the Christian Era. In Portugal the change was not made till 1422. No satisfactory explanation has been found of the date from which this era started.

THE GREGORIAN REFORM.—The introduction of the Gregorian Calendar entailed various discrepancies between the dates which different people assigned to the same events. The Julian system of time-measurements, introduced by Cæsar, was not sufficiently accurate, as it made the year slightly too long, with the result that by the sixteenth century it had fallen ten days in arrear, so that, for instance, the day of the vernal equinox, which should have been called 21 March, was called 11 March. To remedy this, besides substituting an improved system which should prevent the error from operating in future, it was necessary to omit ten full days in order to bring things back to the proper point. Pope Gregory XIII, who introduced the reformed system, or "New Style", ordained that ten days in October, 1582, should not be counted, the fourth of that month being immediately followed by the fifteenth. He moreover determined that the year should begin with 1 January, and in order to prevent the Julian error from causing retardation in the future as in the past, he ruled that three leap years should be omitted in every four centuries, viz. those of the centennial years the first two figures of which are not exact multiples of four, as 1700, 1800, 1900, 2100, etc. The New Style (N. S.) was speedily adopted by Catholic States, but for a long time the Protestant States retained the Old (O. S.), from which there followed important differences in marking dates according as one or other style was followed. In the first place there was the original difference of ten days between them, increased to eleven by the O. S. 29 February in A. D. 1700, to twelve days in 1800, and to thirteen in 1900. Moreover, the period from 1 January to 24 March inclusive, which was the commencement of the year according to N. S., according to O. S. was the conclusion of the year previous. From want of attention to this, important events have sometimes been misquoted by a year. In illustration may be considered the death of Queen Elizabeth. This occurred in what was then styled in England 24 March, 1602, being the last day of that year. In France and wherever the N. S. prevailed, this day was described as 3 April, 1603. To avoid all possible ambiguity such dates are frequently expressed in fractional form, as $\frac{24 \text{ March}}{3 \text{ April}}$, 160 $\frac{2}{3}$. In our modern histories

years are always given according to N. S., but dates are otherwise left as they were originally recorded. Thus Queen Elizabeth is said to have died 24 March, 1603. Not till 1700 was the Gregorian reform accepted by the Protestant States of Germany and the Low Countries, and not till 1752 by Great Britain, there being by that time a difference of eleven days between O. S. and N. S. Sweden, after some strange vacillation, followed suit in 1753. O. S. is still followed by Russia and other countries subject to the authority of the Greek Church, and their dates consequently are now thirteen days behind those of the rest of Christendom.

Julian Period.—The Christian Era has this disadvantage for chronological purposes, that dates have to be reckoned backwards or forwards according as they are B. C. or A. D., whereas in an ideally perfect system all events would be reckoned in one sequence. The difficulty was to find a starting point whence to reckon, for the beginnings of history in which this should naturally be placed are those of which chronologically we know least. At one period it was attempted to date from the Creation (A. M. or *Anno Mundi*), that event being placed by Christian chronologists, such as Archbishop Usher, in 4004 B. C., and by the Jews in 3761 B. C. But any attempt thus to determine the age of the world has been long since abandoned. In the year 1583, however—that following the Gregorian reform—Joseph Justus Scaliger introduced a basis of calculation which to a large extent served the purpose required, and, according to Sir John Herschel, first introduced light and order into chronology. This was the Julian Period—one of 7980 Julian years, i. e. years of which every fourth one contains 366 days. The same number of Gregorian years would contain 60 days less. For historians these commence with the midnight preceding 1 January, 4713 B. C., for astronomers with the following noon. The period 7980 was obtained by multiplying together 28, 19, and 15, being respectively the number of years in the Solar Cycle, the Lunar Cycle, and the Roman Indiction, and the year 4713 B. C. was that for which the number of each of these subordinate cycles equals 1. [For a fuller explanation of this see Bond, "Handy Book" (ed. of 1875), p. 257.] The astronomical day is reckoned from noon to noon instead of from midnight to midnight. Scaliger calculated his period for the meridian of Alexandria to which Ptolemy had referred his calculation.

Other Eras.—Various eras employed by historians and chroniclers may be briefly mentioned, with the dates from which they were computed.

The Chinese Era dates probably from 2700 B. C., and time is computed by cycles of sixty lunar years, each shorter by eleven days than ordinary solar years.

Era of Abraham, from 1 October, 2016 B. C.

Era of the Olympiads, 13 July, 776 B. C., and continued to A. D. 396 (Olympiad 293).

Era of the Foundation of Rome, 21 April, 753 B. C.

Era of Nabonassar, 26 February, 747, the basis of all calculations of Ptolemy.

Era of Alexander, 12 November, 324 B. C.

Greek Era of Seleucus, 1 September, 312 B. C.

Era of Tyre, 19 October, 125 B. C.

Cæsarian Era of Antioch, 9 August, 48 B. C., instituted to commemorate the battle of Pharsalia.

Julian Era, 1 January, 45 B. C., instituted on the Julian reformation of the calendar.

Era of Spain or of the Cæsars, 1 January, 38 B. C.

Era of Augustus, 2 September, 31 B. C., instituted to commemorate the Battle of Actium.

Egyptian Year, 29 August, 26 B. C., instituted on the reformation of the Egyptian calendar by Augustus.

Era of Martyrs or of Diocletian, 29 August, A. D. 284, employed by Eusebius and early ecclesiastical writers.

Era of the Armenians, 9 July, A. D. 552, commemorates the consummation of the Armenian schism by their condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon.

Era of the Hegira, 16 July, A. D. 622, dates from the entrance of Mohammed into Medina after his flight from Mecca; its years are lunar, of 354 days each, except in intercalary years, of which there are eleven in each cycle of thirty. In these there are 355 days.

Persian Era of Yezdegird III, 16 June, A. D. 632.

At the French Revolution it was determined to introduce an entirely new system of chronology, dating from that event and having no affinity with any previously adopted. In the first form this was the *Era of Liberty*, commencing 1 January, 1789. This was replaced presently by the *Republican Era*, at first appointed to commence 1 January, 1792, and afterwards 22 September, 1792. This was the date of the proclamation of the Republic, which coincided with the autumnal equinox, calculated on the meridian of Paris. The year was divided into twelve months of thirty days each, and the days into decades, weeks being abolished. The months had names given to them according to their seasonal character. The autumnal months (22 Sept. onwards) were:—Vendémiaire (Vintage), Brumaire (Foggy), Frimaire (Sleety). Winter Months:—Nivose (Snowy), Pluviose (Rainy), Ventose (Blowy). Spring Months:—Germinal (Budding), Floréal (Flowery), Prairial (Meadowy). Summer Months:—Messidor (Harvesting), Thermidor (Torrid), Fructidor (Fruitful). As these months contained only 360 days, five *jours complémentaires* were added at the end of Fructidor, officially called Primidi, Duodi, Tridi, Quartidi, Quintidi, but commonly known as *Sans-culottides*. Olympic or leap years occurred every fourth year of the Republic, and had a sixth intermediary day called Sextidi. The period thus terminated was called *Franciade*. This calendar was enforced in France till 1 January, 1806, when it was abolished by Napoleon, and the use of the Gregorian calendar resumed.

Days of the Month and Week.—Various methods have been devised for ascertaining upon what day of the week any given date falls. The best known is that of *Dominical Letters*, which has this disadvantage, that a table is usually required to find out what is the Dominical Letter for the year in question. Complication is likewise caused by the necessity of passing from one letter to another in leap years, on reaching the intercalary day in February. The following method is free from these inconveniences, and can be worked without any reference to tables:—

The days of the week are numbered according to their natural order, *viz.* Sunday = 1, Monday = 2, Tuesday = 3, Wednesday = 4, Thursday = 5, Friday = 6, Saturday = 7. (At the time from which the Christian Era starts there were of course no weeks, such a measure of time not being known among the Greeks and Romans. Counting backwards, however, according to our present system, we can divide all time into weeks, and it is to be noted that in the Christian period the order of days of the week has never been interrupted. Thus, when Gregory XIII reformed the Calendar, in 1582, Thursday, 4 October, was followed by Friday, 15 October. So in England, in 1752, Wednesday, 2 September, was followed by Thursday, 14 September. What we style 14 August, 1907, the Russians style 1 August, but both call it Wednesday.) For our present purpose the year commences with March; January and February being reckoned as the 11th and 12th months of the preceding year; thus 29 February, when it occurs, is the last day of the year and causes no further disturbance.—As a matter of fact, it is found by computation that 1 March of the year known as A. D. 1 was a Tuesday. Assigning to this year the figure 1 as its year number, to March the figure 1 as its month number, and adding these to 1, the day number of 1 March, we get 3, indicating Tuesday the third day of the week. From this

first datum all the rest follows. The succeeding days of March increase their figures each by 1, on account of the increased day number. When 7 is passed it is only the figures which remain, after division by that number, which are to be considered; thus 11 may be treated as 4 (7 + 4) and 30 as 2 (28 + 2). In general, any exact multiple of 7 (14, 21, 28) may be added or subtracted when convenient without affecting the result. Instead of adding any number (e. g. 1 or 4) we may subtract its difference from 7 or a multiple of 7 (e. g. 6 or 3). The remainder 0 in a division is equivalent to 7, and thus in calculating for the day of the week it signifies Saturday.

As the days of the leading month, so those of the months preceding it follow naturally. As March contains 31 days (i. e. 28+3), April necessarily begins with a day 3 places later in the weekly sequence, and its month number instead of 1 is 4. So of other months, according to the number of days in that which preceded. The following are the month numbers throughout the year which never change:—March 1; April 4; May 6; June 2; July 4; August 0; September 3; October 5; November 1; December 3; January 6; February 2. A. D. 1, being a common year of 365 days (or 52 weeks + 1 day), ends with the same day of the week—Tuesday—with which it commenced. Consequently the next year, A. D. 2, commences a day later, with Wednesday for 1 March, and as its year number is increased to 2, we get 2+1+1=4. So in A. D. 3, the year number becomes 3, and 1 March is Thursday. But on account of 29 February preceding 1 March, A. D. 4, this day falls 366 days (or 52 weeks+2 days) after 1 March, A. D. 3, or on Saturday, and its year number must be increased to 5; 5+1+1=7. Thus, to find the number belonging to any year within its own century, we must find how many days beyond an exact number of weeks there have been since that century commenced. As every common year contains one day more than fifty-two weeks, and every leap year two days more, by adding at any period the number of leap years which there have been in the century to the total number of years in the same, we obtain the number of days required. To obtain the number of leap years, we divide the last two figures of the date (i. e. those in the tens and units place) by four. The quotient (neglecting any remainder) shows the number of leap years; which, added to the same two figures, gives the number of days over and above the sets of fifty-two weeks which the years contain. Thus, for example, the year '39 of any century (939, 1539, 1839, 1939) will have 6 for its year number, for in such year 48 extra days will have accumulated since the corresponding day of the centurial year (00), viz. 1 day for each of the 30 common years, and 18 days for the 9 leap years.

THE CENTURY.—One more element of calculation remains to be considered, viz. the *Century*. We begin with the Julian system, or O. S.—according to which all centuries contain 75 common years of 365 days, and 25 leap years of 366, and accordingly 125 days in all, over and above 5200 weeks. But 125 days=17 weeks+6 days. Therefore a Julian century ends with the day of the week *two* days previous to that with which it began, and the succeeding century will begin with the day of the week, *one* day earlier than its predecessor. Thus, A. D. 1 March, 1300, being Tuesday, in 1400 it would be Monday, in 1500 Sunday, in 1600 Saturday. Having obtained the centurial number for any century, we add to it the year numbers of the years which follow to the close of that century. Centurial numbers O. S. are obtained by subtracting the centurial figure or figures (viz. those preceding 00) from the multiple of 7 next above, the remainder being the number required. Thus for A. D. 1100 the centurial number is 3 (14–11), for 1500, 6 (21–15), for 1900, 2 (21–19).

Under the N. S. three centuries in every four contain 76 common years and 24 leap years, and thus have only 124 days over 5200 weeks, or 17 weeks and 5 days, and end with the day of the week *three* earlier than they began. The following century, beginning two days earlier than that which it follows, has its centurial number less by 2. Thus 1 March, A. D. 1700, was Monday, and the centurial number 0 (or 7). 1 March, 1800, was Saturday, and the centurial number 5. Every fourth centurial year N. S., being a leap year (1600, 2000, 2400, etc.), has 366 days; and the century to which it belongs, like those of the O. S., diminishes its centurial number only by 1 from the preceding. N. S. having been introduced in the sixteenth century, it is only for dates 15— and upwards that N. S. centurial numbers are required. They are as follows: for 1500=3; 1600=2; 1700=7; 1800=5; 1900=3; 2000=2. It will be seen that the same figures constantly recur. Leap year centuries (with the first two figures exactly divisible by 4) having the centurial number 2, and the three centuries following having 7 (or 0), 5, and 3 respectively, after which 2 comes round again. The centurial number N. S. can be obtained from that of O. S. if the difference of days between O. S. and N. S. be allowed for. This is done by subtracting the said difference from the O. S. centurial number, increased by as many times 7 as the subtraction requires. As we have seen, for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the difference was 10 days; for the eighteenth, 11; for the nineteenth, 12; for the twentieth and twenty-first, 13. Thus:—

A.D. 1500 etc.	C.N. (O.S.)	=6(N.S.)	=3(6+ 7–10).
A.D. 1600	do. =5	do.	=2(5+ 7–10).
A.D. 1700	do. =4	do.	=0(7) (4+ 7–11).
A.D. 1800	do. =3	do.	=5(3+ 14–12).
A.D. 1900	do. =2	do.	=3(2+ 14–13).
A.D. 2000	do. =1	do.	=2 (1+ 14–13).

Rule to find day of week for any date:—Take the sum of the centurial number + year number + month number + day number; divide this by 7; the remainder gives day of week, O. S. or N. S., according to centurial number used.

Examples.—(1) King John was crowned 27 May, 1199. What day?

Century (O. S.) Year Month Day

$$3 + 4 + \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{6 or} \\ 6(27=21+6)\end{matrix}\right\} + 27 \Big\} = 40 = 7\times5+5.$$

Therefore the day was Thursday.

(2) Waterloo was fought 18 June, 1815. What day?

Century (N. S.) Year Month Day

$$5 + \left\{\begin{matrix}\text{18 or} \\ 4(18=14+4)\end{matrix}\right\} + 2 + 18 \Big\} = 43 = 7\times6+1.$$

Therefore the day was Sunday, as readers of "Vanity Fair" will recollect.

(3) Columbus discovered the New World 12 October, 1492. What day?

Century (O. S.) Year Month Day

$$0 + 3 + 5 + 12 = \frac{20}{7};\ \text{remainder 6.}$$

Therefore the day was Friday.

(4) If St. Patrick died 17 March, 463, required the day of the week.

Century (O. S.) Year Month Day

$$3 + 1 + 1 + 17 = \frac{22}{7};\ \text{remainder 1.}$$

Therefore the day was Sunday.

(5) Mary Queen of Scots was executed 8 February, 1587 ($158\frac{6}{7}$), which was a Wednesday. Was this O. S. or N. S.?

Century (O. S.) Year 1586 Month Day

$$6 + 2 + 2 + 8 = 18 = \text{Wednesday.}$$

It was O. S.

According to N. S. it would be:—

Century (N. S.)	Year 1586	Month	Day
3	+ 2	+ 2	+ 8 = 15 = Sunday.

This is an illustration of February being reckoned in the preceding year.

GIRY, *Manuel de Diplomatique* (Paris, 1894); MAS-LATRIE, *Trésor de chronologie* (Paris, 1889), Introduction; GROTEFEND, *Taschenbuch der Zeitrechnung* (Hanover and Leipzig, 1905); GROTEFEND, *Zeitrechnung des d. Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1891–8). Other valuable works of reference are the Benedictine *Art de vérifier les dates* (Paris, 1818–42); BOND, *Handy Book for Verifying Dates* (1875); IDELER, *Handbuch der Chronologie* (Berlin, 1825–6); HAMPSON, *Medii Ævi Kalendarium* (London, 1841); KRUSCH, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1881); SACHSE, *Das Aufkommen der Datierungen nach dem Festkalender in Urkunden*, etc. (Erlangen, 1904); NILLES, *Calendarium Utriusque Ecclesiæ* (Innsbruck, 1896); MARZI, *La Questione della Riforma del Calendario nel quinto concilio Lateranensi* (Florence, 1896); MACDONALD, *Chronologies and Calendars* (London, 1897); GOLDSCHNEIDER, *Ueber die Einführung der neuen Kalender in Dänemark und Schweden* (Berlin, 1898); LERSCH, *Einleitung in die Chronologie* (Freiburg, 1889); LEDOUBLE, *La Connaissance des Années et des Jours* (Soissons, 1887), a convenient little handbook; ARBUTHNOT, *The Mysteries of Chronology* (London, 1900).

JOHN GERARD.

Chrysanthus and Daria, SAINTS, Roman martyrs, buried on the Via Salaria Nova, and whose tombs, according to the testimony of the itinerary guides to the tombs of the Roman martyrs, were publicly venerated (De Rossi, "Roma Sotterranea", I, 176). A church erected over the tomb was situated near that of St. Saturninus, which was built over the catacomb of Thraso (*cæmeterium Thrasonis ad S. Saturninum*). Their tomb was in fact in a disused sandpit (*arenaria*) near this catacomb. The two martyrs were revered in Rome in the fourth century, as the appearance of their names in the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" proves. The existing Acts of these Martyrs are without historical value; they did not originate until the fifth century, and are compiled in two texts—a longer one, written originally in Greek, but afterwards translated into Latin, and a shorter one in Latin. The historical notices of Chrysanthus and Daria in the so-called historical martyrologies of the West, as in the Greek Synaxaria, go back to the legend which makes Chrysanthus the son of the noble Polemius of Alexandria. He came to Rome with his father and was converted by the presbyter Carpophorus. Everything was done to make him apostatize. Daria, a beautiful and very intelligent Vestal, entered into relations with him, but she herself was won over to the Christian Faith by Chrysanthus, and both concluded a virginal matrimonial union. Many Romans and Roman ladies were converted by these, among them the Tribune Claudius, his wife Hilaria, and two sons Maurus and Jason, all of whom, with the exception of the mother, suffered martyrdom. Chrysanthus and Daria were themselves condemned to death, led to a sandpit in the Via Salaria, and there stoned.

This legend is evidently connected with a number of Roman martyrs, whose tombs were venerated in the catacombs of the Via Salaria, near those of Chrysanthus and Daria. The story, apart from the assured fact of their martyrdom and the veneration of their tombs, has, perhaps, some historical value, in assigning the date to the reign of the Emperor Numerianus (283–84). As this ruler was never in Rome, some historians believe (for instance, Allard; see below) that the name is Valerianus, and transfer the martyrdom to the persecution under this emperor. But perhaps the name of Numerianus ought to be adhered to, and the origin of this indication is to be found in the legend of an Oriental martyr having the same name. There is another martyrdom closely connected with the tomb of the two saints, which is related at the end of the Acts of these martyrs. After the death of Chrysanthus and Daria, when many of the faithful of Rome were assembled at their tomb to celebrate the anniversary of their death, they were surprised by the persecutors, who filled in with stones and earth the subterranean crypt where the Christians were assembled, so that all perished. Later, when the tomb of Sts. Chrysanthus and Daria was looked for and found, the bones of these martyrs, and even the liturgical silver vessels, which they used for the celebration of the Eucharist, were also discovered. Everything was left as it was found, and a wall was erected, so that no one could enter the place. Only through a window-opening in the wall could be seen the tomb of Sts. Chrysanthus and Daria, as well as the bones of the Christians killed in the tomb. This tomb, like so many others, was embellished by Pope Damasus, who had poems in praise of the martyrs engraved on marble and placed there. Gregory of Tours describes this sanctuary in an interesting chapter of his "De gloriâ martyrum", I, xxxviii (P. L., LXXI, 739). During the invasions of the Goths the sanctuary was desecrated, but later it was restored, as a metrical inscription composed at that time and falsely attributed to Pope Damasus asserts. In the ninth century the remains of Sts. Chrysanthus and Daria were brought to Prüm and were thence transferred to Münstereifel in Rhenish Prussia, where they are still greatly venerated. The feast of these saints stands in the Roman Martyrology on the 25th of October, on which day, also, it appears in some martyrologies dating from the seventh century. In the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" the martyrs are mentioned on 12 August and 29 November; according to some MSS., on other days also. The Greeks celebrate their feast on 19 March.

MOMBRITIUS, *Sanctuarium*, I, 152 sqq.; *Acta SS.*, October, XI, 437–495; DE ROSSI, *Inscriptiones christianæ urbis Romæ*, II, 84, 87, 116, 135; DUFOURCQ, *Gesta martyrum romains* (Paris, 1900), 255 sqq.; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'hist. ecclés.*, IV, 565 sqq.; DE ROSSI, *Bullettino di archeol. crist.*, 1873, 9–12; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions* (Paris, 1887), III, 46 sq., 72, 314 sq.; MARUCCHI, *Les catacombes romaines* (Rome, 1900), 310 sqq.; WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1904), 310; FLOSS, *Romreise des Abtes Marcward von Prüm und Uebertragung der hll. Chrysanthus und Daria nach Münstereifel i. J. 844* (Cologne, 1869).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Chrysogonus, SAINT, Martyr, suffered at Aquileia, probably during the persecution of Diocletian, was buried there, and publicly venerated by the faithful of that region. His name is found in the so-called "Martyrologium Hieronymianum" on two different days, 31 May and 24 November, with the topographical note, "in Aquileia" ("Martyrol. Hier.", ed. De Rossi; Duchesne in "Acta SS.", Nov. II). The Weissenburg manuscript of the "Mart. Hieron." alone mentions the primitive topographical indication on the latter date; the Echternach manuscript says, "Romæ natale Crisogoni", while under 23 November Chrysogonus appears again among the Roman martyrs. Very early indeed the veneration of this martyr of Aquileia was transferred to Rome, where a titular church, in Trastevere, bears his name to this day. This church (*Titulus Chrysogoni*) is first mentioned in the signatures of the Roman Synod of 499 (Duchesne, "Notes sur la topographie de Rome au moyen âge" in "Mélanges d'archéol. et d'histoire", VII, 227), but it probably dates from the fourth century (De Rossi, "Inscript. christ.", II, 152, N. 27; "Bulletino di archeol. crist.", 1887, 168). It is possible that the founder of the church was a certain Chrysogonus, and that, on account of the similarity of name, the church was soon devoted to the veneration of the martyr of Aquileia; it is also possible that from the beginning, for some unknown reason, it was consecrated to St. Chrysogonus, and takes its name from him. In a similar way the veneration of St. Anastasia of Sirmium was transplanted to Rome (see ANASTASIA, SAINT, MARTYR). About the sixth century arose a legend of the martyr that made him a Roman and brought him into relation with St. Anastasia, evidently to explain the ven-

eration of St. Chrysogonus in the Roman church that bears his name. According to this legend, Chrysogonus, at first a functionary of the *vicarius Urbis*, was the Christian teacher of Anastasia, daughter of the noble Roman Prætextatus. Being thrown into prison during the persecution of Diocletian, he comforted by his letters the severely afflicted Anastasia. By order of Diocletian, Chrysogonus was brought before the emperor at Aquileia, condemned to death, and beheaded. His corpse, thrown into the sea, was washed ashore and buried by the aged priest, Zoilus. In the legend the death of the saint is placed on the 23rd of November. In the actual Roman martyrology his feast is celebrated on 24 November; by the Greeks on 16 April.

SURIUS (ed.), *Acta S. Chrysogoni et sociorum*, in *Vitæ Sanctorum*, XII, 313 sqq.; MOMBRITIUS (ed.), *Sanctuarium*, I, 200 sqq.; *Metaphrastes*, in *P. G.*, CXVI, 573 sqq.; DUFOURCQ, *Etude sur les Gesta Martyrum romains* (Paris, 1900), 121; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions* (Paris, 1890), IV, 372· MARUCCHI, *Basiliques et églises de Rome* (Rome, 1902), 452 §qq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Chrysopolis, a titular see of Roman Arabia, not to be confounded with Chrysopolis (to-day Scutari), opposite Constantinople, which latter place was never a see. Our Chrysopolis was suffragan to Bostra in Arabia. It does not figure in Hierocles nor in Georgius Cyprius; perhaps it had a native name which has not been identified. Its name is, however, found in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" of Anastasius, Patriarch of Antioch in the sixth century. (See Echos d'Orient, X, May, 1907.) One Greek bishop is known, John, present at Chalcedon in 451 (Lequien, II, 867). Seven Latin titulars are known from 1297 to 1648 (Lequien, III, 1307; Eubel, I, 193 and 194, note 1; II, 143).

S. VAILHÉ.

Chur (anciently CURIA RHÆTORUM, in Ital. COIRA, Fr. COÏRE, in the local Romance language CUERA), DIOCESE OF (CURIENSIS), comprises at present the

VIEW OF CHUR

Swiss Cantons of Graubünden (Grisons), Glarus, Zürich, Unterwalden, and Uri, as well as the little Principality of Lichtenstein. The city of Chur, the residence of the bishop and capital of the Canton of Graubünden, is very ancient, having once been a Roman fortified camp. Its present population is about 10,000, of which number one-third are Catholics.

The first mention of a Bishop of Chur (St. Asimo) is at the Synod of Milan, as early as 451 (Mansi, IV, 141). The Rt. Rev. John Fidelis Battaglia, consecrated 1 March, 1889, is the ninety-sixth Bishop of Chur. The see was at first suffragan to that of Milan, but after the treaty of Verdun (843) it became suffragan to Mainz. In consequence of political changes it became, in 1803, immediately subject to the Holy See. According to local traditions, the first Bishop of Chur was St. Lucius, a reputed King of Britain, who is said to have died a martyr at Chur about the year 176, and whose relics are preserved in the cathedral. St. Lucius is venerated as the principal patron of the diocese. (See G. Mayer, "St. Luzi bei Chur", Lindau, 1876.) The country had to pass through very severe struggles for the true faith. Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards after him, attempted to introduce Arianism in the sixth and seventh centuries. During the dispute between Barbarossa and Pope Alexander III, Bishop Egino of Chur sided with the emperor, and was rewarded with the dignity of Prince of the Empire (1170). In later times the bishops were also temporal lords of the city, and several of them were better warriors than pastors. The struggles of Switzerland for liberty in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and, later, the secret preaching of Zwingli and Calvin, did great harm to the diocese, especially as the Catholic clergy neglected the instruction of the people. The Reformation was publicly proclaimed at Chur in 1524, and the two Catholic churches of St. Martin and St. Regula were given over to the Protestants, who retain possession of them to this day. The bishop fled, and his administrator, Abbot Theodor Schlegel, was publicly beheaded (1 January, 1529). Bishop Thomas Planta, a friend of St. Charles Borromeo, tried, but without success, to suppress Protestantism. He died, probably poisoned, 5 May, 1565. (See Camenisch, "Carlo Borromeo und die Gegenreform im Veltlin", 1901.) Twenty years later St. Charles sent the Capuchins into the endangered region, but Bishop Peter II (de Rascher) refused to admit them. His successor, Bishop John V (Flugi d'Aspermont, 1601–27), a saintly and courageous man, endeavoured to restore the Catholic religion, but was compelled to flee three times (1607, 1612, and 1617), and for several years a bloody war was waged between the Catholics and the Protestants. Finally, the newly erected Congregation of Propaganda commissioned the Capuchins to save the Catholic Faith among the people (1621). The first Capuchin superior of the mission was St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen, who, on his way from Sewis to Grüsch, a little north of Chur, was slain (24 April, 1622) by peasants whom the sermons of the Protestant preachers had wrought up to a fury. Some relics of this martyr are preserved in the cathedral at Chur. A second mission, that of Misocco and Calanca, in the southern part of the diocese, was entrusted to the Capuchins in 1635. These two missions (Rhætiæ and Mesauci) are at present prefectures Apostolic under the care of Italian Capuchins, and the prefects reside at the two cities of Obervatz and Cama, both in the Canton of Grisons.

Several holy and extraordinary men have contributed to the splendour of the Diocese of Chur. Four of its bishops—St. Asimo (c. 450), St. Valentinian (530–48), St. Ursicinus (d. 760), and St. Adalbert (1151–60)—are honoured as saints; St. Sigisbert flourished about the year 600, St. Pirminus a century later; St. Florian, whom the diocese has chosen as its second patron, lived in the ninth century, the hermit St. Gerold in the tenth. The Capuchin Theodosius Florentini, vicar-general from 1860 till his death (15 February, 1865), was a very distinguished missionary; in 1852 he erected the Hospital of the Cross at Chur; before this he had already laid the foundations of two female religious congregations, one for the instruction of children, the other for the care of the sick. Chur is the birthplace of the painter Angelica Kauffman.

The cathedral of Chur, which was begun by Bishop Tello (758–73), has a highly interesting crypt; it is built in Romanesque style, and contains remarkable paintings by Dürer and Holbein. According to the "Kirchliches Handlexicon" (Munich, 1906) the dio-

cese has a Catholic population of about 248,887 (non-Catholics, 431,356). There are 358 secular and 226 religious priests in charge of about 201 parishes, besides many chaplaincies and mission-stations. The largest Catholic community is at Zurich (43,655). The 35 Capuchins of the prefectures Apostolic had charge of 79 chapels in 1906. Three Benedictine abbeys—Einsiedeln, Engelberg, and Disentis—are within the diocese and, with the church of St. Nicolaus von der Flue at Sachseln, are places of pilgrimage. There is an ecclesiastical seminary at Chur, besides colleges at Schwyz, Disentis, Einsiedeln, Engelberg, Sarnen, and Stans. There are in the diocese nine orders of men, ten orders of women (Franciscans, Augustinians, Dominicans, Benedictines, and others), and eleven congregations.

EICHHORN, *Episcopatus Curiensis* (St. Blasien, 1797); MOHR, *Codex diplomaticus zur Gesch. Cur.-Rhætiens.* (1846–61); MONT AND PLATTNER, *Das Hochstift und der Staat Chur* (Chur, 1860); FETZ, *Das Bistum Chur, histor.-statistisch beschrieben* (Chur, 1863–69); WERNER, *Kath. Kirchenatlas* (Freiburg, 1888); MÜLINEN, *Helvetia Sacra* (Bern, 1888), I; C. F., *Leben und Wirken des P. Theodos. Florentini* (Ingenbohl, 1878); LÜTOLF, *Glaubensboten der Schweiz vor dem hl. Gallus* (Lucerne, 1871); *Acta Canonizationis S. Fidelis a Sigmaringen* (Rome, 1749); ALEXIUS SPIRENSIS, *Historialis relatio eorum quæ in Missione Rhæticâ acciderunt*, MS. in Capuchin Archives at Rome, printed in *Analecta Capucc.* (1898), 265 sqq.; *Analecta Capucc.*, passim; MAYER, *Vaticano-Curiensia* (1888); BÜCHI, *Die katholische Kirche in der Schweiz* (1902).

OTTO JÉRON.

Church, THE.—The term *church* (A. S., *cirice, circe;* Mod. Ger., *Kirche;* Sw., *Kyrka*) is the name employed in the Teutonic languages to render the Greek *ἐκκλησία, ecclesia*, the term by which the New Testament writers denote the society founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ. The derivation of the word has been much debated. It is now agreed that it is derived from the Greek *κυριακόν, cyriacon*, i. e. the Lord's house, a term which from the third century was used, as well as *ἐκκλησία*, to signify a Christian place of worship. This, though the less usual expression, had apparently obtained currency among the Teutonic races. The Northern tribes had been accustomed to pillage the Christian churches of the empire, long before their own conversion. Hence, even prior to the arrival of the Saxons in Britain, their language had acquired words to designate some of the externals of the Christian religion. The present article is arranged as follows: (I) The term *Ecclesia;* (II) The Church in Prophecy; (III) Its Constitution by Christ; the Church after the Ascension; (IV) Its Organization by the Apostles; (V) The Church a Divine Society; (VI) The Church the Necessary Means of Salvation; (VII) Visibility of the Church; (VIII) The Principle of Authority; Infallibility; Jurisdiction; (IX) Members of the Church; (X) Indefectibility of the Church; Continuity; (XI) Universality of the Church; the "Branch" Theory; (XII) Notes of the Church; (XIII) The Church a Perfect Society.

I. THE TERM ECCLESIA.—In order to understand the precise force of this word, something must first be said as to its employment by the Septuagint translators of the Old Testament. Although in one or two places (Ps. xxv, 5; Judith, vi, 21; etc.) the word is used without religious signification, merely in the sense of "an assembly", this is not usually the case. Ordinarily it is employed as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew קהל, *qāhāl*, i. e., the entire community of the children of Israel viewed in their religious aspect. Two Hebrew words are employed in the Old Testament to signify the congregation of Israel, viz. קהל, *qāhāl*, and עדה, *'êdāh*. In the Septuagint these are rendered, respectively, *ἐκκλησία* and *συναγωγή*. Thus in Prov., v, 14, where the words occur together, "in the midst of the church and the congregation" (בתוך קהל ועדה), the Greek rendering is *ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας καὶ συναγωγῆς*. The distinction is indeed not rigidly observed—thus in Ex., Lev., Num., both words are regularly represented by *συναγωγή*—but it is adhered to in the great majority of cases, and may be regarded as an established rule. In the writings of the New Testament the words are sharply distinguished. With them *ecclesia* denotes the Church of Christ; *synagoga*, the Jews still adhering to the worship of the Old Covenant. Occasionally, it is true, *ecclesia* is employed in its general significance of "assembly" (Acts, xix, 32; I Cor., xiv, 19); and *synagoga* occurs once in reference to a gathering of Christians, though apparently of a non-religious character (James, ii, 2.) But *ecclesia* is never used by the Apostles to denote the Jewish Church. The word as a technical expression had been transferred to the community of Christian believers.

It has been frequently disputed whether there is any difference in the signification of the two words. St. Augustine (in Psalm. lxxvii, in P. L., XXXVI, 984) distinguishes them on the ground that *ecclesia* is indicative of the calling together of men, *synagoga* of the forcible herding together of irrational creatures: "congregatio magis pecorum convocatio magis hominum intelligi solet". But it may be doubted whether there is any foundation for this view. It would appear, however, that the term קהל, *qāhāl*, was used with the special meaning of "those called by God to eternal life", while עדה, *'êdāh*, denoted merely "the actually existing Jewish community" (Schürer, Hist. Jewish People, II, 59). Though the evidence for this distinction is drawn from the Mishna, and thus belongs to a somewhat later date, yet the difference in meaning probably existed at the time of Christ's ministry. But however this may have been, His intention in employing the term, hitherto used of the Hebrew people viewed as a church, to denote the society He Himself was establishing cannot be mistaken. It implied the claim that this society now constituted the true people of God, that the Old Covenant was passing away, and that He, the promised Messias, was inaugurating a New Covenant with a New Israel.

As signifying the Church, the word *Ecclesia* is used by Christian writers, sometimes in a wider, sometimes in a more restricted sense. (a) It is employed to denote all who, from the beginning of the world, have believed in the one true God, and have been made His children by grace. In this sense, it is sometimes distinguished, signifying the Church before the Old Covenant, the Church of the Old Covenant, or the Church of the New Covenant. Thus St. Gregory (Epp. V, ep. xviii ad. Joan. Ep. Const., in P. L., LXXVII, 740) writes: "Sancti ante legem, sancti sub lege, sancti sub gratiâ, omnes hi . . . in membris Ecclesiæ sunt constituti" (The saints before the Law, the saints under the Law, and the saints under grace—all these are constituted members of the Church). (b) It may signify the whole body of the faithful, including not merely the members of the Church who are alive on earth but those, too, whether in heaven or in purgatory, who form part of the one communion of saints. Considered thus, the Church is divided into the Church Militant, the Church Suffering, and the Church Triumphant. (c) It is further employed to signify the Church Militant of the New Testament. Even in this restricted acceptation, there is some variety in the use of the term. The disciples of a single locality are often referred to in the New Testament as a Church (Apoc., ii, 18; Rom., xvi, 4; Acts, ix, 31), and St. Paul even applies the term to disciples belonging to a single household (Rom., xvi, 5; I Cor., xvi, 19, Col., iv, 15; Philem., i, 2). Moreover, it may designate specially those who exercise the office of teaching and ruling the faithful, the *Ecclesia Docens* (Matt., xviii, 17), or again the governed as

distinguished from their pastors, the *Ecclesia Discens* (Acts xx, 28). In all these cases the name belonging to the whole is applied to a part. The term, in its full meaning, denotes the whole body of the faithful, both rulers and ruled, throughout the world (Eph., i, 22; Col., i, 18). It is in this meaning that the Church is treated of in the present article. As thus understood, the definition of the Church given by Bellarmine is that usually adopted by Catholic theologians: "A body of men united together by the profession of the same Christian Faith, and by participation in the same sacraments, under the governance of lawful pastors, more especially of the Roman Pontiff, the sole vicar of Christ on earth" (Cœtus hominum ejusdem christianæ fidei professione, et eorumdem sacramentorum communione colligatus, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum et præcipue unius Christi in Terris vicarii Romani Pontificis.—Bellarmine, De Eccl., III, ii, 9). The accuracy of this definition will appear in the course of the article.

II. The Church in Prophecy.—Hebrew prophecy relates in almost equal proportions to the person and to the work of the Messias. This work was conceived as consisting of the establishment of a kingdom, in which he was to reign over a regenerated Israel. The prophetic writings describe for us with precision many of the characteristics which were to distinguish that kingdom. Christ during His ministry affirmed not only that the prophecies relating to the Messias were fulfilled in His own person, but also that the expected Messianic kingdom was none other than His Church. A consideration of the features of the kingdom as depicted by the Prophets, must therefore greatly assist us in understanding Christ's intentions in the institution of the Church. Indeed many of the expressions employed by Him in relation to the society He was establishing are only intelligible in the light of these prophecies and of the consequent expectations of the Jewish people. It will moreover appear that we have a weighty argument for the supernatural character of the Christian revelation in the precise fulfilment of the sacred oracles.

A characteristic feature of the Messianic kingdom, as predicted, is its universal extent. Not merely the twelve tribes, but the Gentiles are to yield allegiance to the Son of David. All kings are to serve and obey him; his dominion is to extend to the ends of the earth (Pss. xxi, 28 sq.; ii, 7-12; cxvi, 1; Zach., ix, 10). Another series of remarkable passages declares that the subject nations will possess the unity conferred by a common faith and a common worship—a feature represented under the striking image of the concourse of all peoples and nations to worship at Jerusalem. "It shall come to pass in the last days [באחרית הימים, i. e. in the Messianic Era] . . . that many nations shall say: Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth out of Sion, and the word of the Lord out of Jerusalem" (Mich., iv, 1-2; cf. Is., ii, 2; Zach., viii, 3). This unity of worship is to be the fruit of a Divine revelation common to all the inhabitants of the earth (Zach., xiv, 8).

Corresponding to the triple office of the Messias as priest, prophet, and king, it will be noted that in relation to the kingdom the Sacred Writings lay stress on three points: (a) it is to be endowed with a new and peculiar sacrificial system; (b) it is to be the kingdom of truth possessed of a Divine revelation; (c) it is to be governed by an authority emanating from the Messias. (a) In regard to the first of these points, the priesthood of the Messias Himself is explicitly stated (Ps. cix, 4); while it is further taught that the worship which He is to inaugurate shall supersede the sacrifices of the Old Dispensation. This is implied, as the Apostle tells us, in the very title, "a priest after the order of Melchisedech"; and the same truth is contained in the prediction that a new priesthood is to be formed, drawn from other peoples besides the Israelites (Is., lxvi, 18), and in the words of the Prophet Malachias which foretell the institution of a new sacrifice to be offered "from the rising of the sun even to the going down" (Mal., i, 11). The sacrifices offered by the priesthood of the Messianic kingdom are to endure as long as day and night shall last (Jer., xxxiii, 20). (b) The revelation of the Divine truth under the New Dispensation is attested by Jeremias: "Behold the days shall come saith the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Juda . . and they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, saying: Know the Lord: for all shall know me from the least of them even to the greatest" (Jer., xxxi, 31, 34), while Zacharias assures us that in those days Jerusalem shall be known as the city of truth. (Zach., viii, 3). (c) The passages which foretell that the kingdom will possess a peculiar principle of authority in the personal rule of the Messias are numerous (e. g. Pss. ii; lxxi; Is., ix, 6 sq.); but in relation to Christ's own words, it is of interest to observe that in some of these passages the prediction is expressed under the metaphor of a shepherd guiding and governing his flock (Ezech., xxxiv, 23; xxxvii, 24-28). It is noteworthy, moreover, that just as the prophecies in regard to the priestly office foretell the appointment of a priesthood subordinate to the Messias, so those which relate to the office of government indicate that the Messias will associate with Himself other "shepherds", and will exercise His authority over the nations through rulers delegated to govern in His name (Jer., xviii, 6; Ps. xliv, 17; cf. St. Augustine Enarr. in Psalm. xliv, no. 32). Another feature of the kingdom is to be the sanctity of its members. The way to it is to be called "the holy way: the unclean shall not pass over it". The uncircumcised and unclean are not to enter into the renewed Jerusalem (Is., xxxv, 8; lii, 1).

The later uninspired apocalyptic literature of the Jews shows us how profoundly these predictions had influenced their national hopes, and explains for us the intense expectation among the populace described in the Gospel narratives. In these works as in the inspired prophecies the traits of the Messianic kingdom present two very different aspects. On the one hand, the Messias is a Davidic king who gathers together the dispersed of Israel, and establishes on this earth a kingdom of purity and sinlessness (Psalms of Solomon, xvii). The foreign foe is to be subdued (Assumpt. Moses, c. x) and the wicked are to be judged in the valley of the son of Hinnon (Enoch, xxv, xxvii, xc). On the other hand, the kingdom is described in eschatological characters. The Messias is pre-existent and Divine (Enoch, Simil., xlviii, 3); the kingdom He establishes is to be a heavenly kingdom inaugurated by a great world-catastrophe, which separates this world (*αἰὼν οὗτος*, עולם הזה), from the world to come *αἰὼν μέλλων*, עולם הבא). This catastrophe is to be accompanied by a judgment both of angels and of men (Jubilees, x, 8; v, 10; Assumpt. Moses, x, 1). The dead will rise (Ps. Solom., iii, 11) and all the members of the Messianic kingdom will become like to the Messias (Enoch, Simil., xc, 37). This twofold aspect of the Jewish hopes in regard to the coming Messias must be borne in mind, if Christ's use of the expression "Kingdom of God" is to be understood. Not infrequently, it is true, He employs it in an eschatological sense. But far more commonly He uses it of the kingdom set up on this earth—of His Church. These are indeed, not two kingdoms, but one. The Kingdom of God to be established at the last day is the Church in her final triumph.

III. Constitution by Christ.—The Baptist pro-

claimed the near approach of the Kingdom of God, and of the Messianic Era. He bade all who would share its blessings prepare themselves by penance. His own mission, he said, was to prepare the way of the Messias. To his disciples he indicated Jesus of Nazareth as the Messias whose advent he had declared (John, i, 29-31). From the very commencement of His ministry Christ laid claim in an explicit way to the Messianic dignity. In the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke, iv, 21) He asserts that the prophecies are fulfilled in His person; He declares that He is greater than Solomon (Luke, xi, 31), more venerable than the Temple (Matt., xii, 6), Lord of the sabbath (Luke, vi, 5). John, He says, is Elias, the promised forerunner (Matt., xvii, 12); and to John's messengers He vouchsafes the proofs of His Messianic dignity which they request (Luke, vii, 22). He demands implicit faith on the ground of His Divine legation (John, vi, 29). His public entry into Jerusalem was the acceptance by the whole people of a claim again and again reiterated before them. The theme of His preaching throughout is the Kingdom of God which He has come to establish. St. Mark, describing the beginning of His ministry, says that He came into Galilee saying, "The time is accomplished, and the Kingdom of God is at hand". For the kingdom which He was even then establishing in their midst, the Law and the Prophets had been, He said, but a preparation (Luke, xvi, 16; cf. Matt., iv, 23; ix, 35; xiii, 17; xxi, 43; xxiv, 14; Mark, i, 14; Luke, iv, 43; viii, 1; ix, 2, 60; xviii, 17).

When it is asked what is this kingdom of which Christ spoke, there can be but one answer. It is His Church, the society of those who accept His Divine legation, and admit His right to the obedience of faith which He claimed. His whole activity is directed to the establishment of such a society: He organizes it and appoints rulers over it, establishes rites and ceremonies in it, transfers to it the name which had hitherto designated the Jewish Church, and solemnly warns the Jews that the kingdom was no longer theirs, but had been taken from them and given to another people. The several steps taken by Christ in organizing the Church are traced by the Evangelists. He is represented as gathering numerous disciples, but as selecting twelve from their number to be His companions in an especial manner. These share His life. To them He reveals the more hidden parts of His doctrine (Matt., xiii, 11). He sends them as His deputies to preach the kingdom, and bestows on them the power to work miracles. All are bound to accept their message; and those who refuse to listen to them shall meet a fate more terrible than that of Sodom and Gomorrha (Matt., x, 1-15). The Sacred Writers speak of these twelve chosen disciples in a manner indicating that they are regarded as forming a corporate body. In several passages they are still termed "the twelve" even when the number, understood literally, would be inexact. The name is applied to them when they have been reduced to eleven by the defection of Judas, on an occasion when only ten of them were present, and again after the appointment of St. Paul has increased their number to thirteen (Luke, xxiv, 33; John, xx, 24; I Cor., xv, 5; Apoc., xxi, 14).

In this constitution of the Apostolate Christ lays the foundation of His Church. But it is not till the action of official Judaism had rendered it manifestly impossible to hope the Jewish Church would admit His claim, that He prescribes for the Church as a body independent of the synagogue and possessed of an administration of her own. After the breach had become definite, He calls the Apostles together and speaks to them of the judicial action of the Church, distinguishing, in an unmistakable manner, between the private individual who undertakes the work of fraternal correction, and the ecclesiastical authority empowered to pronounce a judicial sentence (Matt., xviii, 15-17). To the jurisdiction thus conferred He attached a Divine sanction. A sentence thus pronounced, He assured the Apostles, should be ratified in heaven. A further step was the appointment of St. Peter to be the chief of the Twelve. For this position he had already been designated (Matt., xvi, 15 sqq.) on an occasion previous to that just mentioned: at Cæsarea Philippi, Christ had declared him to be the rock on which He would build His Church, thus affirming that the continuance and increase of the Church would rest on the office created in the person of Peter. To him, moreover, were to be given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven—an expression signifying the gift of plenary authority (Is., xxii, 22). The promise thus made was fulfilled after the Resurrection, on the occasion narrated in John, xxi. Here Christ employs a simile used on more than one occasion by Himself to denote His own relation to the members of His Church—that of the shepherd and his flock. His solemn charge, "Feed my sheep", constituted Peter the common shepherd of the whole collective flock. (For a further consideration of the Petrine texts see article PRIMACY.) To the twelve Christ committed the charge of spreading the kingdom among all nations, appointing the rite of baptism as the one means of admission to a participation in its privileges (Matt., xxviii, 19).

In the course of this article detailed consideration will be given to the principal characteristics of the Church. Christ's teaching on this point may be briefly summarized here. It is to be a kingdom ruled in His absence by men (Matt., xviii, 18; John, xxi, 17). It is therefore a visible theocracy; and it will be substituted for the Jewish theocracy that has rejected Him (Matt., xxi, 43). In it, until the day of judgment, the bad will be mingled with the good (Matt., xiii, 41). Its extent will be universal (Matt., xxviii, 19), and its duration to the end of time (Matt., xiii, 49); all powers that oppose it shall be crushed (Matt., xxi, 44). Moreover, it will be a supernatural kingdom of truth, in the world, though not of it (John, xviii, 36). It will be one and undivided, and this unity shall be a witness to all men that its founder came from God (John, xvii, 21).

It is to be noticed that certain recent critics contest the positions maintained in the preceding paragraphs. They deny alike that Christ claimed to be the Messias, and that the kingdom of which He spoke was His Church. Thus, as regards Christ's claim to Messianic dignity, they say that Christ does not declare Himself to be the Messias in His preaching: that He bids the possessed who proclaimed Him the Son of God be silent: that the people did not suspect His Messiahship, but formed various extravagant hypotheses as to his personality. It is manifestly impossible within the limits of this article to enter on a detailed discussion of these points. But, in the light of the testimony of the passages above cited, it will be seen that the position is entirely untenable. In reference to the Kingdom of God, many of the critics hold that the current Jewish conception was wholly eschatological, and that Christ's references to it must one and all be thus interpreted. This view renders inexplicable the numerous passages in which Christ speaks of the kingdom as present, and further involves a misconception as to the nature of Jewish expectations, which, as has been seen, together with eschatological traits, contained others of a different character. Harnack (What is Christianity? p. 62) holds that in its inner meaning the kingdom as conceived by Christ is "a purely religious blessing, the inner link of the soul with the living God". Such an interpretation can in no possible way be reconciled with Christ's utterances on the subject. The whole tenor of his expressions is to lay stress on the concept of a theocratic society.

The Church after the Ascension.—The doctrine of the Church as set forth by the Apostles after the Ascension is in all respects identical with the teaching of Christ just described. St. Peter, in his first sermon, delivered on the day of Pentecost, declares that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messianic king (Acts, ii, 36). The means of salvation which he indicates is baptism; and by baptism his converts are aggregated to the society of disciples (ii, 41). Though in these days the Christians still availed themselves of the Temple services, yet from the first the brotherhood of Christ formed a society essentially distinct from the synagogue. The reason why St. Peter bids his hearers accept baptism is none other than that they may "save themselves from this unbelieving generation". Within the society of believers not only were the members united by common rites, but the tie of unity was so close as to bring about in the Church of Jerusalem that condition of things in which the disciples had all things common (ii, 44).

Christ had declared that His kingdom should be spread among all nations, and had committed the execution of the work to the twelve (Matt., xxviii, 19). Yet the universal mission of the Church revealed itself but gradually. St. Peter indeed makes mention of it from the first (Acts, ii, 39). But in the earliest years the Apostolic activity is confined to Jerusalem alone. Indeed an old tradition (Apollonius, cited by Eusebius "Hist. Eccl.", V, xvii, and Clem. Alex., "Strom.", VI, v, in P. G. IX, 264) asserts that Christ had bidden the Apostles wait twelve years in Jerusalem before dispersing to carry their message elsewhere. The first notable advance occurs consequent on the persecution which arose after the death of Stephen, A. D. 37. This was the occasion of the preaching of the Gospel to the Samaritans, a people excluded from the privileges of Israel, though acknowledging the Mosaic Law (Acts, viii, 5). A still further expansion resulted from the revelation directing St. Peter to admit to baptism Cornelius, a devout Gentile, i. e. one associated to the Jewish religion but not circumcised. From this time forward circumcision and the observance of the Law were not a condition requisite for incorporation into the Church. But the final step of admitting those Gentiles who had known no previous connexion with the religion of Israel, and whose life had been spent in paganism, was not taken till more than fifteen years after Christ's Ascension; it did not occur, it would seem, before the day described in Acts xiii, 46, when, at Antioch in Pisidia, Paul and Barnabas announced that since the Jews accounted themselves unworthy of eternal life they would "turn to the Gentiles".

In the Apostolic teaching the term *Church*, from the very first, takes the place of the expression *Kingdom of God* (Acts, v, 11). Where others than the Jews were concerned, the greater suitability of the former name is evident; for *Kingdom of God* had special reference to Jewish beliefs. But the change of title only emphasizes the social unity of the members. They are the new congregation of Israel—the theocratic polity: they are the people (λαός) of God (Acts, xv, 14; Rom., ix, 25; II Cor., vi, 16; I Peter, ii, 9 sq.; Heb., viii, 10; Apoc., xviii, 4; xxi, 3). By their admission to the Church, the Gentiles have been grafted in and form part of God's fruitful olive-tree, while apostate Israel has been broken off (Rom., xi, 24). St. Paul, writing to his Gentile converts at Corinth, terms the ancient Hebrew Church "our fathers" (I Cor., x, 1). Indeed from time to time the previous phraseology is employed, and the Gospel message is termed the preaching of the Kingdom of God (Acts, xx, 25; xxviii, 31).

Within the Church the Apostles exercised that regulative power with which Christ had endowed them. It was no chaotic mob, but a true society possessed of a corporate life, and organized in various orders. The evidence shows the twelve to have possessed (a) a power of jurisdiction, in virtue of which they wielded a legislative and judicial authority, and (b) a magisterial office to teach the Divine revelation entrusted to them. Thus (a) we find St. Paul authoritatively prescribing for the order and discipline of the churches. He does not advise; he directs (I Cor., xi, 34; xxvi, 1; Titus, i, 5). He pronounces judicial sentence (I Cor., v, 5; II Cor., ii, 10), and his sentences, like those of other Apostles, receive at times the solemn sanction of miraculous punishment (I Tim., i, 20; Acts, v, 1–10). In like manner he bids his delegate Timothy hear the causes even of priests, and rebuke, in the sight of all, those who sin (I Tim., v, 19 sq.). (b) With no less definiteness does he assert that the Apostolate carries with it a doctrinal authority, which all are bound to recognize. God has sent them, he affirms, to claim "the obedience of faith" (Rom., i, 5; xv, 18). Further, his solemnly-expressed desire, that even if an angel from heaven were to preach another doctrine to the Galatians than that which he had delivered to them, he should be anathema (Gal., i, 8), involves a claim to infallibility in the teaching of revealed truth.

While the whole Apostolic College enjoyed this power in the Church, St. Peter always appears in that position of primacy which Christ assigned to him. It is Peter who receives into the Church the first converts, alike from Judaism and from heathenism (Acts, ii, 41; x, 5 sq.), who works the first miracle (Acts, iii, 1 sqq.), who inflicts the first ecclesiastical penalty (Acts, v, 1 sqq.). It is Peter who casts out of the Church the first heretic, Simon Magus (Acts, viii, 21), who makes the first Apostolic visitation of the churches (Acts, ix, 32), and who pronounces the first dogmatic decision (Acts, xv, 7). (See Schanz, III, p. 460.) So indisputable was his position that when St. Paul was about to undertake the work of preaching to the heathen the Gospel which Christ had revealed to him, he regarded it as necessary to obtain recognition from Peter (Gal., i, 18). More than this was not needful: for the approbation of Peter was definitive.

IV. Organization by the Apostles.—Few subjects have been so much debated during the past half-century as the organization of the primitive Church. The present article cannot deal with the whole of this wide subject. Its scope is limited to a single point. An endeavour will be made to estimate the existing information regarding the Apostolic Age itself. Further light is thrown on the matter by a consideration of the organization that is found to have existed in the period immediately subsequent to the death of the last Apostle. (See Bishop.) The independent evidence derived from the consideration of each of these periods will, in the opinion of the present writer, be found, when fairly weighed, to yield similar results. Thus the conclusions here advanced, over and above their intrinsic value, derive support from the independent witness of another series of authorities tending in all essentials to confirm their accuracy. The question at issue is, whether the Apostles did, or did not, establish in the Christian communities a hierarchical organization. All Catholic scholars, together with some few Protestants, hold that they did so. The opposite view is maintained by the rationalist critics, together with the greater number of Protestants.

In considering the evidence of the New Testament on the subject, it appears at once that there is a marked difference between the state of things revealed in the later New Testament writings, and that which appears in those of an earlier date. In the earlier writings we find but little mention of an official organization. Such official positions as may

have existed would seem to have been of minor importance in the presence of the miraculous charismata (q. v.) of the Holy Spirit conferred upon individuals, and fitting them to act as organs of the community in various grades. St. Paul in his earlier Epistles has no messages for the bishops or deacons, although the circumstances dealt with in the Epistles to the Corinthians and in that to the Galatians would seem to suggest a reference to the local rulers of the Church. When he enumerates the various functions to which God has called various members of the Church, he does not give us a list of Church offices. "God", he says, "hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors [διδάσκαλοι]; after that miracles; then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues" (I Cor., xii, 28). This is not a list of official designations. It is a list of "charismata" bestowed by the Holy Spirit, enabling the recipient to fulfil some special function. The only term which forms an exception to this is that of *apostle*. Here the word is doubtless used in the sense in which it signifies the twelve and St. Paul only. As thus applied the Apostolate was a distinct office, involving a personal mission received from the Risen Lord Himself (I Cor., i, 1; Gal., i, 1). Such a position was of altogether too special a character for its recipients to be placed in any other category. The term could indeed be used in a wider reference. It is used of Barnabas (Acts, xiv, 13) and of Andronicus and Junias, St. Paul's kinsmen (Rom., xvi, 7). In this extended signification it is apparently equivalent to *evangelist* (Eph., iv, 11; II Tim., iv, 5) and denotes those "apostolic men", who, like the Apostles, went from place to place labouring in new fields, but who had received their commission from them, and not from Christ in person. (See APOSTLES.)

The "prophets", the second class mentioned, were men to whom it was given to speak from time to time under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit as the recipients of supernatural inspiration (Acts, xiii, 2; xv, 23; xxi, 11; etc.). By the nature of the case the exercise of such a function could be occasional only. The "charisma" of the "doctors" (or teachers) differed from that of the prophets, in that it could be used continuously. They had received the gift of intelligent insight into revealed truth, and the power to impart it to others. It is manifest that those who possessed such a power must have exercised a function of vital moment to the Church in those first days, when the Christian communities consisted to so large an extent of new converts. The other "charismata" mentioned do not call for special notice. But the prophets and teachers would appear to have possessed an importance as organs of the community, eclipsing that of the local ministry. Thus in Acts, xiii, 1, it is simply related that there were in the Church which was at Antioch prophets and doctors. There is no mention of bishops or deacons. And in the Didache—a work as it would seem of the first century, written before the last Apostle had passed away—the author enjoins respect for the bishops and deacons, on the ground that they have a claim similar to that of the prophets and doctors. "Appoint for yourselves", he writes, "bishops and deacons, worthy of the Lord, men who are meek, and not lovers of money, and true and approved; for unto you they also perform the service [λειτουργοῦσι τὴν λειτουργίαν] of the prophets and doctors. Therefore despise them not: for they are your honourable men along with the prophets and teachers" (c. xv).

It would appear, then, indisputable that in the earliest years of the Christian Church ecclesiastical functions were in a large measure fulfilled by men who had been specially endowed for this purpose with "charismata" of the Holy Spirit, and that as long as these gifts endured, the local ministry occupied a position of less importance and influence. Yet, though this be the case, there would seem to be ample ground for holding that the local ministry was of Apostolic institution: and, further, that towards the later part of the Apostolic Age the abundant "charismata" were ceasing, and that the Apostles themselves took measures to determine the position of the official hierarchy as the directive authority of the Church. The evidence for the existence of such a local ministry is plentiful in the later Epistles of St. Paul (Phil., I and II Tim., and Titus). The Epistle to the Philippians opens with a special greeting to the bishops and deacons. Those who hold these official positions are recognized as the representatives in some sort of the Church. Throughout the letter there is no mention of the "charismata", which figure so largely in the earlier Epistles. It is indeed urged by Hort (Christian Ecclesia, p. 211) that even here these terms are not official titles. But in view of their employment as titles in documents so nearly contemporary, as I Clem., c. 4, and the Didache, such a contention seems devoid of all probability.

In the Pastoral Epistles the new situation appears even more clearly. The purpose of these writings was to instruct Timothy and Titus regarding the manner in which they were to organize the local Churches. The total absence of all reference to the spiritual gifts can scarcely be otherwise explained than by supposing that they no longer existed in the communities, or that they were at most exceptional phenomena. Instead, we find the Churches governed by a hierarchical organization of bishops, sometimes also termed presbyters, and deacons. That the terms *bishop* and *presbyter* are synonymous is evident from Titus, i, 5–7: "I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldest . . . ordain priests in every city . . . For a bishop must be without crime." These presbyters form a corporate body (I Tim., iv, 14), and they are entrusted with the twofold charge of governing the Church (I Tim., iii, 5) and of teaching (I Tim., iii, 2; Titus, i, 9). The selection of those who are to fill this post does not depend on the possession of supernatural gifts. It is required that they should not be unproved neophytes, that they should be under no charge, should have displayed moral fitness for the work, and should be capable of teaching. (I Tim., iii, 2–7; Titus, i, 5–9.) The appointment to this office was by a solemn laying on of hands (I Tim., v, 22). Some words addressed by St. Paul to Timothy, in reference to the ceremony as it had taken place in Timothy's case, throw light upon its nature. "I admonish thee", he writes, "that thou stir up the grace (χάρισμα) of God, which is in thee by the laying on of my hands" (II Tim., i, 6). The rite is here declared to be the means by which a charismatic gift is conferred; and, further, the gift in question, like the baptismal character, is permanent in its effects. The recipient needs but to "waken into life" [ἀναζωπυρεῖν] the grace he thus possesses in order to avail himself of it. It is an abiding endowment. There can be no reason for asserting that the imposition of hands, by which Timothy was instructed to appoint the presbyters to their office, was a rite of a different character, a mere formality without practical import.

With the evidence before us, certain other notices in the New Testament writings, pointing to the existence of this local ministry, may be considered. There is mention of presbyters at Jerusalem at a date apparently immediately subsequent to the dispersion of the Apostles (Acts, xi, 30; cf. xv, 2; xvi, 4; xxi, 18). Again, we are told that Paul and Barnabas, as they retraced their steps on their first missionary journey, appointed presbyters in every Church (Acts, xiv, 22). So too the injunction to the Thessalonians

(I Thess., v, 12) to have regard to those who are over them in the Lord (*προϊστάμενοι*; cf. Rom., xii, 6) would seem to imply that there also St. Paul had invested certain members of the community with a pastoral charge. Still more explicit is the evidence contained in the account of St. Paul's interview with the Ephesian elders (Acts, xx, 17-23). It is told that, sending from Miletus to Ephesus, he summoned "the presbyters of the Church", and in the course of his charge addressed them as follows: "Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops to tend [*ποιμαίνειν*] the Church of God" (xx, 28). St. Peter employs similar language: "The presbyters that are among you, I beseech, who am myself also a presbyter . . tend [*ποιμάνατε*] the flock of God which is among you." These expressions leave no doubt as to the office designated by St. Paul, when in Eph., iv, 11, he enumerates the gifts of the Ascended Lord as follows: "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some *pastors and doctors* [*τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους*]. The Epistle of St. James provides us with yet another reference to this office, where the sick man is bidden send for the presbyters of the Church, that he may receive at their hands the rite of unction (James, v, 14).

The term *presbyter* was of common use in the Jewish Church, as denoting the "rulers" of the synagogue (cf. Luke, xiii, 14). Hence it has been argued by some non-Catholic writers that in the bishops and deacons of the New Testament there is simply the synagogal organization familiar to the first converts, and introduced by them into the Christian communities. St. Paul's concept of the Church, it is urged, is essentially opposed to any rigid governmental system; yet this familiar form of organization was gradually established even in the Churches he had founded. In regard to this view it appears enough to say that the resemblance between the Jewish "rulers of the synagogue" and the Christian *presbyter-episcopus* goes no farther than the name. The Jewish official was purely civil and held office for a time only. The Christian presbyterate was for life, and its functions were spiritual. There is perhaps more ground for the view advocated by some (cf. de Smedt, Revue des quest. hist., vols. XLIV, L), that *presbyter* and *episcopus* may not in all cases be perfectly synonymous. The term *presbyter* is undoubtedly an honorific title, while that of *episcopus* primarily indicates the function performed. It is possible that the former title may have had a wider significance than the latter. The designation *presbyter*, it is suggested, may have been given to all those who were recognized as having a claim to some voice in directing the affairs of the community, whether this were based on official status, or social rank, or benefactions to the local Church, or on some other ground; while those presbyters who had received the laying on of hands would be known, not simply as "presbyters", but as "presiding [*προϊστάμενοι*—I Thess., v. 12] presbyters", "presbyter-bishops", "presbyter-rulers" (*ἡγούμενοι*—Heb., xiii, 17).

It remains to consider whether the so-called "monarchical" episcopate was instituted by the Apostles. Besides establishing a college of presbyter-bishops, did they further place one man in a position of supremacy, entrusting the government of the Church to him, and endowing him with Apostolic authority over the Christian community? Even if we take into account the Scriptural evidence alone, there are sufficient grounds for answering this question in the affirmative. From the time of the dispersion of the Apostles, St. James appears in an episcopal relation to the Church of Jerusalem (Acts, xii, 17; xv, 13; Gal., ii, 12). In the other Christian communities the institution of "monarchical" bishops was a somewhat later development. At first the Apostles themselves fulfilled, it would seem, all the duties of supreme oversight. They established the office when the growing needs of the Church demanded it. The Pastoral Epistles leave no room to doubt that Timothy and Titus were sent as bishops to Ephesus and to Crete respectively. To Timothy full Apostolic powers are conceded. Notwithstanding his youth he holds authority over both clergy and laity. To him is confided the duty of guarding the purity of the Church's faith, of ordaining priests, of exercising jurisdiction. Moreover, St. Paul's exhortation to him, "to keep the commandment without spot, blameless, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ", shows that this was no transitory mission. A charge so worded includes in its sweep, not Timothy alone, but his successors in an office which is to last until the Second Advent. Local tradition unhesitatingly reckoned him among the occupants of the episcopal see. At the Council of Chalcedon, the Church of Ephesus counted a succession of twenty-seven bishops commencing with Timothy (Mansi, VII, 293; cf. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., III, iv, v).

These are not the sole evidences which the New Testament affords of the monarchical episcopate. In the Apocalypse the "angels" to whom the letters to the seven Churches are addressed are almost certainly the bishops of the respective communities. Some commentators, indeed, have held them to be personifications of the communities themselves. But this explanation can hardly stand. St. John, throughout, addresses the angel as being responsible for the community precisely as he would address its ruler. Moreover, in the symbolism of ch. i, the two are represented under different figures: the angels are the stars in the right hand of the Son of Man; the seven candlesticks are the image which figures the communities. The very term *angel*, it should be noticed, is practically synonymous with *apostle*, and thus is aptly chosen to designate the episcopal office. Again the messages to Archippus (Col., iv, 17; Philem., 2) imply that he held a position of special dignity, superior to that of the other presbyters. The mention of him in a letter entirely concerned with a private matter, as is that to Philemon, is hardly explicable unless he were the official head of the Colossian Church. We have therefore four important indications of the existence of an office in the local Churches, held by a single person, and carrying with it Apostolical authority. Nor can any difficulty be occasioned by the fact that as yet no special title distinguishes these successors of the Apostles from the ordinary presbyters. It is in the nature of things that the office should exist before a title is assigned to it. The name of *apostle*, we have seen, was not confined to the Twelve. St. Peter (I Peter, v, 1) and St. John (II and III John, i, 1) both speak of themselves as "presbyters". St. Paul speaks of the Apostolate as a *διακονία*. A parallel case in later ecclesiastical history is afforded by the word *pope*. This title was not appropriated to the exclusive use of the Holy See till the eleventh century. Yet no one maintains that the supreme pontificate of the Roman bishop was not recognized till then. It should cause no surprise that a precise terminology, distinguishing bishops, in the full sense, from the presbyter-bishops, is not found in the New Testament.

The conclusion reached is put beyond all reasonable doubt by the testimony of the sub-Apostolic Age. This is so important in regard to the question of the episcopate that it is impossible entirely to pass it over. It will be enough, however, to refer to the evidence contained in the epistles of St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, himself a disciple of the Apostles. In these epistles (about A. D. 107) he again and again asserts that the supremacy of the bishop is of Divine institution and belongs to the Apostolic constitution of the Church. He goes so far as to affirm that the

bishop stands in the place of Christ Himself. "When ye are obedient to the bishop as to Jesus Christ," he writes to the Trallians, "it is evident to me that ye are living not after men, but after Jesus Christ. . . be ye obedient also to the presbytery as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ" (ad Trall., n. 2). He also incidentally tells us that bishops are found in the Church, even in "the farthest parts of the earth" (ad Ephes., n. 3). It is out of the question that one who lived at a period so little removed from the actual Apostolic Age could have proclaimed this doctrine in terms such as he employs, had not the episcopate been universally recognized as of Divine appointment. It has been seen that Christ not only established the episcopate in the persons of the Twelve but, further, created in St. Peter the office of supreme pastor of the Church. Early Christian history tells us that before his death, he fixed his residence at Rome, and ruled the Church there as its bishop. It is from Rome that he dates his first Epistle, speaking of the city under the name of Babylon, a designation which St. John also gives it in the Apocalypse (c. xviii). At Rome, too, he suffered martyrdom in company with St. Paul, A. D. 67. The list of his successors in the see is known, from Linus, Anacletus, and Clement, who were the first to follow him, down to the reigning pontiff. The Church has ever seen in the occupant of the See of Rome the successor of Peter in the supreme pastorate. (See POPE.)

The evidence thus far considered seems to demonstrate beyond all question that the hierarchical organization of the Church was, in its essential elements, the work of the Apostles themselves; and that to this hierarchy they handed on the charge entrusted to them by Christ of governing the Kingdom of God, and of teaching the revealed doctrine. These conclusions are far from being admitted by Protestant and other critics. They are unanimous in holding that the idea of a Church—an organized society—is entirely foreign to the teaching of Christ. It is therefore, in their eyes, impossible that Catholicism, if by that term we signify a world-wide institution, bound together by unity of constitution, of doctrine, and of worship, can have been established by the direct action of the Apostles. In the course of the nineteenth century many theories were propounded to account for the transformation of the so-called "Apostolic Christianity" into the Christianity of the commencement of the third century, when beyond all dispute the Catholic system was firmly established from one end of the Roman Empire to the other. At the present day (1908) the theories advocated by the critics are of a less extravagant nature than those of F. C. Baur (1853) and the Tübingen School, which had so great a vogue in the middle of the nineteenth century. Greater regard is shown for the claims of historical possibility and for the value of early Christian evidences. At the same time it is to be observed that the reconstructions suggested involve the rejection of the Pastoral Epistles as being documents of the second century. It will be sufficient here to notice one or two salient points in the views which now find favour with the best known among non-Catholic writers.

(a) It is held that such official organization as existed in the Christian communities was not regarded as involving special spiritual gifts, and had but little religious significance. Some writers, as has been seen, believe with Holtzmann that in the *episcopi* and *presbyteri*, there is simply the synagogal system of ἄρχοντες and ὑπηρέται. Others, with Hatch, derive the origin of the episcopate from the fact that certain civic functionaries in the Syrian cities appear to have borne the title of "episcopi". Professor Harnack, while agreeing with Hatch as to the origin of the office, differs from him in so far as he admits that from the first the superintendence of worship belonged to the functions of the bishop. The offices of prophet and teacher, it is urged, were those in which the primitive Church acknowledged a spiritual significance. These depended entirely on special charismatic gifts of the Holy Ghost. The government of the Church in matters of religion was thus regarded as a direct Divine rule by the Holy Spirit, acting through His inspired agents. And only gradually, it is supposed, did the local ministry take the place of the prophets and teachers, and inherit from them the authority once attributed to the possessors of spiritual gifts alone (cf. Sabatier, Religions of Authority, p. 24). Even if we prescind altogether from the evidence considered above, this theory appears devoid of intrinsic probability. A direct Divine rule by "charismata" could only result in confusion, if uncontrolled by any directive power possessed of superior authority. Such a directive and regulative authority, to which the exercise of spiritual gifts was itself subject, existed in the Apostolate, as the New Testament amply shows (I Cor., xiv). In the succeeding age a precisely similar authority is found in the episcopate. Every principle of historical criticism demands that the source of episcopal power should be sought, not in the "charismata", but, where tradition places it, in the Apostolate itself.

(b) It is to the crisis occasioned by Gnosticism and Montanism in the second century that these writers attribute the rise of the Catholic system. They say that, in order to combat these heresies, the Church found it necessary to federate itself, and that for this end it established a statutory, so-called "apostolic" faith, and further secured the episcopal supremacy by the fiction of "apostolic succession" (Harnack, Hist. of Dogma, II, ii; Sabatier, op. cit., pp. 35–59). This view appears to be irreconcilable with the facts of the case. The evidence of the Ignatian epistles alone shows that, long before the Gnostic crisis arose, the particular local Churches were conscious of an essential principle of solidarity binding all together into a single system. Moreover, the very fact that these heresies gained no foothold within the Church in any part of the world, but were everywhere recognized as heretical and promptly excluded, suffices to prove that the Apostolic faith was already clearly known and firmly held, and that the Churches were already organized under an active episcopate. Again, to say that the doctrine of Apostolic succession was invented to cope with these heresies is to overlook the fact that it is asserted in plain terms in the Epistle of Clement, c. xlii.

M. Loisy's theory as to the organization of the Church has attracted so much attention in recent years as to call for a brief notice. In his work, "L'Evangile et l'Eglise", he accepts many of the views held by critics hostile to Catholicism, and endeavours by a doctrine of development to reconcile them with some form of adhesion to the Church. He urges that the Church is of the nature of an organism, whose animating principle is the message of Jesus Christ. This organism may experience many changes of external form, as it develops itself in accordance with its inner needs, and with the requirements of its environment. Yet so long as these changes are such as are demanded in order that the vital principle may be preserved, they are unessential in character. So far indeed are they from being organic alterations, that we ought to reckon them as implicitly involved in the very being of the Church. The formation of the hierarchy he regards as a change of this kind. In fact, since he holds that Jesus Christ mistakenly anticipated the end of the world to be close at hand, and that His first disciples lived in expectation of His immediate return in glory, it

follows that the hierarchy must have had some such origin as this. It is out of the question to attribute it to the Apostles. Men who believed the end of the world to be impending would not have seen the necessity of endowing a society with a form of government intended to endure.

These revolutionary views constitute part of the theory known as Modernism, whose philosophical presuppositions involve the complete denial of the miraculous. The Church, according to this theory, is not a society established by eternal Divine interposition. It is a society expressing the religious experience of the collectivity of consciences, and owing its origin to two natural tendencies in men, viz. the tendency of the individual believer to communicate his beliefs to others, and the tendency of those who hold the same beliefs to unite in a society. The Modernist theories were analyzed and condemned as "the synthesis of all the heresies" in the Encyclical "Pascendi Dominici gregis" (18 September, 1907). The principal features of M. Loisy's theory of the Church had been already included among the condemned propositions contained in the Decree "Lamentabili" (3 July, 1907). The fifty-third of the propositions there singled out for reprobation is the following: "The original constitution of the Church is not immutable; but the Christian society like human society is subject to perpetual change."

V. The Church a Divine Society.—The Church, as has been seen, is a society formed of living men, not a mere mystical union of souls. As such it resembles other societies. Like them, it has its code of rules, its executive officers, its ceremonial observances. Yet it differs from them more than it resembles them: for it is a supernatural society. The Kingdom of God is supernatural alike in its origin, in the purpose at which it aims, and in the means at its disposal. Other kingdoms are natural in their origin; and their scope is limited to the temporal welfare of their citizens. The supernatural character of the Church is seen, when its relation to the redemptive work of Christ is considered. It is the society of those whom He has redeemed from the world. The world, by which term are signified men in so far as they have fallen from God, is ever set forth in Scripture as the kingdom of the Evil One. It is the "world of darkness" (Eph., vi, 12), it is "seated in the wicked one" (I John, vi, 19), it hates Christ (John, xv, 18). To save the world, God the Son became man. He offered Himself as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world (I John, ii, 2). God, Who desires that all men should be saved, has offered salvation to all; but the greater part of mankind rejects the proffered gift. The Church is the society of those who accept redemption, of those whom Christ "has chosen out of the world" (John, xv, 19). Thus it is the Church alone which He "hath purchased with his own blood" (Acts, xx, 28). Of the members of the Church, the Apostle can say that "God hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love" (Col., i, 13). St. Augustine terms the Church "mundus salvatus"—the redeemed world—and speaking of the enmity borne towards the Church by those who reject her, says: "The world of perdition hates the world of salvation" ("in Joan.", Tract. lxxx, vii, n. 2 in P. L., XXXV, 1885). To the Church Christ has given the means of grace He merited by His life and death. She communicates them to her members; and those who are outside her fold she bids to enter that they too may participate in them. By these means of grace—the light of revealed truth, the sacraments, the perpetual renewal of the Sacrifice of Calvary—the Church carries on the work of sanctifying the elect. Through their instrumentality each individual soul is perfected, and conformed to the likeness of the Son of God.

It is thus manifest that, when we regard the Church simply as the society of disciples, we are considering its external form only. Its inward life is found in the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the gifts of faith, hope, and charity, the grace communicated by the sacraments, and the other prerogatives by which the children of God differ from the children of the world. This aspect of the Church is described by the Apostles in figurative language. They represent it as the Body of Christ, the Spouse of Christ, the Temple of God. In order to understand its true nature some consideration of these comparisons is requisite. In the conception of the Church as a body governed and directed by Christ as the head, far more is contained than the familiar analogy between a ruler and his subjects on the one hand, and the head guiding and coordinating the activities of the several members on the other. That analogy expresses indeed the variety of function, the unity of directive principle, and the co-operation of the parts to a common end, which are found in a society; but it is insufficient to explain the terms in which St. Paul speaks of the union between Christ and His disciples. Each of them is a member of Christ (I Cor., vi, 15); together they form the body of Christ (Eph., iv, 16); as a corporate unity they are simply termed Christ (I Cor., xii, 12).

The intimacy of union here suggested is, however, justified, if we recall that the gifts and graces bestowed upon each disciple are graces merited by the Passion of Christ, and are destined to produce in him the likeness of Christ. The connexion between Christ and himself is thus very different from the purely juridical relation binding the ruler of a natural society to the individuals belonging to it. The Apostle develops the relation between Christ and His members from various points of view. As a human body is organized, each joint and muscle having its own function, yet each contributing to the union of the complex whole, so too the Christian society is a body "compacted and firmly joined together by that which every part supplieth" (Eph., iv, 16), while all the parts depend on Christ their head. It is He Who has organized the body, assigning to each member his place in the Church, endowing each with the special graces necessary, and, above all, conferring on some of the members the graces in virtue of which they rule and guide the Church in His name (ibid., iv, 11). Strengthened by these graces, the mystical body, like a physical body, grows and increases. This growth is twofold. It takes place in the individual, inasmuch as each Christian gradually grows into the "perfect man", into the image of Christ (Eph., iv, 13, 15; Rom., viii, 29). But there is also a growth in the whole body. As time goes on, the Church is to increase and multiply till it fills the earth. So intimate is the union between Christ and His members, that the Apostle speaks of the Church as the "fullness" (πλήρωμα) of Christ (Eph., i, 23; iv, 13), as though apart from His members something were lacking to the head. He even speaks of it as Christ: "As all the members of the body whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ" (I Cor., xii, 12). And to establish the reality of this union he refers it to the efficacious instrumentality of the Holy Eucharist: "We being many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of that one bread" (I Cor., x, 17—Greek text).

The description of the Church as God's temple, in which the disciples are "living stones" (I Peter, ii, 5), is scarcely less frequent in the Apostolic writings than is the metaphor of the body. "You are the temple of the living God" (II Cor., vi, 16), writes St. Paul to the Corinthians, and he reminds the Ephesians that they are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building being framed together, groweth up into a holy temple

in the Lord" (Eph., ii, 20 sq.). With a slight change in the metaphor, the same Apostle in another passage (I Cor., iii, 11) compares Christ to the foundation, and himself and other Apostolic labourers to the builders who raise the temple upon it. It is noticeable that the word translated "temple" is *ναός*, a term which signifies properly the inner sanctuary. The Apostle, when he employs this word, is clearly comparing the Christian Church to that Holy of Holies where God manifested His visible presence in the Shekinah. The metaphor of the temple is well adapted to enforce two lessons. On several occasions the Apostle employs it to impress on his readers the sanctity of the Church in which they have been incorporated. "If any shall violate the temple of God", he says, speaking of those who corrupt the Church by false doctrine, "him shall God destroy" (I Cor., iii, 17). And he employs the same motive to dissuade disciples from forming matrimonial alliance with unbelievers: "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For you are the temple of the living God" (II Cor., vi, 16). It further illustrates in the clearest way the truth that to each member of the Church God has assigned his own place, enabling him by his work there to co-operate towards the great common end, the glory of God.

The third parallel represents the Church as the bride of Christ. Here there is much more than a metaphor. The Apostle says that the union between Christ and His Church is the archetype of which human marriage is an earthly representation. Thus he bids wives be subject to their husbands, as the Church is subject to Christ (Eph., v, 22 sq.). Yet he points out on the other hand that the relation of husband to wife is not that of a master to his servant, but one involving the tenderest and most self-sacrificing love. He bids husbands love their wives, "as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered himself up for it" (ibid., v, 25). Man and wife are one flesh; and in this the husband has a powerful motive for love towards the wife, since "no man ever hated his own flesh". This physical union is but the antitype of that mysterious bond in virtue of which the Church is so truly one with Christ, that "we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh'" (Eph., v, 30 sq.; Gen., ii, 24). In these words the Apostle indicates the mysterious parallelism between the union of the first Adam with the spouse formed from his body, and the union of the second Adam with the Church. She is "bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh", even as Eve was in regard to our first father. And those only belong to the family of the second Adam, who are her children, "born again of water and of the Holy Ghost". Occasionally the metaphor assumes a slightly different form. In Apoc., xix, 7, the marriage of the Lamb to his spouse the Church does not take place till the last day in the hour of the Church's final triumph. Thus too St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians (II Cor., xi, 2), compares himself to "the friend of the bridegroom", who played so important a part in the Hebrew marriage ceremony (cf. John, iii, 29). He has, he says, espoused the Corinthian community to Christ, and he holds himself responsible to present it spotless to the bridegroom.

Through the medium of these metaphors the Apostles set forth the inward nature of the Church. Their expressions leave no doubt that in them they always refer to the actually existing Church founded by Christ on earth—the society of Christ's disciples. Hence it is instructive to observe that Protestant divines find it necessary to distinguish between an actual and an ideal Church, and to assert that the teaching of the Apostles regarding the Spouse, the Temple, and the Body refers to the ideal Church alone (cf. Gayford in Hastings, "Dict. of the Bible", s. v. Church).

VI. The Necessary Means of Salvation.—In the preceding examination of the Scriptural doctrine regarding the Church, it has been seen how clearly it is laid down that only by entering the Church can we participate in the redemption wrought for us by Christ. Incorporation with the Church can alone unite us to the family of the second Adam, and alone can engraft us into the true Vine. Moreover, it is to the Church that Christ has committed those means of grace through which the gifts He earned for men are communicated to them. The Church alone dispenses the sacraments. It alone makes known the light of revealed truth. Outside the Church these gifts cannot be obtained. From all this there is but one conclusion: Union with the Church is not merely one out of various means by which salvation may be obtained: it is the only means.

This doctrine of the absolute necessity of union with the Church was taught in explicit terms by Christ. Baptism, the act of incorporation among her members, He affirmed to be essential to salvation. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: he that believeth not shall be condemned" (Mark, xvi, 16). Any disciple who shall throw off obedience to the Church is to be reckoned as one of the heathen: he has no part in the kingdom of God (Matt., xviii, 17). St. Paul is equally explicit. "A man that is a heretic", he writes to Titus, "after the first and second admonition avoid: knowing that he that is such a one is . . . condemned by his own judgment" (Tit., iii, 10 sq.). The doctrine is summed up in the phrase, *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*. This saying has been the occasion of so many objections that some consideration of its meaning seems desirable. It certainly does not mean that none can be saved except those who are in visible communion with the Church. The Catholic Church has ever taught that nothing else is needed to obtain justification than an act of perfect charity and of contrition. Whoever, under the impulse of actual grace, elicits these acts receives immediately the gift of sanctifying grace, and is numbered among the children of God. Should he die in these dispositions, he will assuredly attain heaven. It is true such acts could not possibly be elicited by one who was aware that God has commanded all to join the Church, and who nevertheless should wilfully remain outside her fold. For love of God carries with it the practical desire to fulfil His commandments. But of those who die without visible communion with the Church, not all are guilty of wilful disobedience to God's commands. Many are kept from the Church by ignorance. Such may be the case of numbers among those who have been brought up in heresy. To others the external means of grace may be unattainable. Thus an excommunicated person may have no opportunity of seeking reconciliation at the last, and yet may repair his faults by inward acts of contrition and charity.

It should be observed that those who are thus saved are not entirely outside the pale of the Church. The will to fulfil all God's commandments is, and must be, present in all of them Such a wish implicitly includes the desire for incorporation with the visible Church: for this, though they know it not, has been commanded by God. They thus belong to the Church by desire (*voto*). Moreover, there is a true sense in which they may be said to be saved through the Church. In the order of Divine Providence, salvation is given to man in the Church: membership in the Church Triumphant is given through membership in the Church Militant. Sanctifying grace, the title to salvation, is peculiarly the grace of those who are united to Christ in the Church: it is the birthright of the children of God. The

primary purpose of those actual graces which God bestows upon those outside the Church is to draw them within the fold. Thus, even in the case in which God saves men apart from the Church, He does so through the Church's graces. They are joined to the Church in spiritual communion, though not in visible and external communion. In the expression of theologians, they belong to the soul of the Church, though not to its body. Yet the possibility of salvation apart from visible communion with the Church must not blind us to the loss suffered by those who are thus situated. They are cut off from the sacraments God has given as the support of the soul. In the ordinary channels of grace, which are ever open to the faithful Catholic, they cannot participate. Countless means of sanctification which the Church offers are denied to them. It is often urged that this is a stern and narrow doctrine. The reply to this objection is that the doctrine is stern, but only in the sense in which sternness is inseparable from love. It is the same sternness which we find in Christ's words, when he said: "If you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sin" (John, viii, 24). The Church is animated with the spirit of Christ; she is filled with the same love for souls, the same desire for their salvation. Since, then, she knows that the way of salvation is through union with her, that in her and in her alone are stored the benefits of the Passion, she must needs be uncompromising and even stern in the assertion of her claims. To fail here would be to fail in the duty entrusted to her by her Lord. Even where the message is unwelcome, she must deliver it.

It is instructive to observe that this doctrine has been proclaimed at every period of the Church's history. It is no accretion of a later age. The earliest successors of the Apostles speak as plainly as the medieval theologians, and the medieval theologians are not more emphatic than those of to-day. From the first century to the twentieth there is absolute unanimity. St. Ignatius of Antioch writes: "Be not deceived, my brethren. If any man followeth one that maketh schism, he doth not inherit the kingdom of God. If any one walketh in strange doctrine, he hath no fellowship with the Passion" (ad Philad., n. 3). Origen says: "Let no man deceive himself. Outside this house, i. e. outside the Church, none is saved" (Hom. in Jos., iii, n. 5 in P. G., XII, 841). St. Cyprian speaks to the same effect: "He cannot have God for his father, who has not the Church for his mother" (De Unit., c. vi). The words of the Fourth Œcumenical Council of Lateran (1215) define the doctrine thus in its decree against the Albigenses: "Una est fidelium universalis Ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur" (Denzinger, n. 357); and Pius IX employed almost identical language in his Encyclical to the bishops of Italy (10 August, 1863): "Notissimum est catholicum dogma neminem scilicet extra catholicam ecclesiam posse salvari" (Denzinger, n. 1529).

VII. Visibility of the Church.—In asserting that the Church of Christ is visible, we signify, first, that as a society it will at all times be conspicuous and public, and second, that it will ever be recognizable among other bodies as the Church of Christ. These two aspects of visibility are termed respectively "material" and "formal" visibility by Catholic theologians. The material visibility of the Church involves no more than that it must ever be a public, not a private profession; a society manifest to the world, not a body whose members are bound by some secret tie. Formal visibility is more than this. It implies that in all ages the true Church of Christ will be easily recognizable for that which it is, viz. as the Divine society of the Son of God, the means of salvation offered by God to men; that it possesses certain attributes which so evidently postulate a Divine origin that all who see it must know it comes from God. This, must, of course, be understood with some necessary qualifications. The power to recognize the Church for what it is presupposes certain moral dispositions. Where there is a rooted unwillingness to follow God's will, there may be spiritual blindness to the claims of the Church. Invincible prejudice or inherited assumptions may produce the same result. But in such cases the incapacity to see is due, not to the want of visibility in the Church, but to the blindness of the individual. The case bears an almost exact analogy to the evidence possessed by the proofs for the existence of God. The proofs in themselves are evident: but they may fail to penetrate a mind obscured by prejudice or ill will. From the time of the Reformation, Protestant writers either denied the visibility of the Church, or so explained it as to rob it of most of its meaning. After briefly indicating the grounds of the Catholic doctrine, some views prevalent on this subject among Protestant authorities will be noticed.

It is unnecessary to say more in regard to the material visibility of the Church than has been said in sections III and IV of this article. It has been shown there that Christ established His Church as an organized society under accredited leaders, and that He commanded its rulers and those who should succeed them to summon all men to secure their eternal salvation by entry into it. It is manifest that there is no question here of a secret union of believers: the Church is a world-wide corporation, whose existence is to be forced upon the notice of all, willing or unwilling. Formal visibility is secured by those attributes which are usually termed the "notes" of the Church—her Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity (see below). The proof may be illustrated in the case of the first of these. The unity of the Church stands out as a fact altogether unparalleled in human history. Her members all over the world are united by the profession of a common faith, by participation in a common worship, and by obedience to a common authority. Differences of class, of nationality, and of race, which seem as though they must be fatal to any form of union, cannot sever this bond. It links in one the civilized and the uncivilized, the philosopher and the peasant, the rich and the poor. One and all hold the same belief, join in the same religious ceremonies, and acknowledge in the successor of Peter the same supreme ruler. Nothing but a supernatural power can explain this. It is a proof manifest to all minds, even to the simple and the unlettered, that the Church is a Divine society. Without this formal visibility, the purpose for which the Church was founded would be frustrated. Christ established it to be the means of salvation for all mankind. For this end it is essential that its claims should be authenticated in a manner evident to all; in other words, it must be visible, not merely as other public societies are visible, but as being the society of the Son of God.

The views taken by Protestants as to the visibility of the Church are various. The rationalist critics naturally reject the whole conception. To them the religion preached by Jesus Christ was something purely internal. When the Church as an institution came to be regarded as an indispensable factor in religion, it was a corruption of the primitive message. (See Harnack, What is Christianity, p. 213.) Passages which deal with the Church in her corporate unity are referred by writers of this school to an ideal invisible Church, a mystical communion of souls. Such an interpretation does violence to the sense of the passages. Moreover, no explanation possessing any semblance of probability has yet been given to account for the genesis among the disciples of this remarkable and altogether novel conception of an invisible Church. It may reasonably be demanded of

a professedly critical school that this phenomenon should be explained. Harnack holds that it took the place of Jewish racial unity. But it does not appear why Gentile converts should have felt the need of replacing a feature so entirely proper to the Hebrew religion.

The doctrine of the older Protestant writers is that there are two Churches, a visible and an invisible. This is the view of such standard Anglican divines as Barrow, Field, and Jeremy Taylor (see e. g. Barrow, Unity of Church, Works, 1830, VII, 628). Those who thus explain visibility urge that the essential and vital element of membership in Christ lies in an inner union with Him; that this is necessarily invisible, and those who possess it constitute an invisible Church. Those who are united to Him externally alone have, they maintain, no part in His grace. Thus, when He promised to His Church the gift of indefectibility, declaring that the gates of hell should never prevail against it, the promise must be understood of the invisible, not of the visible Church. In regard to this theory, which is still tolerably prevalent, it is to be said that Christ's promises were made to the Church as a corporate body, as constituting a society. As thus understood, they were made to the visible Church, not to an invisible and unknown body. Indeed for this distinction between a visible and an invisible Church there is no Scriptural warrant. Even though many of her children prove unfaithful, yet all that Christ said in regard to the Church is realized in her as a corporate body. Nor does the unfaithfulness of these professing Catholics cut them off altogether from membership in Christ. They are His in virtue of their baptism. The character then received still stamps them as His. Though dry and withered branches they are not altogether broken off from the true Vine (Bellarmine, De Ecclesiâ, III, ix, 13). The Anglican High Church writers explicitly teach the visibility of the Church. They restrict themselves, however, to the consideration of material visibility (cf. Palmer, Treatise on the Church, Part I, c. iii).

The doctrine of the visibility in no way excludes from the Church those who have already attained to bliss. These are united with the members of the Church Militant in one communion of saints. They watch her struggles; their prayers are offered on her behalf. Similarly, those who are still in the cleansing fires of purgatory belong to the Church. There are not, as has been said, two Churches; there is but one Church, and of it all the souls of the just, whether in heaven, on earth, or in purgatory, are members (Catech. Rom., I, x, 6). But it is to the Church only in so far as militant here below—to the Church among men—that the property of visibility belongs.

VIII. The Principle of Authority.—Whatever authority is exercised in the Church, is exercised in virtue of the commission of Christ. He is the one Prophet, Who has given to the world the revelation of truth, and by His spirit preserves in the Church the faith once delivered to the saints. He is the one Priest, ever pleading on behalf of the Church the sacrifice of Calvary. And He is the one King—the chief Shepherd (I Peter, v, 4)—Who rules and guides, through His Providence, His Church's course. Yet He wills to exercise His power through earthly representatives. He chose the Twelve, and charged them in His name to teach the nations (Matt., xxviii, 19), to offer sacrifice (Luke, xxii, 19), to govern His flock (Matt., xviii, 18; John, xxi, 17). They, as seen above, used the authority committed to them while they lived; and before their death, they took measures for the perpetuation of this principle of government in the Church. From that day to this, the hierarchy thus established has claimed and has exercised this threefold office. Thus the prophecies of the Old Testament have been fulfilled which foretold that to those who should be appointed to rule the Messianic kingdom it should be granted to participate in the Messias' office of prophet, priest, and king. (See II above.)

The authority established in the Church holds its commission from above, not from below. The pope and the bishops exercise their power as the successors of the men who were chosen by Christ in person. They are not, as the Presbyterian theory of Church government teaches, the delegates of the flock; their warrant is received from the Shepherd, not from the sheep. The view that ecclesiastical authority is ministerial only, and derived by delegation from the faithful, was expressly condemned by Pius VI (1794) in his Constitution "Auctorem Fidei" (q. v.); and on the renovation of the error by certain recent Modernist writers, Pius X reiterated the condemnation in the Encyclical on the errors of the Modernists. In this sense the government of the Church is not democratic. This indeed is involved in the very nature of the Church as a supernatural society, leading men to a supernatural end. No man is capable of wielding authority for such a purpose, unless power is communicated to him from a Divine source. The case is altogether different where civil society is concerned. There the end is not supernatural: it is the temporal well-being of the citizens. It cannot then be said that a special endowment is required to render any class of men capable of filling the place of rulers and of guides. Hence the Church approves equally all forms of civil government which are consonant with the principle of justice. The power exercised by the Church through sacrifice and sacrament (*potestas ordinis*) lies outside the present subject. It is proposed briefly to consider here the nature of the Church's authority in her office (1) of teaching (*potestas magisterii*) and (2) of government (*potestas jurisdictionis*).

(1) *Infallibility.*—As the Divinely appointed teacher of revealed truth, the Church is infallible. This gift of inerrancy is guaranteed to it by the words of Christ, in which He promised that His Spirit would abide with it for ever to guide it unto all truth (John, xiv, 16; xvi, 13). It is implied also in other passages of Scripture, and asserted by the unanimous testimony of the Fathers. The scope of this infallibility is to preserve the deposit of faith revealed to man by Christ and His Apostles (see Infallibility). The Church teaches expressly that it is the guardian only of the revelation, that it can teach nothing which it has not received. The Vatican Council declares: "The Holy Ghost was not promised to the successors of Peter, in order that through His revelation they might manifest new doctrine: but that through His assistance they might religiously guard, and faithfully expound the revelation handed down by the Apostles, or the deposit of the faith" (Conc. Vat., Sess. IV, cap. liv). The obligation of the natural moral law constitutes part of this revelation. The authority of that law is again and again insisted on by Christ and His Apostles. The Church therefore is infallible in matters both of faith and morals. Moreover, theologians are agreed that the gift of infallibility in regard to the deposit must, by necessary consequence, carry with it infallibility as to certain matters intimately related to the Faith. There are questions bearing so nearly on the preservation of the Faith that, could the Church err in these, her infallibility would not suffice to guard the flock from false doctrine. Such, for instance, is the decision whether a given book does or does not contain teaching condemned as heretical. (See Dogmatic Facts.)

It is needless to point out that if the Christian Faith is indeed a revealed doctrine, which men must believe under pain of eternal loss, the gift of infallibility was necessary to the Church. Could she err

at all, she might err in any point. The flock would have no guarantee of the truth of any doctrine. The condition of those bodies which at the time of the Reformation forsook the Church affords us an object-lesson in point. Divided into various sections and parties, they are the scene of never-ending disputes; and by the nature of the case they are cut off from all hope of attaining to certainty. In regard also to the moral law, the need of an infallible guide is hardly less imperative. Though on a few broad principles there may be some consensus of opinion as to what is right and what is wrong, yet, in the application of these principles to concrete facts, it is impossible to obtain agreement. On matters of such practical moment as are, for instance, the questions of private property, marriage, and liberty, the most divergent views are defended by thinkers of great ability. Amid all this questioning the unerring voice of the Church gives confidence to her children that they are following the right course, and have not been led astray by some specious fallacy. The various modes in which the Church exercises this gift, and the prerogatives of the Holy See in regard to infallibility, will be found discussed in the article dealing with that subject.

(2) *Jurisdiction.*—The Church's pastors govern and direct the flock committed to them in virtue of jurisdiction conferred upon them by Christ. The authority of jurisdiction differs essentially from the authority to teach. The two powers are concerned with different objects. The right to teach is concerned solely with the manifestation of the revealed doctrine; the object of the power of jurisdiction is to establish and enforce such laws and regulations as are necessary to the well-being of the Church. Further, the right of the Church to teach extends to the whole world: The jurisdiction of her rulers extends to her members alone (I Cor., v, 12). Christ's words to St. Peter, "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven", distinctly express the gift of jurisdiction. Supreme authority over a body carries with it the right to govern and direct. The three elements which go to constitute jurisdiction—legislative power, judicial power, and coercive power—are, moreover, all implied in Christ's directions to the Apostles (Matt., xviii). Not merely are they instructed to impose obligations and to settle disputes; but they may even inflict the extremest ecclesiastical penalty—that of exclusion from membership in Christ.

The jurisdiction exercised within the Church is partly of Divine right, and partly determined by ecclesiastical law. A supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church—clergy and laity alike—belongs by Divine appointment to the pope (Conc. Vat., Sess. IV, cap. iii). The government of the faithful by bishops possessed of ordinary jurisdiction (i. e. a jurisdiction that is not held by mere delegation, but is exercised in their own name) is likewise of Divine ordinance. But the system by which the Church is territorially divided into dioceses, within each of which a single bishop rules the faithful within that district, is an ecclesiastical arrangement capable of modification. The limits of dioceses may be changed by the Holy See. In England the old pre-Reformation diocesan divisions held good until 1850, though the Catholic hierarchy had become extinct in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In that year the old divisions were annulled and a new diocesan system established. Similarly in France, a complete change was introduced after the Revolution. A bishop may exercise his power on other than a territorial basis. Thus in the East there are different bishops for the faithful belonging to the different rites in communion with the Holy See. Besides bishops, in countries where the ecclesiastical system is fully developed, those of the lower clergy who are parish priests, in the proper sense of the term, have ordinary jurisdiction within their own parishes.

Internal jurisdiction is that which is exercised in the tribunal of penance. It differs from the external jurisdiction of which we have been speaking in that its object is the welfare of the individual penitent, while the object of external jurisdiction is the welfare of the Church as a corporate body. To exercise this internal jurisdiction, the power of orders is an essential condition: none but a priest can absolve. But the power of orders itself is insufficient. The minister of the sacrament must receive jurisdiction from one competent to bestow it. Hence a priest cannot hear confessions in any locality unless he has received faculties from the ordinary of the place. On the other hand, for the exercise of external jurisdiction the power of orders is not necessary. A bishop duly appointed to a see, but not yet consecrated, is invested with external jurisdiction over his diocese as soon as he has exhibited his letters of appointment to the chapter.

IX. Members of the Church.—The foregoing account of the Church and of the principle of authority by which it is governed enables us to determine who are members of the Church and who are not. The membership of which we speak, is incorporation in the visible body of Christ. It has already been noted (VI) that a member of the Church may have forfeited the grace of God. In this case he is a withered branch of the true Vine; but he has not been finally broken off from it. He still belongs to Christ. Three conditions are requisite for a man to be a member of the Church. (1) In the first place, he must profess the true Faith, and have received the Sacrament of Baptism. The essential necessity of this condition is apparent from the fact that the Church is the kingdom of truth, the society of those who accept the revelation of the Son of God. Every member of the Church must accept the whole revelation, either explicitly or implicitly, by profession of all that the Church teaches. He who refuses to receive it, or who, having received it, falls away, thereby excludes himself from the kingdom (Titus, iii, 10 sq.). The Sacrament of Baptism is rightly regarded as part of this condition. By it those who profess the Faith are formally adopted as children of God (Eph., i, 13), and an habitual faith is among the gifts bestowed in it. Christ expressly connects the two, declaring that "he who believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark, xvi, 16; cf. Matt., xxviii, 19). (2) It is further necessary to acknowledge the authority of the Church and of her appointed rulers. Those who reject the jurisdiction established by Christ are no longer members of His kingdom. Thus St. Ignatius lays it down in his letter to the Church of Smyrna: "Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be; even as where Jesus may be there is the universal Church" (ad Smyrn., n. 8). In regard to this condition, the ultimate touchstone is to be found in communion with the Holy See. On Peter Christ founded his Church. Those who are not joined to that foundation cannot form part of the house of God. (3) The third condition lies in the canonical right to communion with the Church. In virtue of its coercive power the Church has authority to excommunicate notorious sinners. It may inflict this punishment not merely on the ground of heresy or schism, but for other grave offences. Thus St. Paul pronounces sentence of excommunication on the incestuous Corinthian (I Cor., v, 3). This penalty is no mere external severance from the rights of common worship. It is a severance from the body of Christ, undoing to this extent the work of baptism, and placing the excommunicated man in the condition of the "heathen and the publican". It casts him out of God's kingdom; and the Apostle speaks of it as "delivering him over to Satan" (I Cor., v, 5; I Tim., i, 20).

Regarding each of these conditions, however,

certain distinctions must be drawn. (1) Many baptized heretics have been educated in their erroneous beliefs. Their case is altogether different from that of those who have voluntarily renounced the Faith. They accept what they believe to be the Divine revelation. Such as these belong to the Church in desire, for they are at heart anxious to fulfil God's will in their regard. In virtue of their baptism and good will, they may be in a state of grace. They belong to the soul of the Church, though they are not united to the visible body. As such they are members of the Church internally, though not externally. Even in regard to those who have themselves fallen away from the Faith, a difference must be made between open and notorious heretics on the one hand, and secret heretics on the other. Open and notorious heresy severs from the visible Church. The majority of theologians agree with Bellarmine (de Ecclesiâ, III, c. x), as against Suarez, that secret heresy has not this effect. (2) In regard to schism the same distinction must be drawn. A secret repudiation of the Church's authority does not sever the sinner from the Church. The Church recognizes the schismatic as a member, entitled to her communion, until by open and notorious rebellion he rejects her authority. (3) Excommunicated persons are either *excommunicati tolerati* (i. e. those who are still tolerated) or *excommunicati vitandi* (i. e. those to be shunned). Many theologians hold that those whom the Church still tolerates are not wholly cut off from her membership, and that it is only those whom she has branded as "to be shunned" who are cut off from God's kingdom (see Murray, De Eccles., Disp. i, sect. viii, n. 118). (See EXCOMMUNICATION.)

X. INDEFECTIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.—Among the prerogatives conferred on His Church by Christ is the gift of indefectibility. By this term is signified, not merely that the Church will persist to the end of time, but further, that it will preserve unimpaired its essential characteristics. The Church can never undergo any constitutional change which will make it, as a social organism, something different from what it was originally. It can never become corrupt in faith or in morals; nor can it ever lose the Apostolic hierarchy, or the sacraments through which Christ communicates grace to men. The gift of indefectibility is expressly promised to the Church by Christ, in the words in which He declares that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. It is manifest that, could the storms which the Church encounters so shake it as to alter its essential characteristics and make it other than Christ intended it to be, the gates of hell, i. e. the powers of evil, would have prevailed. It is clear, too, that could the Church suffer substantial change, it would no longer be an instrument capable of accomplishing the work for which God called it into being. He established it that it might be to all men the school of holiness. This it would cease to be if ever it could set up a false and corrupt moral standard. He established it to proclaim His revelation to the world, and charged it to warn all men that unless they accepted that message they must perish everlastingly. Could the Church, in defining the truths of revelation err in the smallest point, such a charge would be impossible. No body could enforce under such a penalty the acceptance of what might be erroneous. By the hierarchy and the sacraments, Christ, further, made the Church the depositary of the graces of the Passion. Were it to lose either of these, it could no longer dispense to men the treasures of grace.

The gift of indefectibility plainly does not guarantee each several part of the Church against heresy or apostasy. The promise is made to the corporate body. Individual Churches may become corrupt in morals, may fall into heresy, may even apostatize. Thus at the time of the Mohammedan conquests, whole populations renounced their faith; and the Church suffered similar losses in the sixteenth century. But the defection of isolated branches does not alter the character of the main stem. The society of Jesus Christ remains endowed with all the prerogatives bestowed on it by its Founder. Only to one particular Church is indefectibility assured, viz. to the See of Rome. To Peter, and in him to all his successors in the chief pastorate, Christ committed the task of confirming his brethren in the Faith (Luke, xxii, 32); and thus, to the Roman Church, as Cyprian says, "faithlessness cannot gain access" [Ep. lv (lix), ad Cornelium]. The various bodies that have left the Church naturally deny its indefectibility. Their plea for separation rests in each case on the supposed fact that the main body of Christians has fallen so far from primitive truth, or from the purity of Christian morals, that the formation of a separate organization is not only desirable but necessary. Those who are called on to defend this plea endeavour in various ways to reconcile it with Christ's promise. Some, as seen above (VII), have recourse to the hypothesis of an indefectible invisible Church. The Right Rev. Charles Gore of Worcester, who may be regarded as the representative of high-class Anglicanism, prefers a different solution. In his controversy with Canon Richardson, he adopted the position that while the Church will never fail to teach the whole truth as revealed, yet "errors of addition" may exist universally in its current teaching (see Richardson, Catholic Claims, Appendix). Such an explanation deprives Christ's words of all their meaning. A Church which at any period might conceivably teach, as of faith, doctrines which form no part of the deposit could never deliver her message to the world as the message of God. Men could reasonably urge in regard to any doctrine that it might be an "error of addition".

It was said above that one part of the Church's gift of indefectibility lies in her preservation from any substantial corruption in the sphere of morals. This supposes, not merely that she will always proclaim the perfect standard of morality bequeathed to her by her Founder, but also that in every age the lives of many of her children will be based on that sublime model. Only a supernatural principle of spiritual life could bring this about. Man's natural tendency is downwards. The force of every religious movement gradually spends itself; and the followers of great religious reformers tend in time to the level of their environment. According to the laws of unassisted human nature, it should have been thus with the society established by Christ. Yet history shows us that the Catholic Church possesses a power of reform from within, which has no parallel in any other religious organization. Again and again she produces saints, men imitating the virtues of Christ in an extraordinary degree, whose influence, spreading far and wide, gives fresh ardour even to those who reach a less heroic standard. Thus, to cite one or two well-known instances out of many that might be given: St. Dominic and St. Francis of Assisi rekindled the love of virtue in the men of the thirteenth century; St. Philip Neri and St. Ignatius Loyola accomplished a like work in the sixteenth century; St. Paul of the Cross and St. Alphonsus Liguori, in the eighteenth. No explanation suffices to account for this phenomenon save the Catholic doctrine that the Church is not a natural but a supernatural society, that the preservation of her moral life depends, not on any laws of human nature, but on the life-giving presence of the Holy Ghost. The Catholic and the Protestant principles of reform stand in sharp contrast the one to the other. Catholic reformers have one and all fallen back on the model set before them in the person of Christ and on the power of the Holy Ghost to breathe fresh life into the souls which He has re-

generated. Protestant reformers have commenced their work by separation, and by this act have severed themselves from the very principle of life. No one of course would wish to deny that within the Protestant bodies there have been many men of great virtues. Yet it is not too much to assert that in every case their virtue has been nourished on what yet remained to them of Catholic belief and practice, and not on anything which they have received from Protestantism as such.

The Continuity Theory.—The doctrine of the Church's indefectibility just considered will place us in a position to estimate, at its true value, the claim of the Anglican Church and of the Episcopalian bodies in other English-speaking countries to be continuous with the ancient pre-Reformation Church of England, in the sense of being part of one and the same society. The point to be determined here is what constitutes a breach of continuity as regards a society. It may safely be said that the continuity of a society is broken when a radical change in the principles it embodies is introduced. In the case of a Church, such a change in its hierarchical constitution and in its professed faith suffices to make it a different Church from what it was before. For the societies we term Churches exist as the embodiment of certain supernatural dogmas and of a Divinely-authorized principle of government. When, therefore, the truths previously held to be of faith are rejected, and the principle of government regarded as sacred is repudiated, there is a breach of continuity, and a new Church is formed. In this the continuity of a Church differs from the continuity of a nation. National continuity is independent of forms of government and of beliefs. A nation is an aggregate of families, and so long as these families constitute a self-sufficing social organism, it remains the same nation, whatever the form of government may be. The continuity of a Church depends essentially on its government and its beliefs.

The changes introduced into the English Church at the time of the Reformation were precisely of the character just described. At that period fundamental alterations were made in its hierarchical constitution and in its dogmatic standards. It is not to be determined here which was in the right, the Church of Catholic days or the Reformed Church. It is sufficient if we show that changes were made vitally affecting the nature of the society. It is notorious that from the days of Augustine to those of Warham, every archbishop of Canterbury recognized the pope as the supreme source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The archbishops themselves could not exercise jurisdiction within their province until they had received papal confirmation. Further, the popes were accustomed to send to England legates *a latere*, who, in virtue of their legatine authority, whatever their personal status in the hierarchy, possessed a jurisdiction superior to that of the local bishops. Appeals ran from every ecclesiastical court in England to the pope, and his decision was recognized by all as final. The pope, too, exercised the right of excommunication in regard to the members of the English Church. This supreme authority was, moreover, regarded by all as belonging to the pope by Divine right, and not in virtue of merely human institution. When, therefore, this power of jurisdiction was transferred to the king, the alteration touched the constitutive principles of the body and was fundamental in its character. Similarly, in regard to matters of faith, the changes were revolutionary. It will be sufficient to note that a new rule of faith was introduced, Scripture alone being substituted for Scripture and Tradition; that several books were expunged from the Canon of Scripture; that five out of the seven sacraments were repudiated; and that the sacrifices of Masses were declared to be "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits". It is indeed sometimes said that the official formularies of Anglicanism are capable of a Catholic sense, if given a "non-natural" interpretation. This argument can, however, carry no weight. In estimating the character of a society, we must judge, not by the strained sense which some individuals may attach to its formularies, but by the sense they were intended to bear. Judged by this criterion, none can dispute that these innovations were such as to constitute a fundamental change in the dogmatic standpoint of the Church of England.

XI. Universality of the Church.—The Church of Christ has from the first claimed to transcend all those national differences which divide men. In it, the Apostle asserts, "there is neither Gentile nor Jew . . . Barbarian nor Scythian"(Col., iii, 11). Men of every race are one in it; they form a single brotherhood in the Kingdom of God. In the pagan world, religion and nationality had been coterminous. The boundaries of the State were the boundaries of the faith which the State professed. Even the Jewish Dispensation was limited to a special race. Previous to the Christian revelation the idea of a religion adapted to all peoples was foreign to the conceptions of men. It is one of the essential features of the Church that she should be a single, world-wide society embracing all races. In it, and in it alone, is the brotherhood of man realized. All national barriers, no less than all differences of class, disappear in the City of God. It is not to be understood that the Church disregards the ties which bind men to their country, or undervalues the virtue of patriotism. The division of men into different nations enters into the scheme of Providence. To each nation has been assigned a special task to accomplish in the working out of God's purposes. A man owes a duty to his nation no less than to his family. One who omits this duty has failed in a primary moral obligation. Moreover, each nation has its own character, and its own special gifts. It will usually be found that a man attains to high virtue, not by neglecting these gifts, but by embodying the best and noblest ideals of his own people.

For these reasons the Church consecrates the spirit of nationality. Yet it transcends it, for it binds together the various nationalities in a single brotherhood. More than this, it purifies, develops, and perfects national character, just as it purifies and perfects the character of each individual. Often indeed it has been accused of exercising an anti-patriotic influence. But it will invariably be found that it has incurred this reproach by opposing and rebuking what was base in the national aspirations, not by thwarting what was heroic or just. As the Church perfects the nation, so reciprocally does each nation add something of its own to the glory of the Church. It brings its own type of sanctity, its national virtues, and thus contributes to "the fullness of Christ" something which no other race could give. Such are the relations of the Church to what is termed nationality. The external unity of the one society is the visible embodiment of the doctrine of the brotherhood of man. The sin of schism, the Fathers tell us, lies in this, that by it the law of love to our neighbour is implicitly rejected. "Nec hæretici pertinent ad Ecclesiam Catholicam, quæ diligit Deum; nec schismatici quoniam diligit proximum" (Neither do heretics belong to the Catholic Church, for she loves God; nor do schismatics, for she loves her neighbour—Augustine, De Fide et Symbolo, ch. x, in P. L., XL, 193). It is of importance to insist on this point. For it is sometimes urged that the organized unity of Catholicism may be adapted to the Latin races but is ill-suited to the Teutonic spirit. To say this is to say that an essential characteristic of this Christian revelation is ill-suited to one of the great races of the world.

The union of different nations in one society is contrary to the natural inclinations of fallen humanity. It must ever struggle against the impulses of national pride, the desire for complete independence, the dislike of external control. Hence history provides various cases in which these passions have obtained the upper hand, the bond of unity has been broken, and "National Churches" have been formed. In every such case the so-called National Church has found to its cost that, in severing its connexion with the Holy See, it has lost its one protector against the encroachments of the secular Government. The Greek Church under the Byzantine Empire, the autocephalous Russian Church to-day, have been mere pawns in the hands of the civil authority. The history of the Anglican Church presents the same features. There is but one institution which is able to resist the pressure of secular powers—the See of Peter, which was set in the Church for this purpose by Christ, that it might afford a principle of stability and security to every part. The papacy is above all nationalities. It is the servant of no particular State; and hence it has strength to resist the forces that would make the religion of Christ subservient to secular ends. Those Churches alone have retained their vitality which have kept their union with the See of Peter. The branches which have been broken from that stem have withered.

Branch Theory.—In the course of the nineteenth century, the principle of National Churches was strenuously defended by the High Church Anglican divines under the name of the "Branch theory". According to this view, each National Church when fully constituted under its own episcopate is independent of external control. It possesses plenary authority as to its internal discipline, and may not merely reform itself as regards ritual and ceremonial usages, but may correct obvious abuses in matters of doctrine. It is justified in doing this even if the step involve a breach of communion with the rest of Christendom; for, in this case, the blame attaches not to the Church which undertakes the work of reformation, but to those which, on this score, reject it from communion. It still remains a "branch" of the Catholic Church as it was before. At the present day the Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Greek Churches are each of them a branch of the Universal Church. None of them has an exclusive right to term itself the Catholic Church. The defenders of the theory recognize, indeed, that this divided state of the Church is abnormal. They admit that the Fathers never contemplated the possibility of a Church thus severed into parts. But they assert that circumstances such as those which led to this abnormal state of things never presented themselves during the early centuries of ecclesiastical history.

The position is open to fatal objections. (1) It is an entirely novel theory as to the constitution of the Church, which is rejected alike by the Catholic and the Greek Churches. Neither of these admit the existence of the so-called branches of the Church. The Greek schismatics, no less than the Catholics, affirm that they, and they only, constitute the Church. Further, the theory is rejected by the majority of the Anglican body. It is the tenet of but one school, though that a distinguished one. It is almost a *reductio ad absurdum* when we are asked to believe that a single school in a particular sect is the sole depositary of the true theory of the Church. (2) The claim made by many Anglicans that there is nothing in their position contrary to ecclesiastical and patristic tradition in quite indefensible. Arguments precisely applicable to their case were used by the Fathers against the Donatists. It is known from the "Apologia" that Cardinal Wiseman's masterly demonstration of this point was one of the chief factors in bringing about the conversion of Newman. In the controversy with the Donatists, St. Augustine holds it sufficient for his purpose to argue that those who are separated from the Universal Church cannot be in the right. He makes the question one of simple fact. Are the Donatists separated from the main body of Christians, or are they not? If they are, no vindication of their cause can absolve them from the charge of schism. "Securus judicat orbis terrarum bonos non esse qui se dividunt ab orbe terrarum in quâcunque parte orbis terrarum" (The entire world judges with security that they are not good, who separate themselves from the entire world in whatever part of the entire world—Augustine, contra epist. Parm., III, c. iv in P. L., XLIII, 101). St. Augustine's position rests throughout on the doctrine he assumes as absolutely indubitable, that Christ's Church must be one, must be visibly one; and that any body that is separated from it is *ipso facto* shown to be in schism.

The contention of the Anglican controversialists that the English Church is not separatist since it did not reject the communion of Rome, but Rome rejected it, has of course only the value of a piece of special pleading, and need not be taken as a serious argument. Yet it is interesting to observe that in this too they were anticipated by the Donatists (Contra epist. Petil., II, xxxviii in P. L., XLIII, 292). (3) The consequences of the doctrine constitute a manifest proof of its falsity. The unity of the Catholic Church in every part of the world is, as already seen, the sign of the brotherhood which binds together the children of God. More than this, Christ Himself declared that it would be a proof to all men of His Divine mission. The unity of His flock, an earthly representation of the unity of the Father and the Son, would be sufficient to show that He had come from God (John, xvii, 21). Contrariwise, this theory, first advanced to justify a state of things having Henry VIII as its author, would make the Christian Church, not a witness to the brotherhood of God's children, but a standing proof that even the Son of God had failed to withstand the spirit of discord amongst men. Were the theory true, so far from the unity of the Church testifying to the Divine mission of Jesus Christ, its severed and broken condition would be a potent argument in the hands of unbelief.

XII. Notes of the Church.—By the notes of the Church are meant certain conspicuous characteristics which distinguish it from all other bodies and prove it to be the one society of Jesus Christ. Some such distinguishing marks it needs must have, if it is, indeed, the sole depositary of the blessings of redemption, the way of salvation offered by God to man. A Babel of religious organizations all proclaim themselves to be the Church of Christ. Their doctrines are contradictory; and precisely in so far as any one of them regards the doctrines which it teaches as of vital moment, it declares those of the rival bodies to be misleading and pernicious. Unless the true Church were endowed with such characteristics as would prove to all men that it, and it alone, had a right to the name, how could the vast majority of mankind distinguish the revelation of God from the inventions of man? If it could not authenticate its claim, it would be impossible for it to warn all men that to reject it was to reject Christ. In discussing the visibility of the Church (VII) it was seen that the Catholic Church points to four such notes—those namely which were inserted in the Nicene Creed at the Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381): Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity. These, it declares, distinguish it from every other body, and prove that in it alone is to be found the true religion. Each of these characteristics forms the subject of a special article in this work. Here, however, will be indicated

the sense in which the terms are to be understood. A brief explanation of their meaning will show how decisive a proof they furnish that the society of Jesus Christ is none other than the Church in communion with the Holy See. (See APOSTOLICITY; CATHOLIC; SANCTITY; UNITY.)

The Protestant reformers endeavoured to assign notes of the Church, such as might lend support to their newly-founded sects. Calvin declares that the Church is to be found "where the word of God is preached in its purity, and the sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance" (Instit., Bk. IV, c. i; cf. Confessio August., art. 4). It is manifest that such notes are altogether nugatory. The very reason why notes are required at all is that men may be able to discern the word of God from the words of false prophets, and may know which religious body has a right to term its ceremonies the sacraments of Christ. To say that the Church is to be sought where these two qualities are found cannot help us. The Anglican Church adopted Calvin's account in its official formulary (Thirty-Nine Articles, art. 17); on the other hand, it retains the use of the Nicene Creed; though a profession of faith in a Church which is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, can have little meaning to those who are not in communion with the successor of Peter.

Unity.—The Church is One because its members (1) are all united under one government, (2) all profess the same faith, (3) all join in a common worship. As already noted (XI) Christ Himself declared that the unity of His followers should bear witness to Him. Discord and separation are the Devil's work on the earth. The unity and brotherhood promised by Christ are to be the visible manifestation on the earth of the Divine union (John, xvii, 21). St. Paul's teaching on this point is to the same effect. He sees in the visible unity of the body of Christ an external sign of the oneness of the Spirit who dwells within it. There is, he says, "one body and one Spirit" (Eph., iv, 4). As in any living organism the union of the members in one body is the sign of the one animating principle within, so it is with the Church. If the Church were divided into two or more mutually exclusive bodies, how could she witness to the presence of that Spirit Whose name is Love. Further, when it is said that the members of the Church are united by the profession of the same faith, we speak of external profession as well as inward acceptance. In recent years, much has been said by those outside the Church, about unity of spirit being compatible with differences of creed. Such words are meaningless in reference to a Divine revelation. Christ came from heaven to reveal the truth to man. If a diversity of creeds could be found in His Church, this could only be because the truth He revealed had been lost in the quagmire of human error. It would signify that His work was frustrated, that His Church was no longer the pillar and ground of the truth. There is, it is plain, but one Church, in which is found the unity we have described—in the Catholic Church, united under the government of the supreme pontiff, and acknowledging all that he teaches in his capacity as the infallible guide of the Church.

Sanctity.—When the Church points to sanctity as one of her notes, it is manifest that what is meant is a sanctity of such a kind as excludes the supposition of any natural origin. The holiness which marks the Church should correspond to the holiness of its Founder, of the Spirit Who dwells within it, of the graces bestowed upon it. A quality such as this may well serve to distinguish the true Church from counterfeits. It is not without reason that the Church of Rome claims to be holy in this sense. Her holiness appears in the doctrine which she teaches, in the worship she offers to God, in the fruits which she brings forth. (1) The doctrine of the Church is summed up in the imitation of Jesus Christ. This imitation expresses itself in good works, in self-sacrifice, in love of suffering, and especially in the practice of the three evangelical counsels of perfection —voluntary poverty, chastity, and obedience. The ideal which the Church proposes to us is a Divine ideal. The sects which have severed themselves from the Church have either neglected or repudiated some part of the Church's teaching in this regard. The Reformers of the sixteenth century went so far as to deny the value of good works altogether. Though their followers have for the most part let fall this anti-Christian doctrine, yet to this day the self-surrender of the religious state is regarded by Protestants as folly. (2) The holiness of the Church's worship is recognized even by the world outside the Church. In the solemn renewal of the Sacrifice of Calvary there lies a mysterious power, which all are forced to own. Even enemies of the Church realize the sanctity of the Mass. (3) Fruits of holiness are not, indeed, found in the lives of all the Church's children. Man's will is free, and though God gives grace, many who have been united to the Church by baptism make little use of the gift. But at all times of the Church's history there have been many who have risen to sublime heights of self-sacrifice, of love to man, and of love to God. It is only in the Catholic Church that is found that type of character which we recognize in the saints—in men such as St. Francis Xavier, St. Vincent de Paul, and many others. Outside the Church men do not look for such holiness. Moreover, the saints, and indeed every other member of the Church who has attained to any degree of piety, have been ever ready to acknowledge that they owe whatever is good in them to the grace the Church bestows.

Catholicity.—Christ founded the Church for the salvation of the human race. He established it that it might preserve His revelation, and dispense His grace to all nations. Hence it was necessary that it should be found in every land, proclaiming His message to all men, and communicating to them the means of grace. To this end He laid on the Apostles the injunction to "go, and teach all nations". There is, notoriously, but one religious body which fulfils this command, and which can therefore lay any claim to the note of Catholicity. The Church which owns the Roman pontiff as its supreme head extends its ministrations over the whole world. It owns its obligation to preach the Gospel to all peoples. No other Church attempts this task, or can use the title of Catholic with any appearance of justification. The Greek Church is at the present day a mere local schism. None of the Protestant bodies has ever pretended to a universal mission. They claim no right to convert to their beliefs the Christianized nations of Europe. Even in regard to the heathen, for nearly two hundred years missionary enterprise was unknown among Protestant bodies. In the nineteenth century, it is true, many of them displayed no little zeal for the conversion of the heathen, and contributed large sums of money for this purpose. But the results achieved were so inadequate as to justify the conclusion that the blessing of God did not rest upon the enterprise. (See MISSIONS, CATHOLIC; MISSIONS, PROTESTANT.)

Apostolicity.—The Apostolicity of the Church consists in its identity with the body which Christ established on the foundation of the Apostles, and which He commissioned to carry on His work. No other body save this is the Church of Christ. The true Church must be Apostolic in doctrine and Apostolic in mission. Since, however, it has already been shown that the gift of infallibility was promised to the Church, it follows that where there is Apostolicity of mission, there will also be Apostolicity of doctrine. Apostolicity of mission consists in the power of Holy

orders and the power of jurisdiction derived by legitimate transmission from the Apostles. Any religious organization whose ministers do not possess these two powers is not accredited to preach the Gospel of Christ. For "how shall they preach", asks the Apostle, "unless they be sent?" (Rom., x, 15). It is Apostolicity of mission which is reckoned as a note of the Church. No historical fact can be more clear than that Apostolicity, if it is found anywhere, is found in the Catholic Church. In it there is the power of Holy orders received by Apostolic succession. In it, too, there is Apostolicity of jurisdiction; for history shows us that the Roman bishop is the successor of Peter, and as such the centre of jurisdiction. Those prelates who are united to the Roman See receive their jurisdiction from the pope, who alone can bestow it. No other Church is Apostolic. The Greek Church, it is true, claims to possess this property on the strength of its valid succession of bishops. But, by rejecting the authority of the Holy See, it severed itself from the Apostolic College, and thereby forfeited all jurisdiction. Anglicans make a similar claim. But even if they possessed valid orders, jurisdiction would be wanting to them no less than to the Greeks.

XIII. The Church a Perfect Society.—The Church has been considered as a society which aims at a spiritual end, but which yet is a visible polity, like the secular polities among which it exists. It is, further, a "perfect society". The meaning of this expression, "a perfect society", should be clearly understood, for this characteristic justifies, even on grounds of pure reason, that independence of secular control which the Church has always claimed. A society may be defined as a number of men who unite in a manner more or less permanent in order, by their combined efforts, to attain a common good. Association of this kind is a necessary condition of civilization. An isolated individual can achieve but little. He can scarcely provide himself with necessary sustenance; much less can he find the means of developing his higher mental and moral gifts. As civilization progresses, men enter into various societies for the attainment of various ends. These organizations are perfect or imperfect societies. For a society to be perfect, two conditions are necessary: (1) The end which it proposes to itself must not be purely subordinate to the end of some other society. For example, the cavalry of an army is an organized association of men; but the end for which this association exists is entirely subordinate to the good of the whole army. Apart from the success of the whole army, there can properly speaking be no such thing as the success of the lesser association. Similarly, the good of the whole army is subordinate to the welfare of the State. (2) The society in question must be independent of other societies in regard to the attainment of its end. Mercantile societies, no matter how great their wealth and power, are imperfect; for they depend on the authority of the State for permission to exist. So, too, a single family is an imperfect society. It cannot attain its end—the well-being of its members—in isolation from other families. Civilized life requires that many families should co-operate to form a State.

There are two societies which are perfect—the Church and the State. The end of the State is the temporal welfare of the community. It seeks to realize the conditions which are requisite in order that its members may be able to attain temporal felicity. It protects the rights, and furthers the interests of the individuals and the groups of individuals which belong to it. All other societies which aim in any manner at temporal good are necessarily imperfect. Either they exist ultimately for the good of the State itself; or, if their aim is the private advantage of some of its members, the State must grant them authorization, and protect them in the exercise of their various functions. Should they prove dangerous to it, it justly dissolves them. The Church also possesses the conditions requisite for a perfect society. That its end is not subordinate to that of any other society is manifest: for it aims at the spiritual welfare, the eternal felicity, of man. This is the highest end a society can have; it is certainly not an end subordinate to the temporal felicity aimed at by the State. Moreover, the Church is not dependent on the permission of the State in the attaining of its end. Its right to exist is derived not from the permission of the State, but from the command of God. Its right to preach the Gospel, to administer the sacraments, to exercise jurisdiction over its subjects, is not conditional on the authorization of the civil Government. It has received from Christ Himself the great commission to teach all nations. To the command of the civil Government that they should desist from preaching, the Apostles replied simply that they ought to obey God rather than men (Acts, v, 29). Some measure of temporal goods is, indeed, necessary to the Church to enable it to carry out the work entrusted to it. The State cannot justly prohibit it from receiving this from the benefactions of the faithful. Those whose duty it is to achieve a certain end have a right to possess the means necessary to accomplish their task.

Pope Leo XIII summed up this doctrine in his Encyclical "Immortale Dei" (1 November, 1885) on the Christian constitution of States: "The Church", he says, "is distinguished and differs from civil society; and, what is of highest moment, it is a society chartered as of right divine, perfect in its nature and its title to possess in itself and by itself, through the will and loving kindness of its Founder, all needful provision for its maintenance and action. And just as the end at which the Church aims is by far the noblest of ends, so is its authority the most excellent of all authority, nor can it be looked on as inferior to the civil power, or in any manner dependent upon it." It is to be observed that though the end at which the Church aims is higher than that of the State, the latter is not, as a society, subordinate to the Church. The two societies belong to different orders. The temporal felicity at which the State aims is not essentially dependent on the spiritual good which the Church seeks. Material prosperity and a high degree of civilization may be found where the Church does not exist. Each society is supreme in its own order. At the same time each contributes greatly to the advantage of the other. The Church cannot appeal to men who have not some rudiments of civilization, and whose savage mode of life renders moral development impossible. Hence, though her function is not to civilize but to save souls, yet when she is called on to deal with savage races, she commences by seeking to communicate the elements of civilization to them. On the other hand, the State needs the supernatural sanctions and spiritual motives which the Church impresses on its members. A civil order without these is insecurely based.

It has often been objected that the doctrine of the Church's independence in regard to the State would render civil government impossible. Such a theory, it is urged, creates a State within a State; and from this, there must inevitably result a conflict of authorities, each claiming supreme dominion over the same subjects. Such was the argument of the Gallican Regalists. The writers of this school, consequently, would not admit the claim of the Church to be a perfect society. They maintained that any jurisdiction which it might exercise was entirely dependent on the permission of the civil power. The difficulty, however, is rather apparent than real. The scope of the two authorities is different, the one belonging to what is temporal, the other to what is

spiritual. Even when the jurisdiction of the Church involves the use of temporal means and affects temporal interests, it does not detract from the due authority of the State. If difficulties arise, they arise, not by the necessity of the case, but from some extrinsic reason. In the course of history, occasions have doubtless arisen, when ecclesiastical authorities have grasped at power which by right belonged to the State, and, more often still, when the State has endeavoured to arrogate to itself spiritual jurisdiction. This, however, does not show the system to be at fault, but merely that human perversity can abuse it. So far, indeed, is it from being true that the Church's claims render government impossible, that the contrary is the case. By determining the just limits of liberty of conscience, they are a defence to the State. Where the authority of the Church is not recognized, any enthusiast may elevate the vagaries of his own caprice into a Divine command, and may claim to reject the authority of the civil ruler on the plea that he must obey God and not man. The history of John of Leyden and of many another self-styled prophet will afford examples in point. The Church bids her members see in the civil power "the minister of God", and never justifies disobedienee, except in those rare cases when the State openly violates the natural or the revealed law. (See CIVIL ALLEGIANCE.)

Among the writings of the Fathers, the following are the principal works which bear on the doctrine of the Church: ST. IRENÆUS, *Adv. Hæreses* in *P. G.*, VII; TERTULLIAN, *De Præscriptionibus* in *P. L.*, II; ST. CYPRIAN, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ* in *P. L.*, IV; ST. OPTATUS, *De Schismate Donatistarum* in *P. L.*, XI; ST. AUGUSTINE, *Contra Donatistas, Contra Epistolas Parmeniani, Contra Litteras Petiliani* in *P. L.*, XLIII; ST. VINCENT OF LÉRINS, *Commonitorium* in *P. L.*, L.—Of the theologians who in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries defended the Catholic Church against the Reformers may be mentioned: STAPLETON, *Principiorum Fidei Doctrinalium Demonstratio* (1574; Paris, 1620); BELLARMINE, *Disputationes de Controversiis Fidei* (1576; Prague, 1721); SUAREZ, *Defensio Fidei Catholicæ adversus Anglicanæ Sectæ Errores* (1613; Paris, 1859).—Among more recent writers: MURRAY, *De Ecclesiâ* (Dublin, 1866); FRANZELIN, *De Ecclesiâ* (Rome, 1887); PALMIERI, *De Romano Pontifice* (Prato, 1891); DÖLLINGER, *The First Age of the Church* (tr. London, 1866); SCHANZ, *A Christian Apology* (tr. Dublin, 1892).—The following English works may also be noticed: WISEMAN, *Lectures on the Church;* NEWMAN, *Development of Christian Doctrine;* IDEM, *Difficulties of Anglicans;* MATHEW, ed., *Ecclesia* (London, 1907). In special relation to recent rationalist criticism regarding the primitive Church and its organization, may be noted: BATIFFOL, *Études d'histoire et de la théologie positive* (Paris, 1906); important articles by Mgr. Batiffol will also be found in the *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* for 1904, 1905, 1906, and in the *Irish Theological Quarterly* for 1906 and 1907; DE SMEDT in the *Revue des questions historiques* (1888, 1891), vols. XLIV, CL; BUTLER in *The Dublin Review* (1893, 1897), vols. CXIII, CXXI. The following works are by Anglican divines of various schools of thought: PALMER, *Treatise on the Church* (1842); GORE, *Lux Mundi* (London, 1890); IDEM, *The Church and the Ministry* (London, 1889); HORT, *The Christian Ecclesia* (London, 1897); LIGHTFOOT, the dissertation entitled *The Christian Ministry* in his *Commentary on Epistle to Philippians* (London, 1881); GAYFORD in HASTINGS, *Dict. of Bible*, s. v. *Church*. Amongst rationalist critics may be mentioned: HARNACK, *History of Dogma* (tr. London, 1904); IDEM, *What is Christianity?* (tr. London, 1901), and articles in *Expositor* (1887), vol. V; HATCH, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (London, 1880); WEIZSÄCKER, *Apostolic Age* (tr. London, 1892); SABATIER, *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit* (tr. London, 1906); LOWRIE, *The Church and its Organization—an Interpretation of Rudolf Sohm's 'Kirchenrecht'* (London, 1904). With these may be classed: LOISY, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise* (Paris, 1902).

G. H. JOYCE.

Church, STATES OF THE. See STATES OF THE CHURCH.

Church and State. See STATE.

Church Father. See FATHERS.

Churching of Women, a blessing given by the Church to mothers after recovery from childbirth. Only a Catholic woman who has given birth to a child in legitimate wedlock, provided she has not allowed the child to be baptized outside the Catholic Church, is entitled to it. It is not a precept, but a pious and praiseworthy custom (*Rituale Romanum*), dating from the early Christian ages, for a mother to present herself in the Church as soon as she is able to leave her house (St. Charles Borromeo, First Council of Milan), to render thanks to God for her happy delivery, and to obtain by means of the priestly blessing the graces necessary to bring up her child in a Christian manner. The prayers indicate that this blessing is intended solely for the benefit of the mother, and hence it is not necessary that she should bring the child with her; nevertheless, in many places the pious and edifying custom prevails of specially dedicating the child to God. For, as the Mother of Christ carried her Child to the Temple to offer Him to the Eternal Father, so a Christian mother is anxious to present her offspring to God and obtain for it the blessing of the Church. This blessing, in the ordinary form, without change or omission, is to be given to the mother, even if her child was still-born, or has died without baptism (Congr. Sac. Rit., 19 May, 1896).

The churching of women is not a strictly parochial function, yet the Congregation of Sacred Rites (21 November, 1893) decided that a parish priest, if asked to give it, must do so, and if another priest is asked to perform the rite, he may do so in any church or public oratory, provided the superior of said church or oratory be notified. It must be imparted in a church or in a place in which Mass is celebrated, as the very name "churching" is intended to suggest a pilgrimage of thanksgiving to the church, and as the rubrics indicate in the expressions: "desires to come to the church", "he conducts her into the church", "she kneels before the altar", etc. Hence the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (No. 246) prohibits the practice of churching in places in which Mass is not celebrated.

The mother, kneeling in the vestibule, or within the church, and carrying a lighted candle, awaits the priest, who, vested in surplice and white stole, sprinkles her with holy water in the form of a cross. Having recited Ps. xxiii, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof", he offers her the left extremity of the stole and leads her into the church, saying: "Enter thou into the temple of God, adore the Son of the Blessed Virgin Mary who has given thee fruitfulness of offspring." She advances to one of the altars and kneels before it, whilst the priest, turned towards her, recites a prayer which expresses the object of the blessing, and then, having sprinkled her again with holy water in the form of a cross, dismisses her, saying: "The peace and blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, descend upon thee, and remain forever. Amen."

BARUFFALDUS, *Commentaria ad Rituale Romanum* (Venice, 1792); BERNARD, *Cours de Liturgie Romaine—Le Rituel* (Paris, 1893), II; KUNZ, *Die liturgischen Verrichtungen des Celebranten* (Ratisbon, 1904); AMBERGER, *Pastoraltheologie* (Ratisbon, 1886), III, 2; VAN DER STAPPEN, *Sacra Liturgia* (Mechlin, 1900), IV.

A. J. SCHULTE.

Church Maintenance.—The proper support of church edifices and church institutions, as well as of the clergy who minister in them, has always been both a necessity and a problem. As the Church of Christ is a visible organization, it must embrace a visible priesthood, worship, and temples. These must be maintained. As a consequence, the Church must acquire property both movable and immovable, and this she cannot obtain without a corresponding generosity on the part of the faithful. To pretend that the Church should be utterly deprived of property, is not only an error, but also an absurdity. In the Old Dispensation, the Jewish priesthood were put in possession of certain towns all through Israel, and by the Mosaic Law they received a portion of various sacrifices offered in the Temple. The magnificent Temple itself was a gift of the kings of Israel, and its

maintenance was provided for partly by royal munificence, partly by the offerings of the people. The Temple had its treasury or *corbona*. By Divine command, as we read in Scripture, the Aaronic clergy received firstfruits, tithes, and other contributions towards their support.

Apostolic Times.—Nor was there less recognition of the general principle in the New Testament. We are told that Christ and His Apostles had a common purse for the defraying of their expenses. That this information comes to us only incidentally, through the narration of an event bearing no direct relation to it, shows that the Evangelist presumes the reader to take it for granted that there was a common purse for the expenses of Christ and His disciples. The Acts of the Apostles portray to us the fervour of the first Christians, who sold their lands and laid their proceeds at the feet of the Apostles that they might employ them for the needs of the nascent Church. Along with the support of the poor and the widow and the orphan, would also necessarily be included the sustentation of the clergy and the defraying of the expenses connected with the worship of God. Christ in sending forth His disciples to preach told them to accept what was necessary for their support from the people to whom they ministered, basing it on the general principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire (Luke, x, 7); Saint Paul states (I Cor., ix) that it is Christ's command that the faithful give temporal sustenance to the clergy. While reminding the Corinthians that he himself has been no charge or burden to them, he takes occasion to inculcate on them the duty of supporting their pastors. "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we reap your carnal things? Know you not that they who work in the holy place, eat the things that are of the place; and that they that serve the altar, partake with the altar? So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel, should live by the Gospel" (I Cor., ix, 11, 13–14).

Connected with this contribution towards the support of the clergy, we find Saint Paul also alluding to the similar duty of helping the poor. In the fifteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans he states that contributions had been made in Macedonia and Achaia for the support of the poor in Jerusalem, and that he is on his way to that city to bring the contributed relief (Rom., xv, 25–28). In like manner (I Tim., v) he speaks of the Church supporting the widows. The Apostles in fact, as we learn from the Acts, charged the deacons with the ministry to the temporal wants of the poor. The Church has always been mindful of this conjoining of the support of the clergy and of church institutions with that of the poor and suffering, and hence the regulations for setting apart some of the income of holders of benefices and the employment of church moneys for the relief of the helpless and the indigent, the widows, the orphans, and the sick.

The Early Church.—From the beginnings of the Christian Church history, as we gather it from the Fathers and early ecclesiastical writers, the faithful made voluntary offerings to defray the expenses of Divine worship and to support the clergy and the poor. Though these offerings would naturally be for the most part in money and in kind, yet we find also property set aside for ecclesiastical purposes. Thus the Christian cemeteries or catacombs and the "titles" or houses where Mass was offered seem very early, even in the lifetime of the Apostles, to have become consecrated to church uses. That in the course of time they passed into the possession of the Church, and became church property in the modern sense of the term, is evident from various edicts and decrees of the Roman Emperors, as, for example, of Aurelian and Constantine. These show conclusively that, even in the times of persecution by pagan rulers, the Church had lands and edifices of various kinds in its possession. Nor was this state of things confined to the city of Rome, but it was practised and recognized all over the Roman Empire.

The Endowed Church.—When peace was given to the Church by Constantine, at the beginning of the fourth century, an era of temporal prosperity for the Church set in. As the Empire gradually became Christian, the donations for religious purposes increased by leaps and bounds. Constantine himself set an example for the Christian rulers who followed him, when he bestowed upon the pope the Lateran palace and erected magnificent basilicas in honour of the Apostles Saint Peter and Saint Paul. Henceforth the civil power, which had been formerly adverse to the Church, became its protector. Gifts of money and land for ecclesiastical purposes were now legally recognized, and though some of the later Roman emperors placed restrictions upon the donations of the faithful, yet the wealth of the Church rapidly increased. Whatever losses ecclesiastical property suffered by the inroads of the barbarians on the fall of the Western Roman Empire, in the last quarter of the fifth century, were made up for later, when the conquering barbarians in their turn were converted to Christianity. Edifices for Divine worship, asylums for the poor and sick, monasteries and nunneries, universities and schools, cathedral and collegiate churches, chantries and preceptories, were founded and endowed in great numbers. The spirit of faith manifested itself in conferring on the Church the means for adding becoming splendour to the celebration of Divine worship and for founding benefices to support the clergy. The bitter complaint made, after the so-called Reformation, that "under the papacy giving had no end" was true to a surprising extent. Landed property became as a rule the title for the ordination of clerics. A great advantage of this system was that the clergy were not obliged to make constant demands on their flocks for the means of livelihood or to sustain worship; and only those who felt impelled to give voluntarily were looked to for offerings. It is true that the Church always insisted on the Divine law that the faithful must support their pastors, yet this support was generally provided for by perpetual foundations, not dependent on the temporary generosity of the people. The wealth of the Church at this period has sometimes been made a matter of reproach to her, but while freely admitting that abuses were possible and indeed at times unquestionable, yet this was in contravention of the laws of the Church. It was never the Church's intention that her clergy should acquire property or income for the purpose of leading an indulgent or luxurious life. The saying of Saint Ambrose that the Church has wealth not in order to hoard it, but to bestow it on those who are in need of it, was always recognized as a bounden duty. Hence the canonical restrictions placed upon the holder of a benefice in the employment of his income, and the duty imposed upon him of setting aside part of it for the poor. It must not be forgotten that when the Church was wealthiest, it covered Europe with asylums and places of refuge for every form of poverty and distress, and that the great landed monasteries were also noted for their hospitality to pilgrims, their generosity to the indigent, and their zeal for education. It is also noteworthy that despite the calamitous usurpations of the civil power in many countries, which reduced the clergy to comparative indigence, yet the fervour of vocations has never been chilled by the loss of endowments and pensions. The canon law contains many severe regulations against avarice and simony in the clergy. As this is not a technical treatment of the question of church property, nothing is here said specially of the laws governing its acquisition, administration, and aliena-

tion; neither, for the same reason, do we enter into any detail concerning the regulations made for benefices and those who hold them. It is intended merely to point out, in general, the temporal means and the sources of support of ecclesiastical institutions and of the clergy during the course of the Church's history. The rapacities of Governments and the violence of revolutions have torn from the Church many of her endowments in most countries of Europe, and all of them in some. In such cases the clergy must again, as in the earliest times, look to the direct generosity of the faithful for their support and for the means of carrying on the liturgical and benevolent institutions of the Church.

MISSIONARY COUNTRIES.—It is particularly in countries where the Church has never been endowed and established, and in those where all such advantages have been entirely withdrawn from her, that the problem of Church maintenance must be faced in all its nakedness. To show what means have been employed to solve this difficult problem, and likewise to give some appreciation of the generosity of the not over-wealthy faithful on the one hand and of the care of ecclesiastical rulers to avoid abuses on the other, it will be well to chronicle the decrees of various synods in countries where church maintenance is a burning question. The synods, first of all, insist on the fact that the faithful are bound by the Divine law to support the clergy who are their spiritual guides. The First Synod of Baltimore in 1791 declares: "Owing to the increasing number of Catholics dispersed over widely-separated tracts of the United States, there is need of a much larger number than formerly of labourers in the Lord's vineyard, and these cannot be obtained or supported unless the means be given by the faithful, as indeed they are bound by Divine precept to give them, for the Apostle says that it is but just that those who sow spiritual things for others should reap of the latter's carnal things (I Cor., ix, 11). Therefore the faithful should be frequently reminded of this obligation, and if they do not satisfy it, they have only themselves to blame if they cannot have Mass on Sundays or feast days nor obtain the sacraments in their extreme necessities. Consequently, when in proportion to the worldly goods with which God has endowed them, they refuse to contribute to the ministry of salvation, and so do not satisfy the Divine and ecclesiastical precept through their own fault, let them know that they are in a state of sin and unworthy of obtaining reconciliation in the tribunal of penance; and moreover that they will have to give an account to God, not only for their own sins, but also for the dense ignorance and vices of the poor who on account of the miserable parsimony of the richer people are entirely deprived of Christian instruction. In order therefore that what is done in other parts of the Christian world should have a beginning among us, we have made decrees concerning the offerings of the faithful" (Decr. 23). The Fathers give these regulations concerning the contributions: "The offerings according to the ancient custom of the Church, are to be divided into three parts if it be necessary; so that one part may be applied to the support of the priest, one to the relief of the poor, and one for obtaining such things as are necessary for the Divine worship and the church fabric. If provision has already been made from other sources for the sustentation of the ministers of the sanctuary and for the relief of the indigent, then all the offerings should be used for procuring sacred vessels and other things necessary for the Divine service, for repairing the churches or for building new ones" (Decr. 7). In 1837, the Fathers of the Third Provincial Council of Baltimore say: "Lest priests be forced to beg or suffer such penury as is unbecoming to their sacred order, we exhort the bishops to admonish the faithful of their duty to supply a proper sustenance for those especially who labour in word and doctrine among them. And if on account of sickness or other cause they be not able to fulfil their sacred ministry, lest affliction be added to affliction, let what is necessary be supplied to them by the faithful to whom they have ministered. If the congregation be too poor to do so, we exhort the bishops to use all the means in their power to arouse the charity of other priests and other congregations in their behalf" (Decr. 2). The Third Provincial Council of Cincinnati, in 1861, declares: "Treating of the proper support of the pastor, the Fathers unanimously agreed that the faithful are bound under grave sin to give him sustenance; but that the pastor on his side, if called to assist a dying person who has refused to fulfil this duty though able to do so, is also bound under grave sin to visit him, on account of the serious obligation of charity towards a dying man placed in extreme necessity." In England, we find the following in the First Provincial Council of Westminster, held in the year 1855: "As the duty of paying tithes does not exist among us, let the faithful be warned that they are not freed thereby from the obligation of providing for Divine worship and for the proper support of the sacred ministers" (Decr. 4). "The faithful who through devotion or for any other cause do not frequent the quasi-parochial church or missionary to whom by domicile they are assigned, should not imagine themselves to be freed from the obligation of assisting the church and supporting their pastors. They should also be as solicitous as those who attend their proper church for relieving the misery of the poor and for educating the young. Therefore, by almsgiving according to their means, let them strengthen their legitimate pastors who must sustain the burden and heat of the day in cultivating the vineyard of the Lord" (Decr. 5). The payment of tithes is declared to be binding on the faithful of the Canadian Province of Quebec by the Fourth Provincial Council, in 1868: "As the error has crept into many minds that tithes and other debts which are paid to the Church or her ministers for their support and to enable them to fulfil their duties towards the faithful of whom they have spiritual charge, are to be paid only through force of civil law, and that the obligation of giving them does not arise from any other source, in order that this error be entirely corrected and completely removed, we consider it opportune to declare and decree that this obligation is derived specially from the laws which the Church herself has made or can make independently of the civil law; and that it pertains to the bishop of each diocese to impose precepts concerning this matter upon the faithful, as necessity shall require, and taking into consideration circumstances of persons and places. Wherefore if it seems just and opportune to the bishop to demand a tax, defined with proper moderation, of the faithful of any place, whether the civil law there prescribes or does not prescribe the paying of tithes, let each of them pay it to the priest to whom under any title belongs the duty of ministering to their spiritual needs. There can be no doubt that the faithful of that place severally are bound in justice and conscience to pay this tax, and anyone who refuses is to be visited with penalties according to the circumstances. What has been said of the obligation on the faithful of supporting their pastors is also to be held concerning the building and the reparation of temples and churches, namely that it binds the conscience of the faithful" (Decr. 16). In Ireland, the Third Provincial Council of Tuam, in 1858, treats also of tithes: "In collecting the offerings of the faithful, who emulating the first Christians and even the Hebrews are accustomed to contribute the first-fruits of grain and other products to parish priests and vicars as to the ministers of God, we ordain that no more be demanded than what is

offered spontaneously and voluntarily. Reproaches against those who may perchance show themselves less liberal, are to be avoided under pain of suspension" (cap. xvii, 1).

BLESSINGS OF GIVING.—The truth that it is more blessed to give than to receive is also insisted on by the synods. Speaking of contributions for the education of candidates for the priesthood, the pastoral letter of the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore (1843) says: "It is by placing the ecclesiastical institutions in the respective dioceses on solid foundations, that you will secure for yourselves and your children the perpetuity of the blessings wherewith it has pleased God to enrich you in Christ Jesus. Those to whom the wealth of this world has been given, cannot better employ a portion of it than in providing for the education of ministers of the altar. We are far, however, from meaning to undervalue the offerings which faith may inspire for the erection of temples to the glory of God, or charity may present for the clothing and maintenance of the orphan. We exhort you brethren to follow the impulse of the Holy Ghost in the various good works for which your charitable co-operation is solicited, and to remember in the day of your abundance, that whatever you set apart to the glory of God, in the exercise of charity, is so much secured against the caprice of fortune. 'Be not then high-minded, nor hope in uncertain riches, but in the living God (who giveth us abundantly, all things to enjoy), do good, be rich in good works, distribute readily, communicate, lay up in store for yourselves a good foundation against the time to come, that you may obtain true life'" (I Tim., vi, 17–19). Again the Fathers of the Sixth Provincial Council (in 1846) write: "On you it depends to give, especially to those who labour in word and doctrine, that support which will leave them without solicitude for the things of this world, that they may wholly apply themselves to the exercise of the holy ministry. We beseech you, brethren, to know them who labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, that you may esteem them more abundantly in charity for their work's sake. To you we look for means to educate youth for the ecclesiastical state, that when fully instructed in the duties of their holy vocation, and trained in discipline, they may become fit ministers of the Church, and adorn it by their piety and zeal, as well as by their talents. You should aid in the erection of the temples in which you and your children are to worship, and see that the house of God be not unworthy of the sublime functions which are to be performed in it. Of the worldly goods which God has bestowed on you, you should set apart a reasonable portion to be specially devoted to His glory; and you should rejoice at the opportunity thus afforded you to manifest your gratitude for His benefits." The Fathers of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852) joyfully acknowledged the generosity of the faithful: "The wants of the Church in this vast country so rapidly advancing in population and prosperity, impose on us, your pastors, and on you, our children in Christ, peculiar and very arduous duties. We have not only to build up the Church, by the preaching of the Gospel, and the inculcation of all the virtues it teaches, but also to supply the material wants of religious worship in proportion to the unexampled rapidity with which our flocks increase. We have to establish missions in places where, but a few years since, none or but few Catholics were to be found, and where now the children of the Church cry with clamorous importunity for the bread of life! We have to build the Church, where before God's name was not publicly worshipped; and to multiply His temples where they no longer suffice for the constantly increasing wants of the faithful. We have to provide a ministry for the present and future wants of the country, and in this matter we have to contend with difficulties which are unknown in countries where religion has been long established, and where the piety and zeal of past generations have furnished ample means for this most important object. We have to provide for the Catholic education of our youth. We have not only to erect and maintain the church, the seminary and the schoolhouse, but we have to found hospitals, establish orphanages, and provide for every want of suffering humanity, which religion forbids us to neglect. We thank the Giver of all good gifts for the extraordinary benediction which He has hitherto bestowed upon our efforts, and those of the venerable men whose places we fill. We rejoice at having the opportunity of bearing public testimony to the generous assistance which we have received from our flocks in our respective dioceses. Much however as has been done, much still remains to be accomplished. Our churches are nowhere equal to the wants of the Catholic population, and, in many places, are far from being sufficiently spacious to afford one-half of our people the opportunity of attending Divine worship. We therefore exhort you, brethren, to co-operate generously and cheerfully with your pastors, when they appeal to you in behalf of works of charity and religious zeal. In contributing to Divine worship, you make an offering to God of the gifts He has bestowed on you, and a portion of which He requires should be consecrated to His service, as a testimony of your continued dependence on His sovereign mercy. We hope that the example of your Catholic forefathers, and even of some among yourselves, will be generally felt and not infrequently imitated; and that here as well as elsewhere, the Church will be able to show the proofs of her children's faith in the numerous temples raised to the honour of God's name, in the beauty of His sanctuary which the true Christian will ever love, and in the ample and permanent provision made for the maintenance of public worship."

RESTRICTIONS ON THE CLERGY.—While vigorously insisting on the duty of giving on the part of the laity, the Church demands on the part of the clergy that moderation and prudence be exercised and that abuses be avoided. The First Synod of Baltimore, in 1791, warns priests to avoid "all appearance of avarice or simony". In the Canadian Council of Halifax, in 1857 (Prov. I), it is decreed: "In the administration of the sacraments care must be taken lest anything be done that savours of the horrible crime of simony or avarice or filthy lucre, and the sacraments must never be denied to any one under the pretext that he has not made the customary offerings. If any priest acts otherwise, he is an unfaithful dispenser, he makes light of the ministry of Christ, he scandalizes the little ones; and such a delinquent should know that he may be severely punished according to the judgment of the ordinary" (Decr. 4). The Plenary Synod of Ireland, at Thurles in 1850, contains a similar decree (Decr. 5): "In the offerings made by ancient and received usage in the administration of certain sacraments, let the parish priests beware lest anything be done that may savour of simony or avarice. Let the sacraments never be denied under the pretext that offerings have not been made; otherwise the delinquents may be disciplined according to the bishop's judgment." The following decree (14) is found in the statutes of the First Provincial Council of Westminster (1855): "Where the custom obtains (which is indeed ancient in England), of giving presents to individual priests at Easter and Christmas, such offerings belong to them. But let every priest be on his guard lest he fall under suspicion of receiving anything in view of the sacrament of penance administered by him." In 1854, the First Council of the Colonies of England, Holland and Denmark passed the following decree (Art. vii, 2): "Let every ordinary determine the sti-

pend for Masses and for everything else that may be accepted from the faithful in ecclesiastical functions, and let no priest infringe this decree under any circumstances, nor ever let them think that they are allowed to deny the sacraments to those who, on account of their poverty, make no contributions. Let the bishops keep before their eyes these words of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII): 'Let them prohibit absolutely those importunate and illiberal exactions of alms (for they are exactions rather than requests) and other similar things, which are not far removed from simoniacal guilt or the disgrace of seeking after lucre.''' The authority of the bishop is needed for unusual demands on the faithful. Thus the Second Provincial Council of Tuam (1854): "It is not permitted to any parish priest or ecclesiastical person or layman to make an extraordinary collection for any object whatever, unless the license of the bishop has been asked and obtained" (Decr. 6). In Australia, the Second Provincial Council of 1869 makes a similar precept (No. xii): "We prohibit any collection under any title or pretext, without the permission of the ordinary." English bishops enter into greater details (II Prov. Westmin.): "Every one seeking alms from the faithful must have the autograph of the ordinary or of his own superior declaring the object of the collection, and the license of the bishop of the place where he collects, under the condition expressed in his letters that he is obliged to render an accurate account to the bishop or to his superior of all the money collected by him and stating explicitly where he obtained it, what persons contributed it, and how long he remained in each place" (Decr. 21). In regard to stipends, the Second Provincial Council of Quebec decrees: "Lest parish priests and rectors of churches fall under suspicion or acquire a bad reputation among their flocks, let them carefully distinguish their own rights from those of their churches; nor may they change the tariff for ecclesiastical functions without the approbation of the bishop, nor may they take anything as their own, except such things as the diocesan law or approved custom ascribes to them" (Art. xvi, § 2, 8). Pope Gregory XVI, writing to the Vicar Apostolic of Gibraltar, in 1841, declared: "As to what pertains to the administration of the sacraments, let it be your care to admonish the faithful subject to you, that these Divine gifts are not to be received for any earthly price; but that they are to be distributed gratis by the ministers of God who have received them gratis; nor can any probable custom contrary to the canon law (against simony) be pretended, for the purpose of asking money on the occasion of the administration of the sacraments, when this has been rightly forbidden by you or the Congregation of the Propaganda by faculties received from us for the preservation of the sanctity of the sacraments." The people are also warned against improper means for obtaining money for charitable purposes. The Pastoral Letter of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (1866) says: "We warn our people most solemnly against the great abuses which have sprung up in the matter of fairs, excursions and picnics, in which, as too often conducted, the name of charity is made to cover a multitude of sins. We forbid all Catholics from having anything to do with them except when managed in accordance with the regulations of the ordinary, and under the immediate supervision of their respective pastors." Certain abuses are sternly censured by the American bishops (II Plen. Balt.): "It is reported, and we have learned it with great sorrow, that there are some priests in certain localities who during the Mass itself descend from the altar and go around in the church asking alms of the faithful. We reprobate, and command the extirpation of this most disgraceful abuse, which is injurious to the Church and its sacred rites, and which provokes the derision and contempt of non-Catholics. Concerning this matter we lay the burden on the conscience of each of the bishops" (tit. vi, cap. i). Again in the same chapter the Fathers say: "We cannot but declare that it is an intolerable abuse and a profanation of holy things, when, as has often happened, public and frequent invitations to give alms for the foundation [of Masses] are inserted for many months together in public newspapers among profane business notices. We desire the bishops, and [regular] prelates to destroy this abuse without delay and prevent it in the future." Likewise when treating of pew-rent, the synods decree that certain seats must be left free, nor can the pastor diminish the free space without the knowledge of the bishop (e. g. II Prov. Westmin., viii). As to collecting money at church entrances when the Sacred Mysteries are celebrated, the Congregation of the Propaganda, writing to the American bishops in 1862 and again in 1866, declared that this practice was contrary to the desires of the sovereign pontiff.

WAYS AND MEANS.—The principal methods of obtaining money for the support of the clergy and church institutions, have been already touched on. We may summarize the main ones here. For England the Second Provincial Council of Westminster (viii, De. bon. eccl.) enumerates: pew-rent, collections during Mass, seat money, alms contributed on the occasion of a sermon by a distinguished preacher, and house-to-house collections. In the United States, the same methods are employed. In some parts of Canada, tithes are payable, and the Third Provincial Council of Quebec (No. ix) decreed for Upper Canada that a certain sum should be required of each of the faithful, to be computed on the basis of the civil assessment roll. In addition to the above, priests may accept fixed stipends for Masses, and although they may not demand money for the administration of the sacraments, yet they can receive what is spontaneously offered at baptisms, marriages, funerals, etc. The poor are to be buried gratis (II Plen. Balt., c. ii). No offering may be received for confession (II Prov. Westmin., viii, 14). Nor is any money to be asked for conferring extreme unction (Syn. Plen. Thurles for Ireland, xv). For the pastor and his assistants, a definite salary is usually fixed, payable out of the revenues of the parish (III Plen. Balt., No. 273). To distinguish between parochial goods and sacerdotal perquisites, the following rule is given: When the things offered are adapted for ecclesiastical purposes, they are presumed to be given to the church; when they are for personal use, they are supposed to be given to the pastor. The latter rule applies also to sacred objects if they are presented by the congregation to a particular priest, expressly as a token of gratitude and affection.

The decrees of synods cited in this article may be found in the *Acta et Decreta S. Conc. Recentiorum: Collectio Lacensis* (Freiburg im Br., 1875), III, with the exception of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (Baltimore, 1886).

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Church Music. See MUSIC, ECCLESIASTICAL.

Church of England. See ANGLICANISM.

Church Property. See PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL.

Church Vestments. See VESTMENTS.

Chusai (Heb. חושי), the Arachite, i. e. the native of Archi, a place south of the portion of Ephraim, near Bethel (Jos., xvi, 2). He is called in I Par., xxvii, 33, "the king's friend". This title is given him as that of counsellor is given to Achitophel, or that of leader of the army to Joab. We see a like use of the term in III K., iv, 5. In the Books of Machabees it is an official title given by the Seleucides to persons of confidence who have important military

or civil functions (I Mach., ii, 18, iii, 38, vi, 10, 14, 28, vii, 6–8, etc.). It is likely, then, that Chusai's title of "friend" of King David does not imply the intimate relations suggested by the term; but the account that is given of him during Absalom's rebellion (II K., xv–xvii) shows that in his case the title was not merely official. Just after David has heard of the treason of Achitophel, he is met, on his way up the Mount of Olives, by Chusai, his garments rent and his head covered with dust. He is probably an old man, for David tells him he would be a burden in the flight; but the king does honour to his cleverness by sending him to Jerusalem to "defeat the counsel of Achitophel". Chusai persuades Absalom to take him into his confidence, and, in the council held shortly afterwards in regard to the measures to be taken against David, he obtains a delay which secured the safety of the king. He is able likewise to convey information to David through Sadoc, Abiathar, and their sons. It may be questioned how far Chusai's conduct can be justified even according to the ethics of war. Scripture relates his conduct, without thereby approving it.

PALIS in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s.v.; STENNING in HAST., *Dict. of the Bible*, s.v. *Hushai*.

W. S. REILLY.

Chytri, a titular see of Cyprus. The Greek see of similar title was suppressed in 1222 by Cardinal Pelagius, papal legate. It was beautifully located in the centre of the island, in the territory of Chytræa, west of Messaria. The flourishing modern village Kyrka (pronounced *tsirká*), in Greek officially *Kythraia*, Turkish *Deirmennik* has preserved the ancient name. There has been found here a pre-Phœnician necropolis. In the time of Assurbanipal, Pilâgura was King of Kitrusi, one of the ten kingdoms in the island. Numerous inscriptions have been found in the Cypriot dialect, some in ordinary Greek. Chytri was noted for the worship of Apollo, Artemis, and Aphrodite Paphia. Later forms of the name are Cythraia, Cythereia, Cythroi, Chytrides; according to the late Greek work of Sakellarios (Kypriaka, 2nd ed., 202–205) Kyrka should be Cythera or Cythereia; he identifies Chytri with Palo-Kythro, a village with ruins two hours south of Kyrka. The historical texts, however, mention only one town. Chytri was at an early date an episcopal see. Lequien's list of the bishops of the see (II, 1069) is very incomplete, only eight being recorded: the first is St. Pappus, who suffered martyrdom under Licinius, Maximinus, or Constantius; the most famous is St. Demetrian, 885–912 (?).

OBERHUMMER, *Chytroi* in PAULY-WISSOWA, *Real-Encyk.*, VI, 2529 sq.; GRÉGOIRE, *S. Démétrianos* in *Byzant. Zeitschrift*, XVI, 206 sqq.; MAS-LATRIE, *L'île de Chypre* (Paris, 1879), 36 sqq.; HACKETT, *A History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus* (London, 1901), 321.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Ciampini, GIOVANNI GIUSTINO, ecclesiastical archæologist, b. at Rome, 1633; d. there 1698. He graduated from the Roman University as a student of law but soon devoted himself to archæological interests, which an important office (*Magister brevium gratiæ*) in the Apostolic Chancery permitted him to pursue. He devoted himself with ardour to the collection of books, coins, and statues, and to the creation of scientific circles for the development of antiquarian learning; thus he founded, in 1671, a society for ecclesiastical history and, in 1679, an academy of the sciences, the latter under the patronage of his friend, Queen Christina of Sweden. He continued the school of archæological research begun by Onofrio Panvinio and Antonio Bosio, and carried on, though with inferior genius, by Fabretti, Boldetti, and Bottari, until, in our own days, Padre Marchi and Giovanni Battista De Rossi renewed the original traditions of scientific thoroughness. Apart from some minor archæological studies and an investigation of the "Liber Pontificalis" (1693), he has left two illustrated works of permanent utility, one a history of the ancient churches East and West, built by Constantine the Great (De sacris ædificiis a Constantino magno constructis, Rome, 1693), and the other a history of the art of mosaic (Vetera monimenta in quibus præcipua . . . musiva opera . . . illustrantur, Rome, 2 vols., 1690–99). Both works contain good illustrations of many ancient Christian edifices and mosaics that have since perished or suffered change and deterioration; they contain, moreover, a rare ecclesiastical erudition, much of it yet useful. His works were edited (Rome, 1747) in three volumes by Giannini.

BUCHBERGER, *Kirchliches Handlexikon* (Munich, 1907), I, 938; CRESCIMBENI, *Vite degli Arcadi illustri* (Rome, 1779); FABRONI, *Vitæ Italorum doctrinâ excellentium* (Pisa, 1766–83).

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Ciasca, AGOSTINO (in the world, PASQUALE), an Italian Augustinian and cardinal, b. at Polignano a Mare, in the province of Bari, 7 May, 1835; d. at Rome, 6 February, 1902. He received the habit of the Order of St. Augustine in 1856, made his religious profession in 1857, and in 1858 was ordained priest. Having perfected himself at Rome in the study of philosophy, theology, and canon law, he dedicated himself in particular to the study of the Oriental languages, especially Arabic and Coptic. Possessed of a keen intellect and a tenacious memory, he soon acquired a vast and profound knowledge in this branch of study. He was a religious of exemplary life, of strong character, assiduous in his work, well versed in ecclesiastical matters, and most loyal to the Catholic Church—qualities which made him especially dear to Leo XIII, who honoured him with his confidence and entrusted to him several delicate missions. In his order, besides being professor of dogmatic theology, Sacred Scripture, and the Oriental languages, Ciasca also held the positions of prefect of studies, assistant general, and afterwards of procurator general.

In 1866 he obtained the chair of Hebrew in the College of Propaganda, and later took part in the Vatican Council in the quality of theologian and as interpreter for the Oriental bishops. He also occupied the following positions: consultor of the Congregation of Propaganda for the affairs of Oriental Rites (1872); writer in the Vatican Library for Arabic (1876); pontifical interpreter at the Congregation of Propaganda; ordinary censor of Oriental books and professor of Oriental languages in the Roman Seminary (1878); dean of the faculties of Oriental languages and theology in the same seminary, and president of the college of interpreters at the Propaganda (1882); consultor of the Holy Office (1889). In 1891 he was created Titular Archbishop of Larissa with the appointment to the office of prefect of the Vatican Archives; in the same year he was sent by the Holy See to preside over the Ruthenian synod at Lemberg. In 1892 he was named pro-secretary and afterwards secretary of the Congregation of Propaganda (1893). His brilliant career was crowned by his elevation to the cardinalate at the secret consistory of 19 June, 1899.

Among Cardinal Ciasca's many services to ecclesiastical learning may be mentioned his publication (1885–89) of the extant fragments of a very ancient Coptic version of the Old Testament, from manuscripts in the Borgia (Propaganda) Museum and his discovery and edition (1888) of a valuable Arabic version of the "Diatessaron" or gospel-harmony of the second-century Christian writer Tatian, a text of much importance for the history of the Canon of the New Testament (cf. M. Maher, "Recent Evidence for the Authenticity of the Gospel: Tatian's Diatessaron", London, 1903). His own principal works are: "Examen Critico-Apologeticum super Constitu-

tionem Dogmaticam de Fide Catholicâ editam in Sessione tertiâ SS. Œcumenici Concilii Vaticani", 270 pp. 8vo (Rome, 1872); "I Papiri Copti del Museo Borgiano della S. C. de Propaganda Fide tradotti e commentati", pamphlet of 55 pp. (Rome, 1881); "Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica Musei Borgiani", vol. I, 4to, 225 pp., with 18 photolithographic plates; vol. II, 362 pp., with 8 phototypic plates (Rome, 1885 and 1889).—These two volumes deal with the Old Testament; vol. III, dealing with the New Testament (509 pp., with 40 phototypic plates) was published by the author of the present article in 1904. —"Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniæ Arabice nunc primum ex duplici codice edidit et latinâ translatione donavit . . .", in 4to, 108 pp., with 210 of the text and a phototypic plate (Rome, 1888).

PERINI, *Studio Bio bibliografico sul Cardinale Agostino Ciasca* (Rome, 1903).

P. J. BALESTRI.

Ciborium, a chalice-like vessel used to contain the Blessed Sacrament. The word is of rather doubtful etymology. Some derive it from the Latin word *cibus*, "food", because it is used to contain the Heavenly Bread; while others trace it to the Greek κιβώριον, "cup", because of the original shape of this Eucharistic receptacle. The term was also applied in early Christian times to the canopy that surmounted and crowned the altar (see article ALTAR, sub-title *Altar-Canopy*), but according to modern liturgical usage the word denotes exclusively the sacred vessel employed for the reservation of the Consecrated Species. At the present day two vessels are used to reserve the Blessed Sacrament: one, called a *pyx*, is a small round box and serves for carrying the Blessed Sacrament to the sick; the other, generally styled a *ciborium*, is used for distributing Holy Communion in churches and for reserving the consecrated particles in the tabernacle. In shape the ciborium resembles a chalice, but the cup or bowl is round rather than oblong, and provided with a conical cover surmounted by a cross or some other appropriate device. The bottom of the cup should be a little raised at the centre so that the last particles may be easily removed and the purification more conveniently performed. The material should be gold or silver (baser metals are sometimes allowed), but the interior of the cup must be always lined with gold. The ciborium is not consecrated, but blessed by a bishop or some priest deputed by him, according to the form given in the Roman Ritual. While containing the Sacred Species it should be covered with a small white veil of silk or cloth of gold, and may not be handled except by sacred ministers; when empty and purified it may be touched by all clerics (Cong. of Rites, Jan., 1907), and by lay persons if specially authorized. In Eastern Churches the paten is commonly used for the distribution of Communion, and the Blessed Sacrament is reserved in gold or silver boxes covered with silk and suspended from the altar-canopy in accordance with ancient custom.

CIBORIUM, DATED 1531, PALAZZO COMUNALE, ROME

During the first three centuries the Blessed Eucharist was not generally reserved in churches, owing to the danger of profanation and the persecutions, but the faithful sometimes kept the Sacred Species in silver boxes in their homes for the purpose of receiving it at the time of death (St. Jerome, De Afr. Pers., I; Tertullian, De Orat., c. xiv, etc.). In the fourth century there are evidences that it was reserved in churches, but only for the sick. In the fifth and sixth centuries reservation was more common, and the method adopted varied with time and place. The vessels in which the Sacred Species was kept were called indiscriminately *capsa*, *pyxis*, *cuppa*, *turris*, *columba*, and *ciborium*, and were themselves preserved either in a chamber in the sacristy (*secretarium*), in a niche in the wall or pillar (*ambry*), under an altar, or in other places designated by the words *diaconium*, *pastophorium*, *vestiarium*, etc. Subsequently it became the practice to reserve the Blessed Sacrament in dove-shaped receptacles (*columbæ*) or in little towers (*turres*), the former being suspended by chains from the ciborium or canopy of the altar, and the latter being usually placed in the *Armarium*. In the sixteenth century the *columbæ* and the towers began to disappear, and gave way to the tabernacle and the custom which is now universal throughout the Western Church. Ancient vessels of reservation may still be seen in the treasuries of continental cathedrals at Milan, Cologne, Rouen, and elsewhere. (See TABERNACLE; RESERVATION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.)

BONA, *Rer. Lit. duo libri*, I, XXV; MARTÈNE, *De antiq. eccl. ritibus*, I, XIX; VAN DER STAPPEN, *De adm. Sacr.* (Mechlin, 1900); CORBLET in *Hist. du sacrement de l'eucharistie* (Paris, 1886), especially II, 285–314, and I, 520–82; LEROSEY, *Manuel liturgique* (Paris, 1890), I, 179 sq.; DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 1682), passim; KRAUS, *Gesch. der christlichen Kunst* (Freiburg im Br., 1896), passim; REUSENS, *Eléments d'archéol. chrét.* (Louvain, 1885), I, 464, II, 327 sq.

PATRICK MORRISROE.

Cibot, PIERRE-MARTIAL, missionary, b. at Limoges, France, 14 August, 1727; d. at Peking, China, 8 August, 1780. He entered the Society of Jesus 7 November, 1743, and taught humanities with much success. He was sent to China at his own request 7 March, 1758, and arrived at Macao 25 July, 1759, whence he reached Peking 6 June, 1760, joining the Jesuits who were retained at the court of the emperor. Cibot during his many years of missionary labour in China found time also to devote to historical and scientific studies Many of his notes and observations on the history and literature of the Chinese were published in the "Mémoires concernant l'histoire, les sciences, les arts, les mœurs, les usages, etc., des Chinois: par les missionaires de Pékin" (Paris, 1776–89, 16 vols.). These volumes were at the time the chief source of information in Europe regarding China and its people. Cibot's most lengthy work, his "Essai sur l'antiquité des Chinois", appeared in the first volume of the "Mémoires". In it he claims Yaou (2356 B. C.) as the founder of the Chinese Empire. This view was not held, however, by other contemporary writers; in the second volume of the "Mémoires" his colleague, Father Amiot, in his "L'antiquité des Chinois prouvée par les monuments", defended the traditional Chinese chronology. Cibot also instituted a comparison between the Jews and the Chinese in connexion with a commentary on the Book of Esther (Mémoires, vols. XIV–XVI). He collected a herbarium of some value and seems to have been particularly interested in botany, though he contributed a number of articles on various topics in natural science to the "Mémoires", e. g. "Notices de quelques plantes arbrisseaux de la Chine" (vol. III), "Observations sur les plantes, les fleurs, et les arbres de Chine qu'il est possible et utile de se procurer en France";

"Notice sur le borax"; "Mémoire sur les chevaux" (vol. XI); "Notice sur l'hirondelle, sur le cerf et sur la cigale" (vol. XII), etc. Cibot's modesty prevented him from signing many of his essays. His style was somewhat diffuse, and his writings received their value chiefly from the variety of topics treated and the interesting information which they contained.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la c. de J.* (Paris, 1891), II, 1167; GROSSIER, in *Biog. univ.*, VIII.

H. M. BROCK.

Ciboule, ROBERT, theologian and moralist, b. in the Department of Eure, France, at the close of the fourteenth century; d. in 1458. He was chancellor of the church of Notre-Dame, Paris, and later dean of Evreux and chamberlain to Pope Nicholas V. In 1437 he was one of the theologians consulted by Charles VII concerning the rehabilitation of Joan of Arc, on which his decision was favourable. The same monarch sent him to the Council of Basle, and in 1439 made him ambassador to the Court of Pope Eugene IV at Florence. He wrote many devotional works, all of which he left in manuscript form. His "Sainte méditation de l'homme sur soi-même" was printed in Paris in 1510 and several times reprinted. Several of his sermons are preserved in the National Library of France (Department of Manuscripts), while his opinion regarding Joan of Arc has been partially published in the *Procès* which tells of her rehabilitation [Procès de condemnation et de réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc (Paris, 1841–49), III, 326–328]; and complete in Lanery d'Arc, "Mémoires et consultations en faveur de Jeanne d'Arc", etc. (Paris, 1889), 351.

THOMAS in *La grande encyclopédie*, s. v. *Ciboule;* DU BOULAY, *Historia universitatis parisiensis* (Paris, 1665–73); BELON AND BALME, *Jean Bréhal, grand inquisiteur de France et la réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc* (Paris, 1893), 59.

JOHN A. RYAN.

Cibyra, a titular see of Caria, in Asia Minor. Kibyra, later Kibyrrha, had been founded by the Lydians in Kabalis, a Lycian district inhabited by the Solymi. It was the leading city of Kabalis, having two votes in the Kabalian tetrapolis; it could arm 30,000 foot and 2000 horse; in 190 B. C. it was ruled by its own kings. In 130 the Romans allowed it to remain independent with its territory. But in 84 it was incorporated with the province of Asia by L. Licinius Murena, a lieutenant of Sulla, and became the capital of the Cibyratic *conventus*. It was renowned for its ironwork, but, being situated away from the great lines of Roman commerce, did not maintain its ancient prosperity. Tiberius restored it after an earthquake. It struck coins, and had its own era, reckoned from A. D. 25. It was annexed by Justinian to Caria, and as early as the eighth century became the chief town of the theme (department) of the Cibyriotes. From the seventh to the twelfth or thirteenth century it figures in the "Synecdemus" of Hierocles, and in many "Notitiæ episcopatuum" as a suffragan of Stauropolis, the metropolis of Caria. Six bishops are mentioned by Lequien (I, 963), the first being Letodorus (not Leontius) at Nicæa in 325; and the last Stephen, a partisan of Photius, who retracted at the Eighth Œcumenical Council in 869. The ruins of Cibyra are near Horzoum, a village in the vilayet of Koniah, where the ancient theatre, odeon, stadium, etc., are still to be seen.

SPRATT AND FORBES, *Travels in Lycia*, I, 256 sq.; COLLIGNON, *Inscriptions de Cibyra* in *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, II, 593 sq.; RAMSAY, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 256 sq.; SMITH, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geography* (London, 1878), I, 614–16.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Ciccione, ANDREA, an Italian sculptor and architect, born in Naples in the first part of the fifteenth century. He was a pupil of Masuccio the younger, and is said to have built the cloister of San Severino, the church and monastery of Monte Oliveto, and several palaces and churches. There is some doubt regarding Ciccione, as certain writers of note make no mention of him, while others do who have not been found always reliable. It is known that he sculptured the monument of Giosuè Caracciolo, formerly in the Duomo, and that he was selected by Joanna II to make a tomb for her brother, King Ladislaus, in the church of San Giovanni a Carbonara. This consists of a towering pile, three stories high, flanked by allegorical figures, the sarcophagus half way up, and Ladislaus on his war horse on the summit. The eyes are coloured, the robe borders and hair gilded, and backgrounds blue with gold fleurs-de-lys. Queen Joanna again commissioned Ciccione when her lover, the Grand Seneschal Gian Caracciolo, was murdered by conspirators. Caracciolo had a chapel in San Giovanni a Carbonara, and there the monks buried him hastily the night following his assassination. Over the tomb Ciccione raised a monument consisting of a sarcophagus borne by three armed knights representing Justice, Strength, and Prudence. A standing figure of Caracciolo on the top was coloured to portray life. Attention is called to the polychromy employed in these tombs, and to the representation of the virtues in military garb. There are no certain dates regarding Ciccione.

LÜBKE, *History of Sculpture*, tr. BURNETT (London, 1878); PERKINS, *Historical Handbook of Italian Sculpture* (New York, 1883).

M. L. HANDLEY.

Cicognara, LEOPOLDO, COUNT, politician, writer on art, and collector of Italian antiquities, b. at Ferrara, 26 November, 1767; d. at Venice, 5 March, 1834. He was thirty years old when pressure of circumstances, Bonaparte's campaigns in Italy, and the hope of a *risorgimento* in his country drove him into public life. An ardent supporter of the Cisalpine Republic, he was a member of the legislative body at Milan (1798), minister to Turin (1799), deputy to the Congress of Lyons (1801), and also Councillor of State. Being subsequently implicated in the Ceroni conspiracy, Count Cicognara was held prisoner at Milan and exiled to Como and Florence, but was finally restored to his functions and sent to Bologna on a diplomatic mission. However, at the beginning of the Empire he retired from the public career in which he had experienced such changes of fortune, being then only thirty-eight.

From that time on he devoted himself unreservedly to the fine arts. A friend from childhood of Canova, a pupil of Corvi and of the landscape-painter Hackert, he combined extensive knowledge and a highly cultivated taste with practical knowledge, and his dissertations on the beautiful "Del Bello, ragionamenti sette", (Florence, 1808) attracted attention. The Academy of Fine Arts had just been founded in Venice, and Cicognara was appointed its director, a post which he held until 1827. It was during this long administration, which must ever redound to his glory, that the admirable museum was established, about as it is to-day. Meanwhile he finished his great history of sculpture (Storia della scultura, Venice, 1813–1818, 3 vols. fol. with 131 plates), a work designed to complete those of Winckelmann and Seroux d'Agincourt, and which won its author a foreign member's seat in the Institute of France. It is, however, less valuable than his masterful publication on the manufactures and monuments of Venice (2 vols. fol. 1815–20; a new, augmented edition, 1833–40 with 250 plates, Italian and French text), in which Cicognara showed himself a learned historian of the city's antiquities, and the worthy and indispensable precursor of Ruskin and his "Stones of Venice".

The analytical catalogue ("Catalogo ragionato dei libri d'arte", Pisa, 1821), which he made of his library and sold to the pope in 1824, is still a model of bibli-

ography. Towards the close of his life Cicognara became an enthusiast for niello, and wrote a memoir which has since remained a classic (Memorie spettanti alla storia della calcografia, Prato, 1831, with atlas). The appearance of this treatise created such a demand for this kind of enamel that many spurious pieces were manufactured and sold as part of the Count's collection, and Cicognara himself was, in consequence, accused of counterfeiting. But modern critics have exonerated him. His last enthusiasm had for its object rare engravings, with which his curio-hunting had made him singularly familiar; he collected over 3000 belonging to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and after his death they were catalogued by his nephew, Count Nanetti, and Ch. Albrizzi, under the title, "The First Century of Calcography" (Venice, 1837).

Diedo, *Discorso funebre* (Venice, 1834); Zanetti, *Cenni biografici* (Venice, 1834); Dutut and Pawlowski, *Manuel de l'amateur d'estampes* (Paris, 1888), I, Pt. II; Malamani, *Memorie del conte Leopoldo Cicognara, tratte dai documenti originali* (Venice, 1888, 2 vols.).

Louis Gillet.

Cid, El (Rodrigo, or Ruy, Diaz, Count of Bivar), the great popular hero of the chivalrous age of Spain, b. at Burgos, c. 1040; d. at Valencia, 1099. He was given the title of *seid* or *cid* (lord, chief) by the Moors, and that of *campeador* (champion) by his admiring countrymen. Tradition and legend have cast a deep shadow over the history of this brave knight, to such an extent that his very existence has been questioned; there is, however, no reason to doubt his existence. We must, at the same time, regard him as a dual personality, and distinguish between the historical Cid and the legendary Cid. History paints him as a free-booter, an unprincipled adventurer, who battled with equal vigour against Christians and Moors; who, to further his own ends, would as soon destroy a Christian church as a Moslem temple; who plundered and slew as much for his own gain as from any patriotic motives. It must be borne in mind, however, that the facts which discredit him have reached us through hostile Arab historians, and that to do him full justice he should be judged according to the standard of his country in his day. Vastly different indeed is the Cid of romance, legend, and ballad, wherein he is pictured as the tender, loving husband and father; the gentle, courageous soldier; the noble, generous conqueror, unswervingly loyal to his country and his king; the man whose name has been an ever-present inspiration to Spanish patriotism. But whatever may have been the real adventures of *El Cid Campeador*, his name has come down to us in modern times in connexion with a long series of heroic achievements in which he stands out as the central figure of the long struggle of Christian Spain against the Moslem hosts.

Ferdinand I, at his death (1065), had divided his dominions between his three sons, Sancho, Alfonso, and García, and his two daughters, Elvira and Urraca, exacting from them a promise that they would respect his wishes and abide by the division. But Sancho, to whose lot had fallen the Kingdom of Castile, being the eldest, thought that he should have inherited the entire dominions of his father, and he resolved to repudiate his promise, claiming that it had been forced from him. Stronger, braver, and craftier than his brothers, he cherished the idea of despoiling them and his sisters of their possessions, and becoming the sole successor of his father. At this time, Rodrigo Diaz was quite young, and Sancho, out of gratitude for the services of Rodrigo's father to the State, had retained his son at the court and looked after his education, especially his military training. Rodrigo later rendered such distinguished services in the war in which Sancho became involved with Aragon that he was made *alferez* (standard-bearer or commander-in-chief) of the king's troops. After ending this war with Aragon, Sancho turned his attention to his plan of despoiling his brothers and sisters (c. 1070). He succeeded in adding to his dominions Leon and Galicia, the portions of his brothers, but not until in each instance Rodrigo had come to his rescue and turned apparent defeat into victory. The city of Toro, the domain of his sister Elvira, was taken without trouble. He then laid siege to the city of Zamora, the portion of his sister Urraca, and there met his fate, being treacherously slain before the gates of the city by one of Urraca's soldiers (1072). Learning this, Alfonso, who had been exiled to the Moorish city of Toledo, set out in haste to claim the dominions of his brother, and succeeded him on the throne as Alfonso VI, though not without opposition, from his brother García, in Galicia, and especially in Castile, the inhabitants of which objected to a Leonese king. The story is told, though not on the best historical authority, that the Castilians refused Alfonso their allegiance until he had sworn that he had had no hand in his brother's death, and that, as none of the nobles was willing to administer the oath for fear of offending him, Rodrigo did so at Santa Gadea before the assembled nobility. If this be true, it would account in a great measure for the ill-will Alfonso bore Rodrigo, and for his subsequent treatment of him. He did not at first show his hatred, but tried to conciliate Rodrigo and the Castilians by bestowing upon him his niece Jimena in marriage (1074). It was not long, however, before he had an opportunity to satisfy his animosity. Rodrigo having been sent by Alfonso to collect tribute from the King of Seville, Alfonso's vassal, he was accused, on his return, by his enemies of having retained a part of it. Whereupon, Alfonso, giving free rein to his hatred, banished him from his dominions (1076). Rodrigo then began his career as a soldier of fortune, which has furnished themes to Spanish poets of early and modern times, and which, idealized by tradition and legend, has made of him the champion of Christian Spain against her Moorish invaders. During this period of his career, he offered his services and those of his followers first to one petty ruler and then another, and often fought on his own account, warring indifferently against Christians and Moors, always with distinguished success, and incidentally rising to great power and influence. But in times of necessity his assistance was sought by Alfonso, and in the midst of his career of conquest he hastened to the latter's support when he was hard pressed by Yusuf, the founder of Morocco. Through some mistake or misunderstanding, however, he failed to join the king, who, listening to the complaints and accusations of the Cid's enemies, took from him all his possessions, imprisoned his wife and children, and again banished him from his dominions. Disgraced and plundered, the Cid resumed his military operations. Upon his return from one of his campaigns, hearing that the Moors had driven the Christians from Valencia and taken possession of the city, he determined to recapture it from them and become lord of that capital. This he did (1094) after a terrible siege. He spent the remainder of his days there. His two daughters were married to the Infante of Navarre and the Count of Barcelona respectively. His remains were transferred to the monastery of San Pedro de Cardeña, near Burgos, where they now rest.

The exploits of *El Cid* form the subject of what is generally considered the oldest monument of Spanish literature. This is an epic poem of a little over 3700 lines as it has reached us (several hundred lines being missing), the author of which, as is not uncommon with works of those days, is unknown. The date of its composition has long been a disputed question. Many critics whose names must be mentioned with respect, among them Dozy and Ticknor, place it at the beginning of the thirteenth century; but to-day the

best opinion places the poem a half-century earlier. Among those who think it was written as early as the middle of the twelfth century are many eminent Spanish and foreign scholars, including Sánchez, the first editor of the poem, Capmany, Quintana, Gil y Zarate, Bouterwek, Sismondi, Schlegel, Huber, and Wolf. The learned Amador de los Ríos, whose opinion carries great weight, thinks that the famous poem must have been written prior to 1157. Though based upon historical facts, the "Poema del Cid" is to a very large extent legendary. Its theme is twofold, the adventures of the exiled Cid and the mythical marriage of his two daughters to the Counts of Carrión. The first few pages are missing, and what remains opens abruptly with the banishment of the Cid by King Alfonso, and ends with a slight allusion to the hero's death. But the story it tells is not its chief claim to our consideration. The poem deserves to be read for its faithful pictures of the manners and customs of the day it represents. It is written with Homeric simplicity and in the language of the day, the language the Cid himself used, which was slowly divorcing itself from the Latin, but was still only half developed. The versification is rather crude and ill-sustained. The prevailing metre is the Alexandrine or fourteen-syllabled verse with a cæsural pause after the eighth; but the lines often run into sixteen or even twenty syllables, and sometimes stop at twelve or ten. This, however, may be partly due to careless copying.

The adventures of the Cid have furnished material for many dramatic writers, notably to Guillen de Castro, the eminent Valencian poet and dramatist of the early seventeenth century, whose masterpiece, "Las Mocedades del Cid" earned him whatever reputation he enjoyed outside of Spain. This latter work, in turn, furnished the basis for Corneille's brilliant tragedy, "Le Cid", which, according to Ticknor, did more than any other drama to determine for two centuries the character of the theatre all over the continent of Europe. Among other works dealing with the life and adventures of the Cid are: (1) "La Legenda de las Mocedades de Rodrigo", or "La Crónica Rimada", as it is sometimes called. This work has been thought to be even older than the "Poema del Cid" by some critics, among them so eminent an authority as Amador de los Ríos. (2) "La Crónica General ó Estoria de España", written by Alfonso the Wise. (3) "La Crónica del Cid", the manuscript of which was found in the very place where the Cid lies buried, the monastery of San Pedro de Cardeña. Its author and the time of its appearance are unknown.

SÁNCHEZ, *Poesías Castellanas Anteriores al Siglo* XV (Madrid, 1779–90), reprinted by OCHOA (Paris, 1842); QUINTANA, *Vidas de Españoles Célebres* (Madrid, 1807); SOUTHEY, *Chronicle of the Cid* (London, 1808); DURÁN, *Romancero General* (Madrid, 1828–52); DENNIS, *The Cid* (London, 1845); TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1849); HÉMON, *Cours de Littérature* (Paris, 1891).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Cidyessus, a titular see of Asia Minor. It was a city of some importance, west of Ammonia in West-Central Phrygia, in the territory of the Setchanli Ova, Mouse Plain; this large and fertile valley projects far into Phrygia Salutaris, but the city belonged to Phrygia Pacatiana. Its site has been determined by an inscription found at the little village of Ghieuktché Euyuk, west of Afium Kara Hissar, in the vilayet of Brusa. The old native name may have been Kydessos, though it is Kidyessos on coins. Lequien (I, 801) mentions only three bishops: Heraclius in 451, Andreas in 787, and Thomas in 879. The see is still mentioned in later "Notitiæ episcopatuum" until the twelfth or thirteenth centuries as a suffragan of Laodicea.

RADET, *En Phrygie* (Paris, 1895), 113; RAMSAY, *Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), 139, 151, 168.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cienfuegos, DIOCESE OF (CENTUMFOCENSIS), includes all the Province of Santa Clara in the central part of Cuba, has an area of 9,560 square miles, and (census of 1899) a population of 356,536; 317,243 native Cubans; 28,398 Spaniards; 10,895 of other nationalities. The diocese, which had previously formed part of that of Havana, was erected by Archbishop Chapelle, of New Orleans, acting as Apostolic Delegate, in virtue of the Brief "Actum præclare", of Leo XIII (20 February, 1903), but was administered by the Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba until 31 May, 1904, when its first bishop, Fray Aurelio Torres y Sanz, O. C. D., took possession.

Missions were established in the cities of Trinidad and Sancti Spiritus, in this part of Cuba, during the sixteenth century, under Franciscans, who preached to the aborigines and continued to keep the spirit of religion alive among the colonists, until the expulsion of the religious orders by the Spanish Government in 1835. Numberless religious endowments witnessed to the piety of the inhabitants, especially during the eighteenth century, when Catholic fervour reached its highest pitch; but by far the greater part of these were in time confiscated by successive Spanish governors. On taking possession of his newly-erected see, the first care of the Bishop of Cienfuegos was to introduce order into the ecclesiastical administration, which had suffered severely from the civil troubles between 1868 and 1895, many of the church buildings having been irreparably ruined.

Santa Clara is an essentially agricultural district. There are numerous sugar mills, and the province is well supplied with railroads. Most of the immigration is Spanish. Although the vast majority of the inhabitants are Catholics, it is impossible to obtain contributions for the support of religion from a populace whose faith and morals have been impaired by years of political turmoil. The Cubans, moreover, have for generations been accustomed to a Church supported by the State. On the other hand, while indifferentism and Freemasonry are rife, Protestantism, although represented by several denominations, has few adherents.

The diocese contains 38 parishes, but of the parochial clergy only eleven are native Cubans. The religious and charitable institutions at Cienfuegos are: Monserrat College, under the Jesuit Fathers, 20 religious, 159 pupils; Bartolomé de las Casas College, Dominican Fathers, 11 religious, 100 pupils; French College, 6 Marist Brothers, with 80 pupils; College of the Apostolate, 8 Sisters of the Apostolate of the Sacred Heart, with 83 pupils; Huérfanas de la Patria, an orphanage conducted by the Daughters of the Rosary, 27 boarders and 54 day-scholars; Congregation of the Servants of Mary, for the care of the sick in their own homes, 8 sisters and 43 girl pupils in the free school; 9 Little Sisters of the Poor, with 62 inmates of their home for the aged. At Santa Clara there is the College of Saint Paul of the Cross, Passionists, 10 religious and 62 pupils; College of the Love of God, 6 Sisters of the Love of God, with 56 girl pupils. At Trinidad the "Líceo Trinitario" is under the direction of a Father of the Order of Discalced Carmelites. The few native Cubans in this diocese who feel called to the priesthood either make their studies at the seminary of the Diocese of Havana or enter religious orders.

Catholic Directory (Milwaukee, 1908); BATTANDIER, *Ann. pont. cath.* (Paris, 1906).

Cignani, CARLO, b. 1628, the most distinguished of three Bolognese painters of the same name, was a count and belonged to a noble family; he was the pupil of Albani and perhaps the most celebrated of the students, but at the same time he was strongly influenced by the teaching of the Carracci and

by the works of Correggio. His first important work was the ornamentation for Cardinal Farnese of the great salon of his palace at Bologna. In the same city he painted scenes in the style of Correggio representing events in Bologna at the time of the plague. They are in the church of San Michele in Bosco, and each picture is supported by two angels of remarkable beauty. He executed a fine piece of interior decoration in the palace of the Duke of Parma and for it received the honour of knighthood. His great achievement is the painting of the "Assumption of the Virgin" in the cupola of Forlì cathedral. On this immense work he was engaged from 1681 to 1706, and on its completion was elected to high office in that town and appointed by Clement XI president of the Academy of Bologna. There is a grandeur and profundity about his work hardly warranted by its actual execution. His colouring is suave, his drawing on the whole accurate but not devoid of clever trickery, and his paintings were executed with extraordinary facility. There are three of his works at Copenhagen, several in Vienna, his own portrait at Florence, and others at Berlin and Munich. He died at Forlì in 1719. (2) Felice, his son, succeeded to the ample fortune left by his father, and practised his art rather from inclination than as an actual professional artist. He was born in 1660 and died in 1724; in Bologna in two of the churches are clever, dexterous, and well-coloured paintings which are his work. (3) Paolo was another pupil of the elder artist and his nephew. He was born at Bologna in 1709 and died in 1764. His style is effective, refined, and highly finished, but only three of his paintings are known to present-day critics.

Lanzi, *Storia Pittorica* (Bassano 1809); Osetti, *Ms. Vols. on Bolognese Painters;* Zanotti, V.

George Charles Williamson.

Cilicia. See Asia Minor.

Cilicia, Patriarch of. See Armenia.

Madonna Enthroned—Cimabue (Academy, Florence)

Cimabue, Cenni di Pepo, Florentine painter, b. 1240; d. after 1301; the legendary founder of Italian painting and the reputed master of Giotto. Vasari begins his biography with these words: "In the flood of disasters which had overwhelmed unfortunate Italy not only all monuments of art worthy of the name but also all artists had disappeared, when, in 1240, Cimabue was born in the city of Florence, of the noble Cimabue family of the period, to illumine, as it were, the way towards the art of painting." Then follows the story of the painter's childhood. According to Vasari some Greeks who had settled in Florence were his masters, but he soon surpassed them, and his reputation became so great that Charles of Anjou came to visit him in his studio. When he completed his famous "Madonna", the people bore it in triumph to Santa Maria Novella, with such jubilation that the section where the painter lived was afterwards called the Borgo Allegri.

All this has since been proved untrue, and is attributed to the zeal of Vasari, the Italian historian of art, for the glory of Florence, his native city. The so-called barbarism of the thirteenth century is no longer credited. This was, on the contrary, the age of the true Renaissance. The cathedrals of Pisa, Lucca, and Pistoia had been built; the basilica of Assisi and the Abbey of S. Galgano were already in the course of construction. In Rome this was the era of the great Cosmati family, of Torriti, and Cavallini, in Sicily of those wonderful sculptors, Ravello and Capone. At Pisa (1260) it was marked by the completion of the famous pulpit of the baptistery, the work of Nicolò Pisano, and the first classical work of art in Italy. Yet this is what Vasari called the "barbarism of the thirteenth century". The story of Cimabue is a curious example of false historical data. It frequently happened among the ancients that the victorious race stole even the past laurels of the vanquished, appropriating their gods, their legends, and their myths. Similarly a rivalry existed in the Middle Ages between the Republics of Siena and Florence. Florence could never pardon Siena for its great victory of Montaperti (1260), and this was the cause of much trouble between the two. The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the most brilliant era of Florence, marked Siena's downfall. Florence alone possessed artists and writers. By means of the printing press the Florentines spread broadcast boasting accounts of themselves, and these errors became fixed.

Nothing availed against such a mass of official falsehoods. It needed all the patience of the modern critic to right these wrongs. It is now established that the famous "Madonna" of Santa Maria Novella, called the "Madonna Ruccellai", is the work of the great artist of Siena, Duccio di Buoninsegna, who painted it in 1285 for the altar of the Brotherhood of the Blessed Virgin. These facts are proved by the discovery of a contract preserved in the records of Florence, and also from the evident relationship between this immortal work of art and other works of Duccio. Again it has been discovered that the triumphal procession to which Vasari refers in his account of Cimabue was held not in Florence, but in Siena (9 June, 1311), in honour of another masterpiece of this same Duccio, the great *Maestà*, or "Madonna of Majesty", which may now be seen at the Opera del Duomo in Siena. That day, writes an eyewitness, a public feast was ordained in Siena. All the shops were closed. The bishop, the clergy, the Council of Nine, with a multitude of people, went to seek the masterpiece in the house of the painter, near the Porta Stalloregi, and accompanied it as far as the cathedral, bearing torches and singing canticles. Thenceforward Siena took, in all public acts, the name of *Civitas Virginis*.

It is evident that these comprise all the elements of the assumed biography of Cimabue. Tradition was contented with a change of name. Duccio was forgotten, and the memory of his triumphs remained

attached to the name of Cimabue, which explains the verse of Dante (Purg., XI):—

> Credette Cimabue nella pintura
> Tener lo campo, ed ora ha Giotto il grido
> Sì che la fama di colui s' oscura.

(Cimabue thought himself the master of painters, Giotto took from him the glory and relegated him to oblivion.) From this verse of Dante, which preserved for posterity the name of Cimabue, it was inferred that he was the master of Giotto. There was nothing more to do but furnish him with a biography and a list of works. Legend did the rest, as we have already seen.

CIMABUE, FRESCO, S. MARIA NOVELLA, FLORENCE

We learn, however, from these verses that Cimabue was a renowned master in his time. A recently discovered text tells us that *Cimabove, pictore de Florencià*, resided at Rome in 1272. In 1301 he received ten "livres" from the Opera del Duomo of Pisa for "St. John the Baptist" in mosaic, which accompanies the "Christ" in the cathedral, and two notarial acts mention the price for an altar-screen of the Madonna, to be painted by the said master, Cenni de Pepo, called Cimabue, with one of his own associates. Here our certitude ends. Aside from the "St. John" of Pisa, a mosaic which has been much repaired, we have not a single work of Cimabue. Some critics ascribe several paintings to him, but it must be admitted that in the absence of documents these surmises are without ground. The "Madonna" of the Louvre and that of the Academy of Florence have enough of the characteristics of Duccio to be taken as paintings of his school. The same must be said of the celebrated fresco of the "Virgin with St. Francis" in the right transept of the lower church of St. Francis at Assisi. But in the upper church the frescoes, now almost in ruins, of both transepts and the choir, representing the "Last Ends", illustrating texts of the New Testament from the Crucifixion and the Acts of the Apostles to the Apocalypse, show a savage grandeur and suggest the work of a Byzantine Æschylus. Nothing confirms, and on the other hand nothing prevents, the attribution of them to Cimabue. At any rate they are the work of a great artist.

CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *History of Painting in Italy* (new ed., London, 1903); VENTURI, *Storia dell' arte italiana* (Milan, 1902), II; VASARI, *Vite de' pittori*, ed. MILANESI (Florence, 1878), I; DOUGLAS, *The Real Cimabue* in *The Nineteenth Century* (1903), no. CCCXIII; THODE, *Franz von Assisi* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1905); FRY, *Art before Giotto* in *Monthly Review* (Oct., 1900).

LOUIS GILLET.

Cima da Conegliano, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, a Venetian painter, b. at Conegliano in the province of Treviso in 1459 or 1460; d. in 1517 or 1518. His father, who died in 1484, was a cloth-shearer (*cimator*), hence the family surname. In 1488 the young painter was at work at Vicenza; in 1492 he established himself at Venice, but by the summer of 1516 he had returned to his native place. Cima married twice, his first wife, Corona, bearing him two sons, the older of whom took Holy orders at Padua. By Joanna, his second wife, he had six children, three being daughters.

His oldest painting inscribed with a date is the "Madonna of the Arbour", made in 1489, and now in the Museum of Vicenza. This picture is done in distemper and savours so much of the style of Bartolommeo Montagna, who lived at Vicenza from 1480, as to make it highly probable that Cima was his pupil. Even in this early production Cima gave evidence of the serious, calm, and almost passionless spirit that so eminently characterized him. Later he fell under the spell of the great Giovanni Bellini and became one of his ablest successors, forming a happy, if not indispensable link between this master and Titian. At first his figures were somewhat crude, but they gradually lost their harshness and gained in grace while still preserving their dignity. In the background of his facile, harmonious compositions the mountains of his country are invested with new importance. Cima was one of the first to assign the landscape a definite place in modern painting, and to formulate the laws of atmosphere and of the distribution of light and shade. His "Baptism of Christ", in the church of S. Giovanni in Bragora (Venice, 1492), gives striking evidence of this. The colouring is rich and bright with a certain silvery tone peculiar to Cima, but which in his later works merges into a delicate gold. His conceptions are usually calm and undramatic, and he has painted scarcely any scenes (having depicted religious ones almost exclusively) that are not suggestive of "sante conversazioni". His "Incredulity of St. Thomas" (National Gallery, London) and his beautiful "Nativity" (Venice, Santa Maria del Carmine, 1509) are hardly aught else. But most of his paintings represent Madonnas enthroned among the elect, and in these subjects he observes a gently animated symmetry. The grouping of these sainted figures, even though they may not have a definitely pious character, and the evident blissfulness of their existence give the impression of unspeakable peace. Such are, among others, the magnificent "Madonna Montinini" (about 1507) in the Parma Museum; the "Madonna with Four Saints" (about 1511) in the Berlin Museum, and the smaller "Virgin and Child Enthroned with St. John the Baptist and the Magdalen" (about 1513) in the Louvre, which was Cima's last bequest as poet and landscape painter.

RIDOLFI, *Meraviglie dell' arte* (Venice, 1648); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *A History of Painting in Italy* (*Northern Schools*); BOTTEON AND ALIPRANDI, *Ricerche intorno alla vita, elle opere di Giambattista Cima* (1893); BERENSON, *Lorenzo Lotto* (London, 1901); BURCKHARDT, *Cima da Conegliano* (Leipzig, 1905).

LOUIS GILLET.

Cimbebasia, UPPER, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF.— Cimbebasia was the name given for a long time to the western part of Southern Africa. Originally it was included in the immense vicariate made up of Senegambia and French and Portuguese Guinea which had been erected in 1842 and of which Bishop Barron was appointed first vicar Apostolic. The Congregation of Propaganda separated Cimbebasia (3 July, 1879) from this vicariate and made of it a prefecture Apostolic. The Congregation of the Holy Ghost was placed in charge of the new field, and Father Duparquet of the same congregation was appointed first prefect Apostolic. The new mission was, however, still very large, being made up of three distinct regions: the northern part, which included the territory of the Amboella and Gangela and was under the influence of Portugal; the southern part, composed of Ovamboland and Damaraland, now under the control of Germany; and Bechuanaland. After having tried to found stations in all these different territories,

the missionaries decided to concentrate their efforts on the northern part of the prefecture. The superior general of the congregation, therefore, requested the Holy See to confide to other institutes the remaining sections of the vicariate. Consequently, Propaganda placed the northern part of the vicariate, under the name of the Prefecture of Upper Cimbebasia, in charge of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost (1 August, 1892), while the German territory was called the Prefecture of Lower Cimbebasia, and given to the Oblate Fathers of Mary. Bechuanaland was then united to the Vicariate of the Orange Free State. The Prefecture of Upper Cimbebasia is bounded on the north by the Kassai River, on the east by the 22d degree of longitude east of Greenwich, on the west by the upper course of the Kunene, and on the south by the degree of latitude determined by the lower course of the Kunene. This degree of latitude also forms the boundary line between the Portuguese and German possessions in Southern Africa. Under the direction of the prefect Apostolic, 20 priests and 8 Brothers of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost labour for the evangelization of this territory. They are aided by 40 catechists and 5 Sisters of the Congregation of St. Joseph of Cluny. There are 7 stations: Kakonda, Bailundo, Bihe, Katoko, Kassengue, Massaka, and Kuniama; 28 flourishing schools contain 1600 boys and 1100 girls, of whom 374 boys and 123 girls have their home at the schools. The Catholic population numbers about 10,200, of whom 9000 are natives. During 1903 and 1904 there were 806 children and 491 adults baptized.

CIMBEBASIA, LOWER, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF, is bounded on the north by the degree of latitude determined by the lower course of the Kunene River; on the east by the 22d degree of longitude east of Greenwich; on the south by the 23d degree of south latitude, in such manner that the town of Rehoboth is included in the Vicariate Apostolic of the former Orange Free State, now the Orange River Colony; on the west by the Atlantic. The region is under the control of Germany. The prefecture was erected by a decree of Propaganda of 1 August, 1892, which divided the earlier prefecture of Cimbebasia. The Oblate Fathers of the Immaculate Mary have charge of the mission under the prefect Apostolic, who resides at Windhoek, the principal station. The other mission stations are: Little Windhoek, Nobra, Swakopmund, Usakos, Aminuis, Tpukiro, Omaruru, Okumbahe. The Catholics number about 1000, some 800 being Europeans. The labourers in the evangelization of this field are: 20 priests, 17 brothers, and 11 Missionary Sisters of St. Francis. There are 11 schools with 500 pupils, and 2 orphanages with 108 orphans.

Missiones Catholicæ (Rome, 1907) 393–95; *Statesman's Year Book* (London, 1907), 1341–42; *Les missions catholiques françaises* (Paris, 1900); *Bulletin de la congrégation du Saint-Esprit.*

ALEXANDRE LEROY.

Cincinnati, ARCHDIOCESE OF (CINCINNATIENSIS), comprises that part of the State of Ohio lying south of 40 degrees, 41 minutes, being the counties south of the northern line of Mercer, Auglaize, Hardin, all west of the eastern line of Marion, Union, and Madison counties, and all west of the Scioto River to the Ohio River, an area of 12,043 square miles. The see was erected 19 June, 1821; the archdiocese created 19 July, 1850.

EARLY MISSIONARY LIFE.—As early as 1749 a Jesuit, Joseph de Bonnecamp, had traversed Northern and Eastern Ohio with De Blainville, who at the time was taking possession of the Valley of the Ohio in the name of France. In 1751 another Jesuit, Armand de la Richardie, established a mission station at Sandusky. In 1795 Rev. Edmund Burke (afterwards first Bishop of Halifax) spent a short time among the Indians along the Maumee, but with little success. In 1790 a colony of French settlers located at Gallipolis on the Ohio, and Dom Peter Joseph Didier, a Benedictine monk, built a church, but growing discouraged left after a few years. The Rev. Stephen T. Badin visited Gallipolis in 1796. Bishop Flaget of Bardstown had charge at this time of Kentucky and Tennessee and the territory divided to-day into the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Ohio. In company with Father Badin he made a tour of Northern Ohio, passing through Chillicothe, Lancaster, and Somerset. The country was nothing but primeval forest. He met the first Catholics at what is to-day known as Somerset, and in response to their earnest appeal he asked the Dominicans to come to their spiritual aid. In this way Father Fenwick, in later years the first Bishop of Cincinnati, was commissioned to take charge. It was here that he met John Fink, and in the latter's house, on the spot now occupied by the Somerset High School, the Sacrifice of the Mass was first offered for the assembled thirteen families. Some two years later Father Fenwick visited Somerset a second time, and secured from the Dittoe family a tract of three hundred acres for the Dominican Order on condition that a church and monastery be erected as early as possible. The buildings, at first small and primitive, have since been replaced by the more beautiful and commodious structure of St. Joseph's Priory. It was early in 1811 that the first attempt was made to organize a congregation in Cincinnati. The Catholics interested in the work met on 13 December in the house of Joseph Fabler, but no definite action was taken. Bishop Flaget was passing through Cincinnati in 1814 on one of his episcopal visitations. The city, which to-day numbers within its corporate limits 400,000 people, and is one of the great centres of art, commerce, education, and religion, was at the time practically a wilderness dotted here and there with a small number of log-cabins reared by the sturdy settlers. On this occasion he met the representatives of the Catholic families of Cincinnati. Their names, recorded in the early annals of the church, were Michael Scott, Patrick Reilly, Edward Lynch, Patrick Gohegan, John McMahon, John White, P. Walsh, and Robert Ward. Mr. Scott was one of the earliest Catholic settlers in Ohio, coming from Baltimore in 1805 and eventually moving to Cincinnati. It was in his house that Bishop Flaget, on the occasion of his first visit, celebrated the first Mass in Cincinnati; on this occasion the bishop urged the erection of a church as soon as means would permit. Their faith, courage, and spirit of sacrifice can be truly appreciated when one remembers the obstacles which confronted them, and the spirit of religious bigotry with which they were obliged to contend. A city ordinance forbade the erection of a Catholic church within the city limits. An appeal for assistance to the Catholics in the East met with a ready and generous response, property was secured on the north-west corner of Vine and Liberty Streets, and with logs cut in the timberland of William Reilly, in Mayslick, Ky., rafted to Cincinnati, and carted by oxen to the site outside the corporate limits, they constructed in 1822 the first Catholic Church in Cincinnati, a plain, barn-like structure. On the recommendation of Bishop Flaget, Ohio was made a diocese 19 June, 1821, with Cincinnati as the see.

BISHOPS.—(1) EDWARD FENWICK, a native of Maryland and a member of the Dominican Order, was appointed the first Bishop of Cincinnati, and made Administrator Apostolic of Michigan and the eastern part of the North-western Territory. He was consecrated by Bishop Flaget in St. Rose's Church, Washington County, Kentucky, 13 January, 1822, and arriving in Cincinnati the same year he took up

his residence at the junction of Ludlow and Lawrence Streets in a small house which served as an episcopal palace and a place of worship. His cathedral, the log-church on the outskirts of the city, was several miles distant and at times almost inaccessible. The prohibitive ordinance had in the meantime been withdrawn, and the little edifice was placed on rollers and moved by oxen through the streets of Cincinnati to the site now occupied by the College of St. Francis Xavier. Shortly before, the diocese being without priests, churches, or schools, Bishop Fenwick made a trip to Europe in quest of aid. Having received generous assistance from the nobility of France and the reigning pontiff, he purchased upon his return the ground on Sycamore Street (the present site of St. Francis Xavier's church), and on 19 May, 1825, the corner-stone of the old St. Peter's Cathedral was laid. The completed edifice was dedicated by Bishop Fenwick 17 December, 1826. The Athenæum, dedicated to St. Francis Xavier, was opened 11 May, 1829, with Rev. H. Montgomery as rector, four theological and six preparatory students. Among the many gifts which the bishop had received in Europe was a printing press, and from this went forth in October, 1831, the first edition of "The Catholic Telegraph", one of the oldest Catholic papers in the United States. At this time the clergy were few; the diocese extended from the Ohio River to the Lakes; the Catholics, limited in number, were scattered over the most distant points, and the bishop was compelled to visit his flock by stage, on horseback, or on foot. Cholera was raging throughout his diocese in 1832, and on 26 September of the same year he was stricken and died at Wooster. His remains were brought to Cincinnati and deposited in the old cathedral, now St. Francis Xavier's, 11 February, 1833. In 1846 they were transferred to the new cathedral, where they now repose. When he assumed charge of the diocese, in 1822, his flock numbered fifty families, the churches did not exceed five, and his clergy were the few pioneers brought from Europe; when he died, in 1832, the Catholic population had grown to seven thousand. The churches throughout the diocese and the clergy had increased proportionately; a cathedral and seminary had been erected.

(2) JOHN BAPTIST PURCELL was consecrated second Bishop of Cincinnati, 13 October, 1833, in the Baltimore cathedral, Archbishop Whitfield being the consecrating prelate. Immediately after his consecration Bishop Purcell attended the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore, and then with borrowed funds set out for his see. Upon his arrival in Cincinnati, 14 November, 1833, he found there only one church—St. Peter's Cathedral. Four Sisters of Charity had arrived in Cincinnati 27 October, 1829, to take charge of the first cathedral school, and with six orphans under their care started the first asylum for orphans in the diocese. The diocese was growing and clergy were needed. The seminary was removed from the city to Brown County in 1839; but in 1845 it was brought back to the city, and the seminarists continued their studies in the Jesuit college under Father Nota up to 1848, when they were transferred to the episcopal residence, under the supervision of the Rev. David Whelan. On 27 January, 1847, Michael and Patrick Considine conveyed to the bishop a tract of five acres on Price Hill for a new seminary, of which the corner-stone was laid on 19 July, 1848. The centre wing was solemnly blessed and opened 2 October, 1851, under the name of Mount St. Mary's of the West. From this institution went forth for a half-century the clergy of the Middle West. Its history is inseparably interwoven with the history of the diocese, and its students cherished with feelings of reverence the names of its presidents, Fathers Hallinan, Quinlan, Barry, Rosecrans, Pabisch, Hecht, Byrne, Murray, and Mackey, all men of great learning and deep piety. In 1904 it was transferred to its present site, Cedar Point, Hamilton County, Ohio. The first German parish church, the Holy Trinity, was erected in 1834, and the Rev. John Martin Henni, afterwards the first Archbishop of Milwaukee, was the first pastor. In 1837 he founded the "Wahrheitsfreund", the first German Catholic paper in the United States. In 1907 it was merged with the "Ohio Waisenfreund". Bishop Purcell was always an ardent advocate of Catholic education and a pioneer in the defence of parochial schools. The progress of Catholicity was such in the thirties as to cause alarm in certain quarters. Lyman Beecher's "Plea for the West" had gone forth, and the sentiment it moulded found expression in the Purcell-Campbell debate. The Ohio College of Teachers was in session, and the occasion was seized by the Rev. Alexander Campbell to accuse the Catholic Church of being an enemy to enlightenment. He issued a challenge for an open debate; it was accepted, though reluctantly, by Bishop Purcell. The debate commenced 13 January, 1837, in the Campbellite church, and continued for seven days. Much of the existing prejudice was removed, and the numerous conversions to Catholicity following the controversy were ample proof that the Church and its doctrines had been ably and eloquently defended by the young Bishop of Cincinnati. From this time an impetus was given to the spread of Catholicity in Cincinnati and throughout the diocese. The fertility and wealth of the Ohio Valley had become known; many immigrated from the Eastern States, and Ohio received a large proportion of the Europeans whom unsatisfactory conditions at home induced to cross the sea to seek their fortunes in the New World.

Communities of sisterhoods were invited to share the burden of supplying the growing needs of religion. The Sisters of Charity arrived in Cincinnati in 1829; the Sisters of Notre-Dame in 1840; the Ursulines in 1845; the Sisters of the Good Shepherd in 1857; the Sisters of Mercy and St. Francis in 1858; the Little Sisters of the Poor in 1868; and the Religious of the Sacred Heart in 1869. To these were added religious orders of men. The Jesuits established a house in 1840; and there followed in succeeding years the Fathers of the Precious Blood (Sanguinists), the Franciscans, the Passionists, the Fathers of the Holy Cross, and the Brothers of Mary. The corner-stone of the present St. Peter's Cathedral was laid in 1841; it was consecrated in 1845. The personality of the bishop was strong and magnetic, and attracted all classes to him. The first German orphan asylum for boys was opened in 1839, and that for girls in 1843. Eventually they were combined, and the German Orphan Asylum at Bond Hill is the successful outgrowth of both. Under the auspices of the St. Peter Benevolent Association for Orphans, formed 25 December, 1833, St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum was opened on 24 July, 1855. It is a monument to the generosity of the people and ministers to the needs of the four hundred inmates. Sixteen churches were built in the city and the immediate neighbourhood; the parochial schools were equally numerous. The Catholic population now exceeded 50,000, and it was deemed necessary to erect a second diocese for the northern half of the state, at Cleveland, of which, on 10 October, 1847, the Rev. Amadeus Rappe was consecrated the first bishop. Not long afterwards Cincinnati was made an archiepiscopal see (19 July, 1850).

In 1853 a wave of Know-Nothingism was sweeping over the country. Philadelphia and Louisville had been the scenes of riotous outbreaks. The Most Rev. Cajetan Bedini, titular Archbishop of Thebes, who had been appointed nuncio to the court of Brazil, and had been commissioned to investigate certain

CINCINNATI

CHURCH OF THE ASSUMPTION
CONVENT OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD
ST. LAWRENCE'S CHURCH (WEST FRONT)
ST. PETER'S CATHEDRAL
ST. LAWRENCE'S CHURCH (INTERIOR)
ST. FRANCIS XAVIER'S CHURCH

causes of complaint at Buffalo and Philadelphia, arrived at Cincinnati in June, 1853. Prior to his coming popular prejudice was appealed to, his character was maligned, and crimes imputed to him of which he was innocent. On his arrival in Cincinnati the smouldering spirit of Know-Nothingism was fanned into a flame. On Christmas night, 1853, while the guest of the Archbishop of Cincinnati, a mob determined upon his death marched to the cathedral, threatening to burn it. The loyalty of the people to their archbishop, who counselled prudence and forbearance, put to shame and disarmed the spirit of revolt, while the action of the mob, disgracing the hospitality of Cincinnati by insulting an unoffending visitor of one of her citizens, was abhorred by every lover of law and order. Archbishop Hughes was the champion of the Church in the East and the vigilant guardian of her interests; Archbishop Purcell was the power which moulded her destiny in the West. His tongue and pen were always active in her defence. Broadminded and devoted to truth, he was loved by all, irrespective of creed. Convinced that he was right, he never swerved from the path which duty marked out for him to follow. Able and wise and fearless as a churchman, he was none the less loyal as a citizen. When the clouds of civil war were gathering, he proclaimed himself an advocate of the Union in opposition to the sentiments of a large number of his people, hoisted the flag upon the cathedral spire, and delivered an address, classic in thought and expression, which breathed the spirit of the patriot and lover of peace. He was signally honoured by Pius IX; and on the silver jubilees of his priesthood and episcopacy, in 1851 and 1858, on his return from the Vatican Council, and on the occasion of the golden jubilee of his priesthood in 1876, the clergy and laity, non-Catholic and Catholic, vied with each other in their demonstrations of devotion to this patriarch of the West, who had laboured incessantly for half a century in the vineyard of the Lord.

Father Edward Purcell, the archbishop's brother, had conducted for years a private system of banking. Simple in its beginning and easy of control, it assumed in the course of years proportions which passed, it may be, beyond the grasp and management of an individual. The crisis and financial reverses came in 1879, it is not known how. In his eagerness to compensate the creditors, Archbishop Purcell attempted to assume the responsibility of the bankruptcy. The courts decided that the obligation was not diocesan, that Father Purcell was individually responsible, and that churches and institutions were liable for borrowed monies only. This indebtedness (of churches and institutions), amounting to some $200,000, was paid. The event hastened the death of Father Edward Purcell, and that of his brother followed on 4 July, 1883, at St. Martin's, Brown County, Ohio, where his remains now rest. The sorrow was universal. Some, it is true, in the hour of their losses, were disposed to blame, but the majority of citizens, Catholic and Protestant, believed firmly in the honesty of purpose of the deceased archbishop and his brother, whose only faults, if such they may be called, were their forgetfulness of self and their willingness to aid their struggling people. The diocese, which in 1833 comprised the State of Ohio, had grown from infancy to full manhood—400 churches and 100 chapels raised their crosses heavenward. The Catholic population amounted to 450,000, more than 85,000 being in Cincinnati alone. He found one church in Cincinnati upon his arrival; there were now upwards of thirty. The original diocese (embracing Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Columbus) employed the services of 440 clergymen, 52 religious communities, 3 theological seminaries, 3 colleges, 25 academic institutions for girls, 22 orphan asylums, 1 protectory for boys, 6 hospitals, 40 charitable institutions, and 266 parochial schools. The Archdiocese of Cincinnati at the time of his death had 180,000 Catholics.

(3) William Henry Elder, Bishop of Natchez, Mississippi, was transferred to the titular See of Avara and made coadjutor to the Archbishop of Cincinnati, with the right of succession, 30 January, 1880, and succeeded to the See of Cincinnati 4 July, 1883. He had been the first to extend his sympathy and to volunteer assistance to his predecessor in the hour of his affliction. He entered upon his episcopal duties during the crucial period of the financial failure. Its settlement was brought about largely through the prudence and wisdom of his administration. He received from Reuben R. Springer the generous bequest of $100,000, and in 1887 he reopened Mount St. Mary's Seminary of the West, which had been closed for eight years. In 1890 he founded St. Gregory's Preparatory Seminary at Cedar Point, Hamilton County, the Very Rev. J. C. Albrinck being its first rector. In 1904 it was transferred to Cincinnati and made a day college. Saintly and retiring, the archbishop exercised an influence silent but effective by the unostentatious sanctity of his life. Judicious at critical moments, he ruled wisely. A true lover of souls, he could be found in the confessional up to the close of his eighty-fifth year. He adhered closely to the laws of the Church, and exacted a similar fidelity in others. Two provincial councils were called, in 1883 and 1888. Several synods were convened and regulations framed, creating system and smoothness in the working of the archdiocese. The zeal of his predecessor characterized his efforts in behalf of Catholic education. Charitable institutions were placed upon a firm basis, and the administration of parishes made more methodical. He was loved by all during life, and was mourned by all at his death, 31 October, 1904.

(4) Henry Moeller, consecrated Bishop of Columbus, Ohio, 25 August, 1900, was promoted to the archiepiscopal See of Areopolis and made coadjutor to Archbishop Elder, with the right of succession, 27 April, 1903. He had been for twenty years Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, previous to his appointment to the See of Columbus.

Causes of Growth.—Up to 1829 there was practically no immigration to the West. In after years the fertility and wealth of the country lying between the Eastern mountains and the Mississippi directed thither the tide of incoming Europeans. The Irish famine of 1848, and political disturbances in Germany about the same time, sent large numbers of Irish and Germans to America. Friends had preceded them, and glowing accounts of the agricultural possibilities of Ohio attracted many to the Ohio Valley. Steamboat facilities after 1830 and railroads after 1838 contributed largely to increase the population. The Civil War did not retard materially the progress of religion.

Pioneer Priests.—The following are worthy of mention: Revs. E. Fenwick, S. T. Badin, N. J. Young, E. Thienpont, J. B. Lamy, Joseph P. Machebeuf, Frederic Rese, J. Ferneding, J. Reed, J. H. Luers, H. D. Juncker, Martin J. Henni, H. Kundig, B. Toebbe, W. Cheymol, J. J. Mullon, Thos. Bolger, and the Jesuits Joseph de Bonnecamp and Armand de la Richardie. Eight of these priests were raised to the episcopate. Among the laymen of distinction, the Fink and Dittoe families in the early years of the Church in Ohio deserve to be remembered. In subsequent years the following merit special mention: Patrick and Michael Considine, John and Joseph Slevin, Stephen Boyle, Chas. Conahan, Joseph and Patrick Rogers, Joseph Butler, Joseph Heman, J. P. Carberry, Dr. Bonner, Col. McGroarty, James F. Meline, N. H. Hackman, Joseph Kline, B. VerKamp F. A. Grever, Reuben R. Springer, Patrick Poland, Joseph Nurre, H. Himmelgarn, Joseph Niehaus, and

Nicholas Walsh. Mrs. Sarah Peter was active in the founding of convents.

SHEA, *Hist. Cath. Church in the United States* (New York, 1889–1892); O'GORMAN, *Roman Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1895); KELLY AND KIRWIN, *History of Mt. St. Mary's Seminary of the West* (Cincinnati, 1894); HOUCK, *A History of Catholicity in Northern Ohio* (Cleveland, 1902); *The Catholic Telegraph* (Cincinnati) files; REUSS, *Bib. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy of the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Directory* (1908).

M. P. O'BRIEN.

Cincture (Lat. *Cingulum*), or, as it is more commonly called in England, *girdle*, an article of liturgical attire which has certainly been recognized as such since the ninth century. Then as now it was used to confine the loose, flowing alb, and prevent it from impeding the movements of the wearer. But its liturgical character appears from the prayers which even from early times were recited in putting it on and from the symbolism of spiritual watchfulness which then specially attached to it, according to the text, "Sint lumbi vestri præcincti". The *cingulum* is enumerated among the Mass vestments in the Stowe Missal, and this very possibly may represent the practice of the Celtic Church in the seventh century. It seems probable, however, that in the Celtic Church, as in the Greek Church of the present day, the girdle was worn only by bishops and priests; the deacon's tunic was left ungirded. Some few surviving examples of early girdles (tenth- and eleventh-century) show that in the beginning the cincture was not always a simple cord, as it is now. On the contrary, we find narrow bands of silk and precious stuff, often richly embroidered, and these lasted until late in the Middle Ages. Some such bands and sashes were again introduced for the same purpose in the last century, but the Congregation of Sacred Rites has disapproved of the practice, though it permitted those which existed to be used until worn out (24 November, 1899). The material of the girdle is preferably flax or hemp, but wool and silk—the latter especially for occasions of solemnity—are not prohibited. This material is woven into a cord, and the ends are usually decorated with tassels. By way of ornament strands of gold and silver thread are sometimes introduced, particularly in the tassels at the extremities. The prayer now recited by the priest in putting on the girdle, "Gird me, O Lord, with the girdle of purity", etc., strongly suggests that this vestment should be regarded as typical of priestly chastity. Like the other Mass vestments, the girdle requires to be blessed before use.

Some kind of cincture, we may further note, is included in almost every form of religious or ecclesiastical costume. In certain religious orders it receives a special blessing, and in such familiar instances as the Cord of St. Francis or the Girdle of St. Augustine it is sanctioned and indulgenced by the Church as indicating a profession of allegiance to a particular institute. Again, the broad sash, which forms part of the civil attire of bishops, priests, and other ecclesiastics, has been imitated, apparently for æsthetic reasons, in the costume of choir boys and servers at the altar. It should be said that this last development, while not expressly prohibited so long as certain rules are observed regarding colour and material, is not in any way prescribed or recommended by ecclesiastical authority.

BRAUN, *Die liturgische Gewandung* (Freiburg, 1907); VAN DER STAPPEN, *Sacra Liturgia* (Mechlin, 1902), IV; BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *Le Costume et les usages ecclésiastiques* (Paris, 1901); THALHOFER, *Liturgik*, etc.; ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *La Messe*, VII. Almost all works on the Mass, e. g. those of GIHR, MÜLLER, BENEDICT XIV, devote a section to vestments.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Cingoli, DIOCESE OF. See OSIMO.

Cinites (A. V. Kenites), a tribe or family often mentioned in the Old Testament, personified as *Qayin* from which the *nomen gentilicium Qêni* is derived. In spite of several attempts at a solution, the origin both of the name and of the tribe is still obscure. Hobab the relative (brother-in-law?) of Moses was a Cinite (Judges, i, 16, iv, 11; as Hobab is also called a Madianite (Num., x, 29), it follows that the Cinites belonged to that nation. Judging from appearances, the Cinites were true worshippers of Yahweh. Some scholars, on the strength of Ex., xviii, go even so far as to assert that it was from them that the Israelites received a great portion of their monotheistic theology; the passage, however, deals directly and only with social organization. At any rate, the Rechabites, a clan of the Cinites [I Par. (A. V. I Chron.) ii, 55] were even ascetics and insisted on retaining the nomadic habits of the followers of Yahweh (Jer., xxxv). Though calamities were foretold for the Cinites by Balaam (Num., xxiv, 21 sqq.), they are always represented as being on friendly terms with the Israelites. Owing probably to their alliance with Moses and also to the bonds of a common religion, they befriended the Israelites during their wanderings in the desert [Num., x, 29–32, I K. (A. V. I Sam.) xv, 6] and joined them in their march on Chanaan (Judges, 1, 16). There is no intimation that there ever was any enmity between the two nations (cf. I K., xxvii, 10, xxx, 29). The Cinites dwelt south of Palestine with the Amalecites, as is evident from Num., xxiv, 21 sqq., I K., xv, 6, and probably also from Judges, i, 16, if we read אתהעמלקי instead of the Massoretic אתהעם, a reading which is supported by several Greek MSS. and by the Sahidic Coptic Version (cf. Ciasca, Fragm. Copto-Sahidica). One clan of the Cinites left the tribe and settled in the north under Haber, at the time of Barac and Debbora (Judges, iv, 11); Jahel, who slew Sisara, was the wife of Haber the Cinite (ibid., iv, 17 sqq., v, 24 sqq.). From the facts that we find the Cinites south and north, and that in Aramaic the root from which *Qayin* is derived implies the idea of a smith, Sayce (in Hastings, Dict. Bib., s. v. Kenites) draws the conclusion that the Cinites were a wandering guild of smiths. This view has against it the obvious meaning of the texts (see especially Gen., xv, 19). Apparently the Cinites shared in the Babylonian Exile and in the Restoration, but they do not appear any more as a distinct tribe and very likely were assimilated with the Jews.

MURRAY, *Comment. de Kinæis* (Hamburg, 1718); STADE, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel* (Berlin, 1889), I, 129 sqq.; IDEM, *Das Kainzeichen* in *Zeitschr. für d. Alttest. Wissenschaft* (1894), 250 sqq.; MOORE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (New York, 1901), 31 sqq.; BARTON, *A Sketch of Semitic Origins* (New York, 1902); LESÊTRE, *Cinéens*, in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible.*

R. BUTIN.

Cinna, a titular see of Asia Minor. According to the order of the "Synecdemus" of Hierocles (p. 696) Kinna was probably in the north-western part of the rich corn-growing district now called Haïmane, west of Angora, though its exact position cannot be determined. It must have been close to Balyk Koyounji (vilayet of Angora) or even nearer the River Sangarius. Kinna was a suffragan of Ancyra, in Galatia Prima. Lequien (I, 483) mentions ten bishops: the first, Gorgonius, was present at Nicæa in 325; the tenth, Antonius, was a partisan of Photius in 879, and another, Sabas, was probably an adherent of St. Ignatius. The see figures in later "Notitiæ episcopatuum".

RAMSAY, *Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), 245, 247, 430.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Circesium (KERKESION, KERKISION, KIRKISIA, CERCUSIUM, CIRCESSUS), a titular see of Osrhoene. Founded under Diocletian and restored by Justinian, it is now identified with the village Abu Serai, on the left bank of the Euphrates, at the confluence of the

Khabur, where the river was commonly crossed. The ancient city, however, had replaced a still older one, called Sirhi in Assyrian texts. Benjamin of Tudela and many after him identified it wrongly with Kharkamis (Carchamish), one of the capitals of the Hittites, situated at Jirbas, or Jerablus, the present name of Europos, or Oropos. Circesium was a bishopric in Osrhoene, suffragan of Edessa; it figures only in Parthey's "Notitiæ episcopatuum" (c. 840). Lequien (II, 977) mentions five bishops: Jonas, who was present at Nicæa, and had suffered mutilation during the preceding persecution; Abramius, present at Chalcedon; Nonnus, a Severian (518 and 532); Davides, present at Constantinople (536); Thomas (553). There are also records of fourteen Jacobite bishops, from 793 to 1042.

RAWLINSON, *The Five Great Monarchies* (4th ed., London, 1879), II, 67; MASPERO, *De Charchemis oppidi situ et historiâ antiquissimâ*, 14 sq.; NÖLDEKE, *Götting. Nachricht.* (Jan., 1876), nn. 11, 13, 15; CHABOT in *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, VI, 194.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Circumcision.—The Heb. מוּלָה, like the Gr. *περιτομή*, and the Lat. *circumcisio*, signifies a cutting and, specifically, the removal of the prepuce, or foreskin, from the penis. The number and variety of tribes and nations who practised it are surprising; a conservative estimate places the number that practise it in our day at two hundred millions. Herodotus says that the Egyptians, Colchians, and Ethiopians, from very early times, were circumcised; and he mentions other races, the Phœnicians and Syrians of Palestine (the Jews, as Josephus maintains), who say that they learned the use of circumcision from the Egyptians (Herod., II, 104; Jos., C. Ap., I, 22). Even some Christians circumcise their children, the Copts, for instance, and the Abyssinians, in Africa; and among the Filipinos, the same may be said of most of the Tagalos, who are Catholics. To these last, however, it is a mere ceremony without religious import. The Mohammedan Moros may have introduced it into the islands, where it remains, notwithstanding centuries of Christian influence against it (C. N. Barney, see bibliography). The Abyssinians are entirely under Jewish influence, though they profess Christianity: they observe the Jewish Sabbath, circumcise on the eighth day, and observe many other usages. (See Andree, cited below, p. 189.) Andree states also that the custom of circumcising is found in Sumatra (pp. 191, 192), the east coast of New Guinea (p. 197), and among the Samoans, who call Europeans "the uncircumcised". Even in America, circumcision was in use among the Aztec and Maya races (op. cit. 201, 202). The fact of its existence in Australia (Spencer and Gillen, Tribes of Central Australia, p. 218 sq.), and in a great part of the islands of Oceanica, not to speak of America, would seem to throw some doubt on the assertion of Herodotus that it had its origin in Egypt.

It is not easy to assign satisfactory reasons for a usage so general. Those who think it was a tribal mark, like tattooing, or the knocking out of the front teeth, should consider that such marks are usually conspicuous. Was it connected with phallic worship, and thus regarded as an offering to the deity of fertility? or was it, as some think, a substitute for human sacrifice? From the fact that the priests in Egypt were, beyond question, circumcised (G. Rawlinson—Ancient Egypt, vol. I, p. 452), as also from the fact that the upper classes among the Aztec and Celebes tribes made use of it, we may conclude that circumcision was not looked upon as a mark of slavery or subjection, but rather of nobility and superiority. Father Lagrange holds that it had a religious significance, and that, as it is not referred to in Chaldean monuments, it was not a protosemitic practice, but may have had its origin in Arabia (Etudes sur les religions sémitiques, 1903, pp. 239–243).

Merely utilitarian motives have been assigned by many: even Philo (De Circumcisione, II, 211, ed. Mangey) gives cleanliness, freedom from disease, offspring, and purity of heart, this last the only mystical or sacramental one among the four, which Herodotus also mentions as the motive of the Egyptians, *καθαριότητος εἵνεκα* (II, 37). Physicians prescribe circumcision in certain cases, for instance, to guard against phimosis, balanitis, and other such evils; further, Rosenzweig recommended its general adoption in the Prussian army (Zur Beschneidungsfrage, 1878). That the ceremony had some relation to initiation into manhood, at the marriageable age, seems to receive support from the custom of certain tribes of being circumcised at the age of puberty; and also from the fact that the Arabic word *khatan* signifies to circumcise and to be allied by marriage.

It is strange that the universal practice of circumcision among those who profess Mohammedanism is neither based upon, nor sanctioned by, the Koran. Was this silence observed by the Prophet of Islam because there was no need of prescribing what already had the force of law or, perhaps, because it did not seem to him to have any religious significance? However we explain his silence, tradition, by appealing to his authority, soon gave to the practice all the weight of his sanction. The age at which the Arabs were circumcised was, according to Josephus (Ant., I, xii, 2), thirteen years, in imitation of Ismael (Gen. xvii, 25). At present the regular time for circumcising Mohammedan children is between the ages of seven and twelve years. The Bedouin tribes too, though not scrupulous Islamites, have adhered faithfully to this usage of their forefathers. A short description of the ceremony of circumcision among the nomads of the Sinaitic peninsula may be read in the "Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement" (Jan., 1906, p. 28). The writer says that the ceremony has "nothing religious" about it: yet, as he states, the beginning of the Koran is recited on the occasion.

The relation, if there be any, between Gentile and Jewish circumcision is an interesting subject. The clear statement of the Bible that circumcision was given to Abraham, as "a sign of the covenant" (Gen. xvii, 11), need not compel us to believe that hitherto it was unknown in the world. Like the law of clean and unclean, in food and daily life, it may be regarded as a practice of venerable antiquity that was adopted and adapted to express what it had not expressed before. The rainbow existed from the first days of rain and sunshine, for it is the result of both, but the Lord gave its future significance to Noe. The same is true of incense, sacrifice, and lustral water, which, though found very early among nations not in touch with revelation, are yet prescribed by Divine ordinance and used in Divine worship. If, therefore, we question the assertion of Herodotus, that circumcision was of Egyptian origin, and was adopted from the Egyptians by surrounding nations, and, among these, by the Syrians (Jews) of Palestine, it is not because of theological scruples, but rather because of lack of argument. Whatever may be said about Herodotus as a witness in matters that fell under his personal observation, when he argues, his authority is only in proportion to the weight of his arguments, and these are, in many instances, mere conjectures. Artapanus, quoted by Eusebius (Præpar. Evan., IX, xxviii), goes so far as to say that the Egyptians adopted the practice of circumcision from Moses.

The illustration of the ceremony of circumcision pictured on the ruins of Karnak, is probably later than the going down of Israel into Egypt. It is given in Andree's work, pp. 187, 188 (see below); and also in Ebers, "Aegypten etc.", pp. 278–284 (see below), who, moreover, discusses the inferences to be drawn from the finding of a circumcised mummy. We may safely say, however, that up to our time the monuments of antiquity furnish no conclusive proof that circum-

cision was practised anywhere prior to the Biblical date, at which God made it "a sign of the covenant" between Himself and Abraham (Gen., xvii, 11). To the Jews it had a sacramental meaning, derived from its Divine institution and sanction. As Isaac, so their children were circumcised on the eighth day, according to the law: "An infant of eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations: he that is born in the house, as well as the bought servant shall be circumcised, and whosoever is not of your stock: And my covenant shall be in your flesh for a perpetual covenant. The male, whose flesh of his foreskin shall not be circumcised, that soul shall be destroyed out of his people: because he hath broken my covenant" (Gen., xvii, 12–14; xxi, 4). For some reason, not given in the text, Moses while in Madian neglected to circumcise his son, Eliezer, on which account God "would have killed him", i. e. not Eliezer, as some think, but Moses, as the passage indicates. Sephora, having taken a sharp stone, circumcised her son with it, and said, "a bloody spouse art thou to me"; whereupon the Lord "let him go" (Exod., iv, 24–26). The Greek reading, "the blood of my son's circumcision has ceased to flow", is obscure. Sephora very probably meant that by what she had done she had saved the life of her husband and confirmed their marriage by the shedding of blood.

During the sojourn of forty years in the desert the law of circumcision was not observed, as the changes incident to nomadic life, in so large a community, made its observance almost impossible. When, however, the people came into the Land of Promise, the Lord said to Josue: "Make thee knives of stone, and circumcise the second time the children of Israel" (Jos., v, 2). *The second time*, i. e. renew the practice which had been omitted during the nomadic period. As Sephora used a stone knife, so on this occasion stone knives were used, which is a proof that the events narrated are of great antiquity. The words of the Lord to Josue, "This day have I taken away from you the reproach of Egypt", seem to refer not to circumcision, as some think, but to the disgrace of being slaves to the Egyptians, contrasted with the honour of entering into the true liberty of the children of God. Josephus interprets them in this sense: "Now the place where Joshua pitched his camp was called 'Gilgal', which denotes 'liberty', for since now they had passed over Jordan, they looked upon themselves as freed from the miseries which they had undergone from the Egyptians, and in the wilderness" (Ant., V, i, 11). Many modern scholars, however, translate Gilgal, "a rolling away", "circle" (Gesenius, s. v.), and think that the Heb. text of Josue (v, 9), "I have rolled away from you the reproach of Egypt", refers to the removal of the disgrace of uncircumcision; for at that time, they suppose, most of the Egyptians, and not a few Jews while in Egypt, were uncircumcised. The law was clear and peremptory: "The uncircumcised shall be destroyed out of his people" (Gen., xvii, 14); and for both Jews and strangers circumcision was a necessary preparation for eating the paschal lamb (Exod., xii, 48). *'Arel*, "uncircumcised", is frequently used as a term of reproach, i. e. profane, unclean (Judges, xv, 18; I K., xiv, 6, xvii, 36, xxxi, 4; Is., lii, 1; Ezech., xxviii, 10, xxxii, 25, 26, etc.). The school of Shammai, therefore, was conservative, insisting on the rigorous observance of the law, while that of Hillel, was more inclined to leniency, in dealing with proselytes and strangers. Josephus, in the advice of Eleazer and Ananias to Izates, King of Adiabene, gives the views of the rigorists and the laxists in reference to the necessity of circumcision (Ant., XX, ii, 4; cf. Graetz, Geschichte d. Juden, III, pp. 172 sqq.). The rigorous doctrine was adopted by John Hyrcanus, who compelled the Idumeans to be circumcised. They received, moreover, the entire Jewish Law; so that Josephus says "they were hereafter no other than Jews" (Ant., XIII, ix, 1). Therefore, the fact that Herod was an Idumean helped him to the throne. The Itureans also were forced "to live according to the Jewish laws" (Jos., Ant., XIII, xi, 3).

Long before this, many of the Persians were circumcised and "became Jews, for the fear of the Jews had fallen upon them" (Esth., viii, 17, Heb. text; Josephus, Ant., XI, vi, 13). The Book of Jubilees insists upon the strict observance of the law, and protests against those that "make the members of their body appear like those of the gentiles" (xv, 26, 27). During the period of Greek rule in Palestine, when those that kept the laws of Moses were put to death by the gentile tyrants (I Mach., i, 63; II Mach., vi, 10), some Jews, under Greek influence, "made themselves prepuces" and turned away from the ways and traditions of their fathers (I Mach., i, 15, 16; Jos., Ant., XII, v, 1). To this epispastic operation performed on the athletes to conceal the marks of circumcision St. Paul alludes, *μὴ ἐπισπάσθω* (I Cor., vii, 18). Therefore Jewish circumcision, in later times, tears the membrane that remains after circumcision given in the ordinary way, among the Arabs for instance, and thus defeats even the surgeon's skill.

In our day many Jews are not so zealous in keeping the law as their fathers were; nor do they think it necessary to have the "sign of the covenant" in their flesh. The ceremony is considered cruel, nor has it any sacramental import in Jewish national life. The Reform movement at Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1843, considered it an unnecessary element of Judaism. This lax doctrine could find no stronger expression than in the case of Chief Rabbi Einhorn of Mecklenburg, who in 1847 defended his having named and consecrated an uncircumcised child in the synagogue, as a child, even though uncircumcised, born of Jewish parents, enjoys all the privileges and assumes all the obligations of a Jew. (See Jewish Encyl., s. vv. Circumcision, Einhorn.)

Neither place nor minister is designated in the law of circumcision. The mother sometimes, oftener the father, circumcised the child. Later, one skilled in the operation, called a *Mohel*, usually a surgeon, performed it. In Josephus, Ant., XX, ii, 4, we read that Izates, the King of Adiabene, wishing to live as a Jew, "sent for a surgeon" and was circumcised, evidently at home, as in modern times also the ceremony may take place either at home or usually in the synagogue. The eighth day was prescribed, even should it be the Sabbath (see John, vii, 22, 23). A name was given, as in Luke, i, 59, ii, 21, to commemorate the change of the patriarch's name from Abram to Abraham, when God made the covenant with him and made circumcision the sign of it (Gen., xvii, 5). In the ceremony, the one that holds the child is called *Sandek*, from the Greek *σύντεκνος*, equivalent to our godfather in baptism; and as Elias was a zealous champion of the law, for which he suffered much, there is a vacant chair for him at every circumcision.

The Jews were proud of their descent from Abraham, but did not always "do the works of Abraham" (John, viii, 39). They attached so much importance to the external act, that while attending to the letter they neglected the spirit of the law. Jeremias (iv, 4; ix, 25, 26) calls their attention to the necessity of circumcision of the heart, as all important. Even in Deut., x, 16, xxx, 6, this spiritual circumcision is set forth in no uncertain language. As uncircumcision means profane, unclean, imperfect, "I am of uncircumcised lips" (Ex., vi, 12), "their ears are uncircumcised" (Jer., vi, 10), and was applied to inanimate things also, as in Lev., xix, 23, "the fruit that cometh forth shall be unclean [Heb. uncircumcised] to you", so to circumcise the heart (Rom., ii, 29) means to reform the inner man, by cutting off the vices and correcting the disorders that make him displeasing in the sight of God. To leave the synagogue was to give up that which more than

anything else characterized it (see Gal., ii, 7, 8). Yet St. Paul, while showing his freedom from the legalities of the Old Dispensation by not circumcising Titus (Gal., ii, 3), wished to bury the synagogue with honour by subjecting Timothy to the law of circumcision (Acts, xvi, 3). Even though Christ Himself, as a true son of Abraham, submitted to the law, His followers were to be children of Abraham by faith, and were to "adore the Father in spirit and in truth" (John, iv, 23). The Council of Jerusalem decided against the necessity of the rite, and St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, condemns the teachers that wished to make the Church of Christ only a continuation of the synagogue: "Behold, I Paul tell you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing" (v, 2). Here he refers to the supposed efficacy and necessity of circumcision, rather than to the mere ceremony; for he did not consider it wrong to circumcise Timothy. It was wrong, however, for the Galatians, having been baptized, and having taken upon themselves the obligations of the law of Christ with all its privileges, to be circumcised as a necessary means of salvation, since, by going for salvation from the Church to the Synagogue, they virtually denied the sufficiency of the merits of Christ (cf. Piconio, "Trip. Exp. in Gal.," v, 2). The Apostle gives the essence of Christianity when he says: "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision: but faith that worketh by charity" (Gal., v, 6). In his Epistle to the Romans, iv, he shows that Abraham was justified by faith, before circumcision was given as a sign of the covenant; so that the uncircumcision of the New Law is the continuation of the first ages of faith upon the earth. The gentile church of uncircumcision, according to St. Gregory the Great, is composed of men from the time of Abel the Just to the end of ages (Hom. xix in Evan.). St. Justin also says that as Henoch and the just of old received the spiritual circumcision, so do we receive it in the Sacrament of Baptism (Dial. cum Tryph., n. xliii).

St. Thomas holds that circumcision was a figure of baptism: this retrenches and restrains the animal man as that removed a part of his body—which physical act indicated the spiritual effect of the sacrament (De Sac., Summa, III, Q. lxx, a. 1). He gives three reasons why the organ of generation rather than any other was to be circumcised: (a) Abraham was to be blessed in his seed; (b) The rite was to take away original sin, which comes by generation; (c) It was to restrain concupiscence, which is found especially in the generative organs (III, Q. lxx, a. 3). According to his teaching, as baptism remits original sin and actual sins committed before its reception, so circumcision remitted both, but *ex opere operantis*, i. e. by the faith of the recipient, or, in the case of infants, by the faith of the parents. Infants that died before being circumcised could be saved, as were those who lived prior to the institution of circumcision, and as females were even after its institution, by some sign—the parents' prayer, for instance—expressive of faith. Adults did not receive the remission of all the temporal punishment due to sin as in baptism:—"Adulti, quando circumcidebantur, consequebantur remissionem, non solum originalis peccati, sed etiam actualium peccatorum; non tamen ita quod liberarentur ab omni reatu pœnæ, sicut in baptismo, in quo confertur copiosior gratia" (III, Q. lxx, a. 4). The main points of the teaching of the Angelic Doctor were commonly held in the Church, even before the days of St. Augustine, who with other Fathers maintained that circumcision was not a mere ceremony, but a sacramental rite. (Cf. De Civ. Dei, xvi, 27.)

Authorities, Patristic and Scholastic, may be found in DE AUGUSTINIS, *De Re Sacram.*, I, par. i, art. ii, th. iii. ASHER, *The Jewish Rite of Circumcision* (London, 1873); SCHECHTER, *Studies in Judaism* (1896), 288, 89, 343; REMONDINO, *History of Circumcision* (Phila. and London, 1891); ANDREE, *Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche* (Leipzig, 1889), *Beschneidung*, pp. 166–213; BARNEY, *Circumcision and Flagellation among the Filipinos* (Carlisle, Pa., 1903); ARNOLD, *Circumcision* in *New York Medical Jour.* (Feb. 13, 1886); EBERS, *Aegypten und die Bücher Moses* (Leipzig, 1868); MACALESTER in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v

JOHN J. TIERNEY.

Circumcision, FEAST OF THE.—As Christ wished to fulfil the law and to show His descent according to the flesh from Abraham, He, though not bound by the law, was circumcised on the eighth day (Luke, ii, 21), and received the sublime name expressive of His office, Jesus, i. e. Saviour. He was, as St. Paul says, "made under the law", i. e. He submitted to the Mosaic Dispensation, "that he might redeem them who were under the law: that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Gal., iv, 4, 5). "The Christ, in order to fulfil all justice, was required to endure this humiliation, and bear in His body the stigma of the sins which He had taken upon Himself" (Fouard, A Life of Jesus, tr., I, 54). The circumcision took place, not in the Temple, though painters sometimes so represent it, but in some private house, where the Holy Family had found a rather late hospitality. The public ceremony in the synagogue, which is now the usage, was introduced later. Christmas was celbrated on 25 December, even in the early centuries, at least by the Western Church, whence the date was soon adopted in the East also. (See CHRISTMAS.) Saint Chrysostom credits the West with the tradition, and St. Augustine speaks of it as well and long established. Consequently the Circumcision fell on the first of January. In the ages of paganism, however, the solemnization of the feast was almost impossible, on account of the orgies connected with the Saturnalian festivities, which were celebrated at the same time. Even in our own day the secular features of the opening of the New Year interfere with the religious observance of the Circumcision, and tend to make a mere holiday of that which should have the sacred character of a Holy Day. St. Augustine points out the difference between the pagan and the Christian manner of celebrating the day: pagan feasting and excesses were to be expiated by Christian fasting and prayer (P. L., XXXVIII, 1024 sqq.; Serm. cxcvii, cxcviii). The Feast of the Circumcision was kept at an early date in the Gallican Rite, as is clearly indicated in a Council of Tours (567), in which the Mass of the Circumcision is prescribed (Con. Tur., II., can. xvii in Labbe, V, 857). The feast celebrated at Rome in the seventh century was not the Circumcision as such, but the octave of Christmas. The Gelasian Sacramentary gives the title "In Octabas Domini", and prohibits the faithful from idolatry and the profanities of the season (P. L., LXXIV, 1061). The earliest Byzantine calendars (eighth and ninth centuries) give for the first of January both the Circumcision and the anniversary of St. Basil. The Feast of the Circumcision was observed in Spain before the death of St. Isidore (636), for the "Regula Monachorum", X, reads: "For it hath pleased the Fathers to appoint a holy season from the day of the Lord's birth to the day of His Circumcision" (P. L., LXXXIII, 880). It seems, therefore, that the octave was more prominent in the early centuries, and the Circumcision later.

It is to be noted also that the Blessed Virgin Mary was not forgotten in the festivities of the holy season, and the Mass in her honour was sometimes said on this day. To-day, also, while in both Missal and Breviary the feast bears the title "In Circumcisione Domini et Octavâ Nativitatis", the prayers have special reference to the Blessed Virgin, and in the Office, the responses and antiphons set forth her privileges and extol her wonderful prerogatives. The psalms for Vespers are those appointed for her feasts, and the antiphons and hymn of Lauds keep her constantly in view. As paganism passed away the religious festivities of the Circumcision became more conspicuous and solemn; yet, even in the tenth century, Atto,

Bishop of Vercelli, rebuked those who profaned the holy season by pagan dances, songs, and the lighting of lamps (P. L., CXXXIV, 43). (See also NEW YEAR'S DAY.)

Acta SS., Jan., I, *Sermo Faustini* (describing secular festivities and Christian fasts; BUTLER, *The Lives of the Saints*, 1 Jan.; SMITH, *Dict. of Christ. Antiquities*, s. v.; DUCHESNE, *Les origines du culte chrét.* (tr. London, 1904), 273.

JOHN J. TIERNEY.

Circumincession. See TRINITY.

Cirta. See CONSTANTINE, DIOCESE OF.

Cisalpine Club, an association of Catholic laymen formed in England to perpetuate the movement which had found expression in the "Declaration and Protestation" signed by the Catholic body in 1789. These principles represent a remarkable reaction against the attitude hitherto traditional among Catholics, which seems to have begun about the time of the death of the Pretender in 1766. Up to then they had been stanch Jacobites, and had looked to the restoration of the Stuarts as the only chance for a revival of Catholicity. About this time, however, by what Berington calls "one of those singular revolutions for which no cause can be assigned" (State and Behaviour of English Catholics in 1780, p. 134), they gave up their former political aspirations, and frankly accepted the reigning House of Hanover. Part of the reaction was a suspicion of the wisdom of their ecclesiastical rulers, who, they became convinced, had adopted in the past a needlessly strict attitude, opposed to English national aspirations, and which (they contended) had been dictated by the Court of Rome.

They reverted to the Oath of Allegiance of the reign of King James I, which they declared themselves willing to take, while some even maintained that the Oath of Supremacy could be interpreted in a sense not inconsistent with the Catholic religion. These were the principles which animated the well-known Catholic Committee (1782–92) in their struggle for emancipation. The two chief leaders were Lord Petre and Sir John Throckmorton, both members of old Catholic families, who had suffered much in times past under the Penal Laws. They had the active assistance of Charles Butler, the distinguished lawyer, nephew of Alban Butler, who acted as secretary to the committee. The greater number (though by no means all) of the Catholic aristocracy, who in those days were the practical supporters of religion, sympathized with them, and, in a modified degree, some of the clergy, especially in London. One bishop, Charles Berington, was on their side, and the Rev. Joseph Wilkes, O. S. B., who was a member of the committee, went to great lengths in supporting them. Dr. James Talbot (Vicar Apostolic of the London District, 1781–90) also allowed his name to be added, and showed a weakness in opposing them which he regretted on his death-bed, and which made the task of his successor, Dr. Douglass (1790–1812), a difficult one.

Towards the end of the year 1788, Lord Stanhope, a member of the Established Church, desiring to help the committee, and believing that their supposed "Ultramontane" principles, and in particular their accredited belief in the "deposing power" of the pope, were the chief obstacles in their way, drew out a "Protestation" disclaiming these in unmeasured language. The committee adopted the Protestation and early in the following year called upon all Catholics to sign it. Butler admits that it was only with some difficulty that the bishops were induced to sign; but they did sign, and were followed by two hundred and forty priests (out of about two hundred and sixty), and by all the chief Catholic laymen of the country. Two of the bishops afterwards revoked their signatures, and Milner, who was one of those who had signed, took an active part in opposing the committee. The result of their labours was the Act of 1791. In the first draft there had been an "Oath of Declaration, Protestation and Allegiance", based on the Protestation of 1789, but going to even greater lengths. This oath was definitely condemned by the bishops, led by the venerable Dr. Walmesley, in 1789 and 1791. After a sharp conflict it was removed from the bill during its passage through Parliament, and the Irish Oath of 1774 substituted. As the act in its final state failed to embody the principles of the Protestation, a new society was formed to perpetuate these, under the ominous title of "The Cisalpine Club". Others besides the members of the Catholic Committee were invited to join the club, and the membership usually numbered between forty and fifty. They met four or five times a year, each meeting being preceded by a dinner. At first they took an active part in Catholic affairs, though consistently disclaiming any representative character. In several ways they succeeded in guarding Catholic interests, and by their influence a school was established at Oscott, directed by a governing body of laymen, though the headmaster was a priest, appointed by the bishop. After a few years, however, the Cisalpine Club ceased to perform any active work, and developed into a mere dining club. At the beginning the bishops had naturally viewed it askance, although indeed in private life the members were all devout and edifying, and often the chief supporters of Catholic charities. As time went on, their Cisalpine tendencies became less and less marked, and they got on good terms with Bishop Poynter (1803–1826), who only regretted the unfortunate name of the club. Soon after the passing of Catholic Emancipation (1829) this was remedied by the members re-forming themselves into a new club, which they called the "Emancipation Club", and which continued for seventeen more years before finally dissolving. (See BUTLER, CHARLES; CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.)

BUTLER, *Hist. Mem. of Eng. Catholics* (London, 1819); MILNER, *Supplementary Memoirs* (London, 1820); AMHERST, *Cath. Emancipation* (London, 1886); WARD, *Cath. London a Century Ago* (1905); *Minute Books . . . of Cisalpine Club*, MS.

BERNARD WARD.

Cisamus, a titular see of Crete. Kisamos, or Kissamos, was a harbour on the north-west coast of Crete in a bay of the same name, and served Aptera as a port of entry. Lequien (II, 272) gives only two Greek bishops, Theopemptus in 692 and Leo in 787; Gams (404) adds Gerasimus about 1500. The see still exists, and is suffragan to Candia. During the occupation of the island by the Venetians there was also a Latin see subject to Gortyna and Candia. Ten bishops are mentioned by Lequien (III, 927–930) from 1346 to 1589; twenty by Eubel (I, 192, II, 142) from about 1305 to 1498. Angelo Barbadigo (created cardinal by the antipope Nicholas V) who was present at Rome at the coronation (1328) of Emperor Louis IV, became *administrator apostolicus Chironensis* in Crete, Bishop of Cisamus, and afterwards of Verona. Kissamos, or Kissamo Kasteli, is now a little port frequented only by coasting boats. S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Cisneros, FRANCISCO XIMENES DE. See XIMENES.

Cistercians.—Religious of the Order of Cîteaux, a Benedictine reform, established at Cîteaux in 1098 by St. Robert, Abbot of Molesme in the Diocese of Langres, for the purpose of restoring as far as possible the literal observance of the Rule of St. Benedict. The history of this order may be divided into four periods: I. The Formation (1098–1134); II. The Golden Age (1134–1342); III. The Decline (1342–1790); IV. The Restoration (1790———).

I. THE FORMATION (1098–1134).—St. Robert, son of the noble Thierry and Ermengarde of Champagne,

was Abbot of Molesme, a monastery dependent on Cluny. Appalled by the laxity into which the Order of Cluny had fallen, he endeavoured to effect reforms in the monasteries of Saint-Pierre-de-la-Celle, Saint-Michel of Tonnerre, and finally in that of Molesme. His attempts at reform in these monasteries meeting with very little success, he, with six of his religious, among whom were Alberic and Stephen, had recourse to Hugh, Legate of the Holy See, and Archbishop of Lyons. Authorized by Archbishop Hugh to institute a reform, Robert and his companions returned to Molesme and there chose from among the religious those whom they considered most fitted to participate in their undertaking. To the number of twenty-one the company retired to the solitude of Cîteaux (in the Diocese of Châlons), which Raynald, Viscount of Beaune, had ceded to them. (See Cîteaux, Abbey of.) On the feast of St. Benedict (21 March), 1098, which fell that year on Palm Sunday, they commenced to build the "New Monastery", as it is called in the "Exordium sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis". This, therefore, was the birthday of the Order of Cîteaux. By order of the Apostolic legate, Robert received the pastoral staff from the bishop of the diocese, Gauthier, and was charged with the government of his brethren, who immediately made their vow of stability. Thus was the "New Monastery" canonically erected into an abbey.

At this news, the monks who had remained at Molesme sent a deputation to Pope Urban II, asking that Robert might be sent back to his first monastery. The pope yielded to their petition, and Robert returned to Molesme, after having governed Cîteaux for one year. There the prior, Alberic, was elected to replace him, and, in his turn, sent the two monks, John and Ilbode, as delegates to Pascal II (who had just succeeded Urban II) to beg him to take the church of Cîteaux under the protection of the Apostolic See. By Apostolic Letters, dated at Troja in Campania, 18 April, 1100, Pascal II declared that he took under his immediate protection the abbey and the religious, of Cîteaux, saving their allegiance to the Church of Châlons. Dating from this day, Alberic and his religious established at Cîteaux the exact observance of the Rule of St. Benedict, substituted the white habit for the black which the Benedictines wore, and, the better to observe the rule in regard to the Divine Office day and night, associated with themselves lay brothers, to be chiefly occupied with the manual labours and material affairs of the order. These lay brothers, or *conversi*, though they were not monks, were to be treated during life and after death just like the monks themselves. St. Alberic died in 1109.

His successor was Stephen Harding, an Englishman by birth, well versed in sacred and profane science, who had been one of the first promoters of the project to leave Molesme. St. Robert, his two immediate successors, and their companions had but one object in view: a reaction against the laxity of Cluny and of other monasteries—to resume manual labour, to adopt a more severe regimen, and to restore in monastic churches and church ceremonies the gravity and simplicity proper to the monastic profession. They never thought of founding a new order, and yet from Cîteaux were to go forth, in course of time, colonies of monks who should found other monasteries destined to become other Cîteaux, and thus create an order distinct from that of Cluny.

St. Bernard's entrance into the Order of Cîteaux (1112) was the signal of this extraordinary development. Thirty young noblemen of Burgundy followed him, among them four of his brothers. Others came after them, and in such numbers that in the following year (1113) Cîteaux was able to send forth its first colony and found its first filiation, La Ferté, in the Diocese of Châlons. In 1114 another colony was established at Pontigny, in the Diocese of Auxerre. In 1115 the young Bernard founded Clairvaux in the Diocese of Langres. In the same year Morimond was founded in the same Diocese of Langres. These were the first four offshoots of Cîteaux; but of these monasteries Clairvaux attained the highest development, becoming mother of sixty-eight monasteries even in the lifetime of St. Bernard. (See Clairvaux.)

After this St. Stephen Harding was to complete the legislation for the new institute. Cluny had introduced into the monastic order the confederation of the members among themselves. St. Stephen added thereto the institution of general chapters and regular visits. Thus mutual supervision, rendering account of the administration, rigid examination of discipline, immediate correction of abuses, were so many sure means of maintaining the observance in all its purity. The collection of statutes which St. Stephen drafted, and in which are contained wise provisions for the government of the order, was called the Charter of Charity (*La Charte de Charité*). It and the "US", the book of usages and customs, together with some of the definitions of the first general chapters, received the approbation of Pope Callistus II. At the death of St. Stephen (1134), the order, after thirty-six years of existence, counted 70 monasteries, of which 55 were in France.

Trappist Monk in Working Dress

II. The Golden Age (1134–1342).—The diffusion of the new order was chiefly effected by means of foundations. Nevertheless several congregations and monasteries, which had existed before the Order of Cîteaux, became affiliated to it, among them the Congregations of Savigny and Obazine, which were incorporated in the order in 1147. St. Bernard and other Cistercians took a very active part, too, in the establishment of the great military orders, and supplied them with their constitutions and their laws. Among these various orders of chivalry may be mentioned the Templars, the Knights of Calatrava, of St. Lazarus, of Alcantara, of Aviz, of St. Maurice, of the Wing of St. Michael, of Montesa, etc. In 1152 the Order of Cîteaux already counted 350 abbeys, not including the granges and priories dependent upon the principal abbeys. Among the causes which contributed to this prosperity of the new order, the influence of St. Bernard evidently holds the first place; in the next place comes the perfect unity which existed between the monasteries and the members of every house, a unity wonderfully maintained by the punctual assembling of general chapters, and the faithful performance of the regular visits. The general chapter was an assembly of all the abbots of the order, even those who resided farthest from Cîteaux. This assembly, during the Golden Age, took place annually, according to the prescriptions of the Charter of Charity. "This Cistercian Areopagus", says the author of the "Origines Cistercienses", "with equal severity and justice kept watch over the observance of the Rule of St. Benedict, the Charter of Charity, and the definitions of the preceding Chapters." The collection

of statutes published by Dom Martène informs us that there was no distinction of persons made. After a fault became known, the same justice was meted out to lay brothers, monks, and abbots, and the first fathers of the order. Thus, as all were firmly persuaded that their rights would be protected with equal justice, the collection of statutes passed by the general chapter were consulted and respected in all the monasteries without exception. All the affairs of the order, such as differences between abbots, purchase and sale of property, incorporation of abbeys, questions relating to the laws, rites, feasts, tributes, erection of colleges, etc. were submitted to the general chapter in which resided the supreme authority of the order. Other orders took these general chapters as models of their own, either spontaneously, like the Premonstratensians, or by decree of the Fourth Lateran Council, that the religious orders should adopt the practice of holding general chapters and follow the form used by the Order of Cîteaux.

The general chapters were held every year up to 1411, when they became intermittent. Their decisions were codified. The first codification was that of 1133, under the title "Instituta Capituli Generalis". The second, which bears the title "Institutiones Capituli Generalis", was commenced in the year 1203 by the Abbot Arnoud I, and was promulgated in 1240. The third, "Libelli Antiquarum Definitionum Capituli Generalis Ordinis Cisterciencis", was issued in 1289 and in 1316. Finally, the general chapter of 1350 promulgated the "Novellæ Definitiones" in conformity with the Constitution of Benedict XII, "Fulgens ut stella" of 12 July, 1335. The regular visits also contributed much to the maintenance of unity and fervour. Every abbey was visited once a year by the abbot of the house on which it immediately depended. Cîteaux was visited by the four first fathers, that is to say, by the Abbots of La Ferté, of Pontigny, of Clairvaux, and Morimond.—"The Visitor", say the ancient statutes, "will urge the Religious to greater respect for their Abbot, and to remain more and more united among themselves by the bonds of mutual love for Jesus Christ's sake. . . The Visitor ought not to be a man who will easily believe every one indiscriminately, but he should investigate with care those matters of which he has no knowledge, and, having ascertained the truth, he should correct abuses with prudence, uniting his zeal for the Order with his feelings of sincere paternal affection. On the other hand, the Superior visited ought to show himself submissive to, and full of confidence in, the Visitor, and do all in his power to reform his house, since one day he will have to render an account to the Lord. . . . [The Abbot] will avoid both before the Visitor and after his departure everything that will have the appearance of revenge, reproach or indignation against any of them" [sc. his subjects].—If the visitor should act against prescriptions, he was to be corrected and punished according to the gravity of his fault by the abbot who was his superior, or by another abbot, or even by the general chapter. Likewise, the abbot visited should know that he would become grievously culpable before God by neglecting the regular form of visit, and that he would deserve to be called to account by his "Father Immediate" or by the general chapter.

Thus everything was foreseen and provided for the maintenance of good order and charity and for the preservation of the unity of observance and spirit. "No one then ought be astonished", says the author of "Origines Cistercienses", "to find in the Cistercian abbeys, during their Golden Age, so many sanctuaries of the most fervent prayer, of the severest discipline, as well as of untiring and constant labour. This explains also why, not only persons of humble and low extraction, but also eminent men, monks and abbots of other orders, doctors in every science and clerics honoured with the highest dignities, humbly begged the favour of being admitted into the Order of Cîteaux." Thus it was during this period that the order produced the greatest number of saints, blessed, and holy persons. Many abbeys—such as Clairvaux, Villiers, Himmerod, Heisterbach, etc.—were so many nurseries of saints. More than forty have been canonized by the Holy See. The Order of Cîteaux constantly enjoyed the favour of the Holy See, which in numerous Bulls bestowed upon the Cistercians the highest praise, and rewarded with great privileges their services to the Church. They enjoyed the favour of sovereigns, who, having entire confidence in them, entrusted to them, like Frederick II, important delegations; or, like Alphonsus I of Portugal, placed their persons and kingdoms under the care and protection of Our Lady of Clairvaux; or again, like Frederick II, feeling themselves near the point of death, wished to die clothed in the Cistercian habit.

The Cistercians benefited society by their agricultural labours. According to Dr. Janauscheck, "none but the ignorant or men of bad faith are capable of denying the merited praises which the sons of St. Benedict have received for their agricultural labours throughout Europe, or that this part of the world owes to them a greater debt of gratitude than to any other colony no matter how important it may be." They also conferred great benefits on society by the exercise of Christian charity. By means of their labours, their economy, their privations, and sometimes owing to generous donations which it would be ungrateful to despise, they became more or less rich in the things of this world, and expended their wealth upon the instruction of the ignorant, the promotion of letters and arts, and the relief of their country's necessities. Cæsarius of Heisterbach speaks of a monastery in Westphalia where one day all the cattle were killed, the chalices and books pledged as security, in order to relieve the poor. The Cistercian abbeys had a house for the reception of the poor, and an infirmary for the sick, and in them all received a generous hospitality and remedies for the ills of soul and body.

Intellectual labour had also its place in the life of the Cistercians. Charles de Visch, in his "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis", published in 1649, devotes 773 historical and critical notices to authors who belonged to the Cistercian Order. Even in the very first period, St. Stephen Harding left a work on the Bible which is superior to anything of its kind produced by any contemporary monastery, not excepting Cluny. The Library of Dijon preserves the venerable manuscript of St. Stephen, which was to serve as a type for all Cistercian Bibles. The Cistercian libraries were rich in books and manuscripts. Nor did the sons of St. Bernard neglect the fine arts; they exercised their genius in building, contributed powerfully to the development and propagation of the Romanesque and the Gothic architecture throughout Europe, and cultivated the arts of painting and engraving.

III. The Decline (1342–1790).—The decadence of the order was due to several causes, the first of which was the large number of monasteries, oftentimes situated in the most widely distant countries, which prevented the "Fathers Immediate" from making the regular visits to all the houses of their filiations, while some of the abbots could not assist every year at the general chapter. Some were also found who, seeing themselves thus sheltered from the remonstrances and the punishments either of the general chapter or of the visitor, permitted abuses to creep into their houses. But the principal cause of the decline of the order (which is based on unity and charity) was the spirit of dissension which animated certain superiors. Some abbots, even not far from Cîteaux, explained in a particular sense, and

that adapted to their own point of view, certain points of the Charter of Charity. The solicitude of the Roman pontiffs themselves who tried to re-establish harmony among the superiors, was not always successful.

And yet at that time there were found some courageous and determined monks who became reformers, and even founded new congregations which were detached from the old trunk of Cîteaux. Those congregations which then severed their union with Cîteaux, but which no longer exist at the present time, are: (1) The Congregation of the Observance of St. Bernard of Spain, founded by Dom Martin de Vargas, in 1425, at Monte Sion near Toledo; (2) The Congregation of St. Bernard of Tuscany and of Lombardy, approved by Alexander VI (1497); (3) the Congregation of Portugal, or of Alcobaça, founded in 1507; (4) the Congregation of the Feuillants, founded by John de la Barrière in 1563, which spread into France and Italy, the monasteries of Italy, however, eventually detaching themselves from those of France to form the Congregation of the *Riformati di San Bernardo;* (5) the Congregation of Aragon, approved by a Bull of Paul V (1616); (6) the Congregation of Rome, or of Central Italy, created by a Decree of Gregory XV in 1623; (7) the Congregation of Calabria and Lucania, established by Urban VIII in 1633, and to which was united the old Congregation of Flore, which had for its founder Blessed Joachim surnamed "the Prophet".—Together with the congregations which separated from Cîteaux there were five or six others which, while remaining subject to the jurisdiction of the parent house, were legislated for by provincial or national chapters. Chief among these congregations were those of Northern Germany, the Strict Observance, and La Trappe. The Congregation of Northern Germany was erected in 1595 by Nicholas II (Boucherat), Abbot of Cîteaux, at the desire of Pope Clement VIII, in the monastery of Fürstenfeld. It comprised four provinces ruled by the abbots, vicars of the general. It counted twenty-two abbeys, only three of which survived the revolutionary tempest, and now form part of the Common Observance of Cîteaux, as the Cistercian province of Austria-Hungary. The Congregation of Strict Observance, resulting from the efforts for reform of the Abbots of Charmoye and Châtillon, was established at Clairvaux by Denis Largentier, abbot of this monastery (1615). The Abbot of Cîteaux, Nicholas Boucherat, approved the reform and permitted it to hold special assemblies and to choose a vicar-general with four assistant generals. The general chapter of Cîteaux in 1623 praised it highly, Cardinal Richelieu became its protector, and the popes gave it encouragement. In 1663 it received an important member in the person of Abbot de Rancé, who introduced the Strict Observance into the Abbey of La Trappe in the Diocese of Séez, adding to it other very severe practices.

The abbeys which did not respond to the appeal of Martin de Vargas, of Denis Largentier, or of Abbot de Rancé, formed an observance which Pope Alexander VII, in his Bull of 19 April, 1666, named *Common*, to distinguish it from the *Strict* Observance, from which in reality it differed only in the use of meat and similar articles of food three times a week, a use certainly contrary to the rule of perpetual abstinence which obtained in the early days, but which the religious wars and other evils of the times in a measure rendered necessary. Mention should be made of two other reforms: that of Orval in Luxemburg, by Bernard de Montgaillard (1605), and that of Septfons, in the Diocese of Moulins, by Eustache de Beaufort, in 1663. The former numbered six monasteries, the latter did not extend beyond Septfons.

The Strict Observance developed rapidly. In a very short time it counted fifty-eight monasteries. At the death of Denis Largentier (1626), Etienne Maugier, who succeeded him, inspired it afresh. From that time it aimed at a certain superiority to which it believed it had some claims, and was resolved, in case of meeting with any opposition, to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the General of Cîteaux. Hence arose quarrels and litigations which lasted forty years or more. In 1632, at the request of the king (Louis XIII), Urban VIII continued the powers which Gregory XV had given ten years before to Cardinal De La Rochefoucauld for the reform of the monasteries of the kingdom. The cardinal heard only the Fathers of the Strict Observance, who persuaded him that no reform was possible without a return to the abstinence from meat. He therefore passed a sentence in 1634 which derogated in many points from the ancient constitutions and the Charter of Charity, particularly in what concerned the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Cîteaux and of the four first fathers. The College of St. Bernard at Paris passed into the hands of the Strict Observance. The Abbot of Cîteaux, Peter de Nivelle, appealed to the sovereign pontiff. The latter annulled the sentence of the cardinal in every point in which it was contrary to legitimate authority. In the meanwhile Peter de Nivelle having resigned, the non-reformed, in the hope of escaping from the authority of Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld, elected Cardinal de Richelieu Abbot of Cîteaux. The cardinal applied the reform in his monastery. Sustained by him, the reformed took possession of Cîteaux after having dispersed into other monasteries the professed religious of this monastery. At the death of Richelieu the expelled monks assembled at Dijon, 2 January, 1643, and elected to his place Dom Claude Vaussin, but the king vetoed the election; they voted again, 10 May, 1645, and gave all their votes to Claude Vaussin, while the reformed, to the number of only fifteen, voted for Dom Jean Jouaud, Abbot of Prières in Britanny. On the 27th of November following, Innocent X sent his Bulls to Dom Claude Vaussin, and imposed silence on the reformed. February 1st, 1647, a Brief of the same pope re-established all matters in the condition in which they had been before the sentence of Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld.

The Strict Observance then tried to form an independent order under the authority of the Abbot of Prières, and with this object in view raised new difficulties in relation to the question of abstinence. A Brief of Alexander VII, dated November, 1657, confirming the decision of Sixtus IV, in 1475, that abstinence from flesh meat was not essential to the rule, did not quiet their scruples. Finally, 26 January, 1662, the same pope interfered in a decisive manner by inviting the two parties to appear at the Court of Rome. The Common Observance sent Claude Vaussin; the Strict Observance, Dom George, Abbot of Val-Richer; La Trappe, Abbot de Rancé. On the 19th of April, 1666, appeared the Bull "In Suprema", which put an end to the divisions. It recommended that the visits be regularly and strictly made, that monks should live in the monasteries, and that the general chapters should be held every three years. It restored the night silence, poverty in apparel, and the monastic tonsure. It maintained the use of meat where that already obtained, and recommended the religious who had made the vow of abstinence to be faithful to it. The Strict Observance remained under the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Cîteaux. This constitution was accepted by the general chapter of 1667, which was held at Cîteaux, in spite of protests from the opponents, and in particular of Abbot de Rancé, and the new reform was put into force in all the monasteries of France, where the number of monks was sufficient.

During the eighteenth century, however, there was

introduced into the Order of Cîteaux, as into almost all the great religious families, a pernicious licence of thought and morality. New conflicts between the Abbot of Cîteaux and the abbots of the four first houses of filiation arose concerning the government of the order and their own jurisdiction. In virtue of the liberties of the Gallican Church, the king and his council appointed a commission to restore order. A new collection of statutes was drawn up, but these were not definitively adopted until 1786. The general chapter of that year finally agreed among themselves and adopted the new statutes on the eve of the French Revolution. The political and religious disturbances which then and at the commencement of the nineteenth century troubled France and Europe almost ruined this venerable order. When the National Convention, by the decree of 13 February, 1790, secularized all the religious houses of France, the Order of Cîteaux had in France 228 monasteries, with 1875 religious; 61 of these houses, with 532 religious, were in the filiation of Cîteaux; 3, with 33 religious, in that of La Ferté; 33, with 171 religious, in that of Pontigny; 92, with 864 religious, in that of Clairvaux; and 37, with 251 religious, in that of Morimond. The sixty-second and last Abbot of Cîteaux, Dom François Trouvé, having lost all hope of saving his monastery, begged Pius VI to transfer all his powers to Robert Schlecht, Abbot of Salsmansweiler, of the Congregation of Northern Germany, so that the remnants of the ancient corporation of Cîteaux might still have a ruler.

From France the hatred of religion passed with the arms of the usurpers into Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, and other countries, and there continued the work of destruction. By an imperial veto of the 25th of February, 1803, and a decree of the Prussian Government of the 28th of April, 1810, all the monasteries of Germany were ruined. The abbeys of Portugal were abolished by a law of the 26th of May, 1834, those of Spain by the laws of the 25th of July and the 11th of October, 1835, those of Poland disappeared before the decrees of the Russian and Prussian rulers.

IV. The Restoration (1790—).—The reform inaugurated at La Trappe by Abbot de Rancé, reviving the austerity and fervour of primitive Cîteaux, was maintained, almost intact, against difficulties of every kind, until the French Revolution. There were then at La Trappe seventy religious and a numerous and fervent novitiate. When, on the 4th of December, a decree of the National Assembly suppressed the Trappists in France, Dom Augustin de Lestrange, then master of novices at La Trappe, authorized by his local superior and the Abbot of Clairvaux, set out with twenty-four of his brethren for Switzerland. The Senate of Fribourg permitted them to settle in Val-Sainte, 1 June, 1791. Pope Pius VI, by a Brief of 31 July, 1794, authorized the erection of Val-Sainte into an abbey. Dom Augustin was elected abbot on the 27th of the following November, and on the 8th of December of the same year, a solemn decree of the nuncio of the Holy See at Lucerne, executing the Brief of Pius VI, constituted Val-Sainte an abbey and the mother-house of the whole Congregation of Trappists. There the Rule of St. Benedict was observed in all its rigour, and at times its severity was even surpassed. Novices flocked thither. From Val-Sainte Dom Augustin sent colonies into Spain, Belgium, and Piedmont.

But the French troops invaded Switzerland in 1796. Obliged to leave Val-Sainte, Dom Augustin, with his religious of both sexes, commenced two years of wanderings through Europe, during which period they gave to the world the spectacle of the most heroic virtues. In 1800 Dom Augustin returned to France, and two years later resumed possession of Val-Sainte. In 1803 he sent a colony of his religious to America under the direction of Dom Urbain Guillet. In 1811, fleeing from the anger of Napoleon, who first favoured the Trappists and then suppressed all their monasteries in France and the whole empire, Dom Augustin himself left for America. In 1815, on the downfall of Napoleon, he returned immediately to La Trappe, while Dom Urbain Guillet established himself at Bellefontaine in the Diocese of Angers.

During this imperial persecution, a schism took place in the Congregation of La Trappe. The colony which Dom Augustin had sent from Val-Sainte into Belgium under the direction of Dom Eugène de Laprade, and which had settled first at Westmalle, and then at Darpheld in Westphalia, had abandoned the Rules of Val-Sainte to embrace those of de Rancé. It returned to France and occupied Port-du-Salut in the Diocese of Laval; Westmalle, restored in 1821, withdrew from the jurisdiction of Dom Augustin to form, five years later, the Congregation of Belgium.

Dom Augustin died 16 July, 1827, at Lyons. A Decree dated 1 October, 1834, confirmed two days later by Gregory XVI, united the different houses of Trappists in France in one congregation known as the Congregation of Cistercian Monks of Our Lady of La Trappe. The General President of the Order of Cîteaux is its head and confirms its abbots. The four first fathers are the Abbots of Melleray, Port-du-Salut, Bellefontaine, and Gard. The Rule of St. Benedict and the Constitutions of Cîteaux or those of de Rancé, according to the custom of each monastery, are observed. But with this diversity of observance, the union did not last long. A pontifical Decree dated the 25 February, 1847, and granted at the request of the religious of each observance, divides the Trappist monasteries of France into two congregations: the Ancient Reform of Our Lady of La Trappe, which follows the Rules of de Rancé, and the New Reform, which follows the Primitive Observance and is governed by the Charter of Charity. Already Westmalle in 1836 formed a distinct congregation known as the Congregation of Belgium. There were then three distinct congregations of the Trappists.

It was reserved for a later generation to see the most complete reform effected by the fusion of all the congregations into one order in unity of government and observance. On the first of October, 1892, at the desire of Leo XIII, a plenary general chapter was held at Rome, under the presidency of Cardinal Mazzella, delegated by the Cardinal Protector Monaco della Valetta. The assembly lasted twelve days; the fusion was adopted; Dom Sebastian Wyart, Abbot of Septfons, who had taken the most active part in all the negotiations to effect this union, was chosen "General of the Order of the Reformed Cistercians of Our Lady of La Trappe". Such was the name given to the order. A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars of 8 December, 1892, then a pontifical Brief of 23 March, 1893, confirmed and ratified the Acts of the chapter. On the 13th of August, 1894, the sovereign pontiff approved the new constitutions and the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars promulgated them on the 25th of the same month. In 1898, the 800th anniversary of the foundation of the order, the sons of St. Bernard again took possession of the ancient Abbey of Cîteaux. Dom Sebastian Wyart was elected abbot, and thus was restored the chain of abbots of Cîteaux which had been broken for 107 years. It was then decided to suppress in the title of the order the words "Our Lady of La Trappe", the Abbey of La Trappe yielding the first rank to Cîteaux. Finally, on the 30th of July, 1902, an Apostolic Constitution of Leo XIII solemnly confirmed the restoration of the order and gave to it the definite name of "Order of Reformed Cistercians, or the Strict Observance". Dom Sebastian Wyart died 18 August, 1904. The general chapter,

postponed that year until October, chose for his successor the Most Rev. Dom Augustin Marre, Abbot of Igny, and titular Bishop of Constance.

CONDITION OF THE ORDER IN 1908.—Several modern congregations must be mentioned which have been grafted on the old trunk of Cîteaux, and which, with some ancient monasteries that escaped the persecution of the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, form the Common Observance. Their mode of life corresponds to that of the Cistercians of the seventeenth century, whose mitigation was approved by Alexander VII in 1666. They are the Congregations of Italy, Belgium, Austria, and Switzerland, and the Congregation of Senanque.

1. The Congregation of St. Bernard of Italy was formed in 1820 with the monasteries which remained of the Congregations of the Roman Province and of Lombardy, after Pius VII had been deprived of his States. The congregation adopted the constitutions of the ancient Congregation of Tuscany and Lombardy.

2. The Congregation of Belgium, formed in 1836, at Bornheim in the Diocese of Mechlin, by the religious who were expelled in 1797 from Lieu-Saint-Bernard-sur-l'Escaut, observe constitutions based upon the Brief of Alexander VII and the Cistercian Ritual. They were approved by the Holy See in 1846.

3. The Cistercian Congregation of Austria and Hungary was formed in 1859 by the monasteries of Austria which had escaped from the Revolution and submitted to the President General of the Order of Cîteaux.

4. The Congregation of Switzerland was formed in 1806 by the three monasteries of Hauterive, Saint-Urbain, and Wettingen, remnants of the Congregation of North Germany. These monasteries having succumbed in 1841 and 1846, the Abbot of Wettingen, an exile in Switzerland, purchased, in 1854, the Benedictine monastery of Mehrerau on the Lake of Bregenz, to which the Holy See transferred all the privileges of Wettingen. To this monastery was joined that of Marienstatt in the Diocese of Cologne in Nassau.

5. The Congregation of Senanque, or the Mean Observance, owes its origin to the parish priest, Luke Barnouin, who, with some associates, in 1849, attempted the religious life in the solitude of Our Lady of Calvary in the Diocese of Avignon, leaving that retreat in 1854, to take up his abode in the monastery of Senanque, which he had purchased. The new congregation, which, without returning to the primitive constitutions, did not adopt all the mitigations of later centuries, received the name of "Congregation of Cistercians of the Immaculate Conception". It was incorporated in the Order of Cîteaux in 1857, and in 1872 transferred its seat to the ancient monastery of Lérins. The constitutions of this congregation were approved by Leo XIII, 12 March, 1892.

When that pope, in 1892, undertook to unite in one order the three Congregations of La Trappe, His Holiness caused the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars to address a letter to the Cistercians of the Common Observance inviting them to join their brethren of the Reformed Observance of La Trappe. But as the pope left them free, they preferred to retain their respective autonomies. Since that time the Order of Cîteaux is divided into two branches absolutely distinct; the Strict and the Common Observances. To these may be added the small Congregation of Trappists of Casamari in Italy, which has only three monasteries with about 45 members.

The Order of Reformed Cistercians has (1908) 71 monasteries of men with more than 4000 subjects. In this number of houses are included the annexes which were founded in certain places to serve as refuges for the communities which had been expelled from France. These monasteries are distributed as follows: in France, 20; in Belgium, 9; in Italy, 5; in Holland, 5; in Germany, 3; in England, 3; in Ireland, 2; in Asia, 4; in Africa, 2; in America, 10; (4 in United States, 5 in Canada, and 1 in Brazil). The Reformed Cistercians make profession of the Primitive Observance of Cîteaux, with the exception of a few modifications imposed by the Holy See at the time of the fusion. Their life is strictly cenobitical, that is to say, life in common in its most absolute form. They observe perpetual silence, except in cases of necessity provided for by the rule, or when express permission is granted by the superior. Their day is divided between the Divine Office, agricultural and kindred labours, and free intervals for reading and study. The supreme authority of the order resides in the general chapter, which assembles every year at Cîteaux, from the 12th to the 17th of September, and is presided over by the abbot general. When the general chapter is not in session, current and urgent matters are regulated by the abbot general aided by his "Council of Definitors".

TRAPPIST MONK IN CHOIR HABIT

The abbot general, who is by right Abbot of Cîteaux, resides in Rome (Via San Giovanni in Laterano, 95), with the procurator general and the five definitors of the order, of whom there are two for French-speaking countries, one for English-speaking, one for German, and one for Flemish. At the house of the abbot general are also the students whom the different houses of the order send to Rome to follow the course of studies at the Gregorian University. The Order of Reformed Cistercians has for its protector at Rome Cardinal Rampolla Del Tindaro.

The four first houses, which replace the ancient Abbeys of La Ferté, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimond, are La Grande Trappe in the Diocese of Séez, Melleray in the Diocese of Nantes, Westmalle in the Diocese of Mechlin, and Port-du-Salut in the Diocese of Laval. The abbots of these four houses every year visit the mother-house at Cîteaux. The other houses are visited regularly every year by the abbots of the houses on which they immediately depend.

The actual condition of the Common Observance is as follows: The Congregation of Italy has five monasteries (two of them in Rome, at Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and at San Bernardo alle Terme) and about 60 members. The Congregation of Belgium has two monasteries (Bornheim and Val-Dieu), with 63 members. The Congregation of Austria, the most powerful, has 12 monasteries, with 599 religious. The Congregation of Switzerland has three monasteries, with 171 members. Lastly, the Congregation of Mean Observance of Senanque, which, since the Waldeck-Rousseau Laws of 1901, has lost Senanque, Fontfroide, and Pont-Colbert, now has but two houses, with about 102 members. The Cistercians of the Common Observance in 1900 elected as their general Dom Amedeus de Bie, of the Congregation of

Belgium. He has for assistants the vicars-general of the five congregations.

The Order of Cîteaux has produced a great number of saints and has given two popes to the Church, Eugene III, a disciple of St. Bernard, and Benedict XII. It has also given the Church forty cardinals, five of whom were taken from Cîteaux, and a considerable number of archbishops and bishops. The Cistercians of all observances have no less enlightened the Church by their teachings and writings, than edified it by the sanctity of their lives. Among great teachers may be cited St. Bernard, the Mellifluous Doctor and the last of the Fathers of the Church, St. Stephen Harding, author of the "Exordium Cisterciensis Cœnobii", of the "Charter of Charity", etc. Then follow Conrad of Eberbach (Exordium Magnum Ordinis Cisterciensis); Ælred, Abbot of Rieval (Sermons); Serlon, Abbot of Savigny (Sermons); Thomas of Cîteaux (Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles); Caramuel, the Universal Doctor, author of a Moral Theology very much esteemed, whom St. Alphonsus Liguori calls "the prince of Laxists"; Cæsarius of Heisterbach (Homilies, "Dialogus Miraculorum", etc.); Manrique (Cistercian Annals in 4 vols. folio); Henriquez (Menologium Cisterciense); Charles de Visch (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis); the Abbot de Rancé ("De la sainteté et des devoirs de la vie monastique", "Eclaircissements sur le même traité", "Méditations sur la règle de Saint-Benoît", etc.); Dom Julien Paris ("Nomasticon Cisterciense" in fol., Paris, 1664), Dom Pierre le Nain, sub-prior of La Trappe ("Vie de l'Abbé de La Trappe", "Essai de l'histoire de Cîteaux", 9 vols., Paris, 1690–97); Sartorius ("Cistercium bis-tertium", Prague, 1700), and others. In the nineteenth century it suffices to mention among a great many writers belonging to both Observances Dr. Leopold Janauscheck (Originum Cisterciensium tom. I, Vienna, 1877—the author died before he was able to commence the second volume), Dom Hugues Séjalon, monk of Aiguebelle (Annales d' Aiguebelle, 2 vols. and a new edition of the "Nomasticon Cisterciense" of Dom Paris, Solesmes, 1892).

Exordes de Cîteaux (Grande Trappe, 1884); D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Intérieur des abbayes cisterciennes au XII^e et au XIII^e siècle;* Gaillardin, *Histoire de La Trappe;* Séjalon, *Les annales d'Aiguebelle* (Valence, 1863); Janauscheck, *Originum Cisterciensium* etc. (Vienna, 1877), I; *Gallia Christiana,* IV; Hélyot, *Dictionnaire des ordres religieux; Ordinis Cisterciensis Jurium* etc. (Rome, 1902); *Abrégé de l'histoire de l'ordre de Cîteaux par un moine de Thymadeuc* (St. Brieuc, 1897).

Cistercians in America.—The establishment of the Cistercians in America is due to the initiative of Dom Augustin de Lestrange. He was born in 1754, in the castle of Colombier-le-Vieux, Ardèche, France, the son of Louis-César de Lestrange, an officer of the household of Louis XV, and of Jeanne-Pierrette de Lalor, daughter of an Irish gentleman who had followed in 1688 James II in his exile. Dom Augustin was master of novices at La Trappe when the Revolution burst forth, and upon the suppression of the religious orders he sought refuge at Val-Sainte in Switzerland, with twenty-four of his brethren. Driven from Val-Sainte by the French troops, these religious wandered over the whole of Europe, going even into Russia. (See above under III. The Decline.)

Dom Augustin at length resolved to send a colony of Cistercian Trappists to America, where he saw much good to be done. Already in 1793, seeing novices flocking to Val-Sainte, he had directed to Canada a part of his religious under the guidance of Father John Baptist. But at Amsterdam this colony found itself prevented by political troubles from departing, and divided into two bands, one of which settled at Westmalle in Belgium, while the other went to England and established itself at Lulworth in Dorsetshire, in the very place where formerly there had existed a Cistercian abbey which was destroyed by Henry VIII. Dom Augustin, however, had not given up the idea of an American foundation. In 1802 he charged Dom Urbain Guillet to carry out his intentions in this regard. Dom Urbain, born at Nantes, in 1766, the son of Ambroise Augustin Guillet, Knight of Malta, and of Marie-Anne Le Quellec, entered La Trappe in 1785, and was the last to pronounce his vows in that monastery when the Revolution burst forth. He assembled 24 religious, lay brothers, and members of the third order (an institution of Dom Augustin de Lestrange), and sailed from Amsterdam, 24 May, 1802, on board of the Sally, a Dutch vessel flying the American flag to avoid the risks of war—for Holland was at the time an ally of France, and a conflict was imminent between that country and England.

The Sally entered the port of Baltimore, on the 25th of September, after a voyage of four months, having been hindered by contrary winds, and having gone out of her course to avoid English cruisers. Dom Urbain and his companions were received at St. Mary's Seminary, which was under the direction of the Sulpicians, to whose superior, the venerable M. Nagot, then eighty-five years of age, the Cistercian immigrants had letters. At that time St. Mary's College possessed several eminent professors, and among these was M. Flaget, who later became Bishop of Bardstown, and then of Louisville, and who, in 1848, was to receive in Kentucky the religious who left Melleray to found Gethsemane.

About fifty miles from Baltimore, between the little towns of Hanover and Heberston was a plantation known as Pigeon Hill, which belonged to a friend of the Sulpicians. Being absent for some years, he left them the power of disposing of it as they should deem proper. This large and beautiful residence was well provided with provisions by the goodness of the Sulpicians. In the woods near by were found all kinds of wild fruits. The Trappists installed themselves at Pigeon Hill. M. de Morainvilliers, a French emigrant, a native of Amiens and pastor of St. Patrick's church, Baltimore, used his influence with his parishioners to procure for the newly-arrived community the aid necessary for their establishment. But everything was dear in the country, and the money which Father Urbain had destined for the purchase of land did not even suffice for the support of his community. Eighteen months had already passed since the arrival of the colony at Pigeon Hill, and the true foundation had not yet been begun. Dom Urbain had not accepted any of the land which had been offered to him. Moreover, the proximity of Baltimore was a frequent source of desertions among the young people of the third order.

About the beginning of 1805 Dom Urbain heard Kentucky spoken of. Its climate was represented to him as more temperate, and its soil more fertile. He left immediately to visit that country, and found there a devoted friend in the only Catholic priest then resident, Father Stephen Badin (q. v.). Father Badin took upon himself the obligation of finding for the Trappists a suitable establishment. Having left Pigeon Hill in July, 1805, Father Urbain and his companions arrived at Louisville in the beginning of September. The inhabitants received them with great kindness and provided for their first wants. They occupied for the time being a plantation which a pious woman offered them, at some distance from Louisville, and this gave them time to acquire, about sixty miles south of Louisville, in the neighbourhood of Rohan's Knob, a property called Casey Creek, or Potinger's Creek.

In the meantime a new band had been sent out by Dom Augustin Lestrange, under the conduct of Father Mary Joseph, a native of Chapelle-les-Rennes, in Jura (b. 22 April, 1774), who had been a grenadier in the French army. One day he had been ordered to shoot a priest, but had refused to obey; he left the army

and became a religious at Val-Sainte. His community was at that time composed of seven priests, seventeen lay brothers, and twenty-one young people of the third order.

In the beginning of 1809 sixty acres of land had already been cleared at Casey Creek, a quantity of grain sowed, and a great number of trees planted. Permanent settlement was about to be made here, when a fire destroyed in a few hours all the buildings of the new monastery. Dom Urbain was deeply affected by the misfortune, and thought only of going elsewhere. An Irish gentleman by the name of Mulamphy whom he had met in Baltimore, offered him the ownership of a habitation in Louisiana. Dom Urbain and Father Mary Joseph left together to visit this property. It pleased them, and they decided to leave Kentucky and Casey Creek.

In the "Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions of Kentucky, 1787–1826" can be read the unexceptionable testimony which Bishop Spalding renders of the fervour of the religious during the whole time they spent in Kentucky. Faithful to the rule of penance, they retrenched nothing from the austere practices of their holy state. The Rev. Father Charles Nerinckx, in a letter to Bishop Carroll, is not sparing in his praises of the Trappists, though he blames certain details of administration which were the cause of their failure at Casey Creek. In the spring of 1809 the community left for Louisiana and took up their abode at Florissant, the property of Mr. Mulamphy, some thirty miles west of St. Louis, on a hill which slopes towards the Missouri. But Father Urbain contemplated the purchase of another property on the other side of the Mississippi, which was offered to him by M. Jarrot, former procurator of the seminary of St. Sulpice at Baltimore, who had established himself at Cahokia, six miles from St. Louis. In the first month of 1810 Dom Urbain bought on the prairie of "Looking Glass" the two highest of the forty mounds which formed the burial-ground of the Indians in the vicinity of Cahokia, known by the name of Indiana Mound.

"Looking Glass" was an immense tract of land in St. Clair County, Illinois, which, it is said, had served the savages for many generations as a burial-place for their dead. These people had built there gigantic monuments which rose up from a base of 160 feet in circumference to a height of more than 100 feet. The Trappists constructed several cabins on the smaller of the two mounds purchased by Dom Urbain, reserving the higher mound for the abbey which they intended to build later. But the new settlers soon felt the influence of the unhealthy climate. Several savage tribes who had attempted in the past to take up their abode there had been obliged to abandon the undertaking. None of the religious escaped the fever, but only one of them died. However, Monks' Mound, as it was afterwards named, presented great advantages. The city of St. Louis was only six or seven miles distant, all around were vast prairies or abundance of wood, and the waters of the Mississippi were so full of fish that, to use the expression of Father Urbain, "a blind man could not help but spear a big fish, if he tried". The lands were easy to cultivate and very fertile. The savages who made frequent incursions into the neighbourhood never molested the monks. Dom Urbain had his rights of property confirmed by Congress at Washington in March, 1810. He wished also to acquire 4000 acres of land in the neighbourhood of Monks' Mound. The president and a certain number of members of Congress were favourable to him, but the hostility of several influential members, who feared to see this country peopled under the influence and direction of religious and Catholic priests, caused his petition to go over to the next session. While waiting, Dom Urbain, struck by the sad condition of religion in the vicinity of St. Louis and in Illinois sent two of his religious to preach the Gospel there—Father Mary Joseph and Father Bernard, the latter a Canadian priest whom he had brought with him from New York to Casey Creek. These settled in a parish which was the most renowned for its scandals. "There", says Gaillardin ("Histoire de la Trappe", II, 285), "a husband had just sold his wife for a bottle of whisky; the purchaser in his turn sold her for a horse; and finally she was sold a third time for a yoke of oxen." But so zealously did these missionaries labour there by word and example that in a short time religion flourished. Father Bernard, already advanced in age, after some time succumbed to fatigue. To aid Father Mary Joseph, Dom Urbain took upon himself the care of the Christian people who were nearest to the monastery.

In 1812 a terrible plague visited the colony of the Monks' Mound. This fever, which desolated the country for two years, attacked the community and rendered it impossible for them to do any work. At the same time all necessaries were dear, and there was no money. Dom Urbain resolved to leave Monks' Mound. He sold all he possessed and transferred his community to Maryland. There he found on his arrival six other religious under the direction of Father Vincent de Paul, who had been sent from Bordeaux to America by Dom Augustin de Lestrange, and, having landed in Boston the 6 August, 1811, with two religious, had been joined in the following year by three lay brothers. (Father Vincent de Paul was a native of Lyons, born in 1769.) Dom Urbain found the little band in the greatest misery. While waiting for better conditions, he settled them upon a little farm between Baltimore and Philadelphia, and conducted his own subjects to an island near Pittsburgh.

In the meanwhile Dom Augustin de Lestrange, pursued by the anger of Napoleon, who had even set a price upon his head, arrived in New York in December, 1813. The Jesuits had just given up their foundation in that city, and Dom Augustin took over the building they had used as a classical school and which was located where St. Patrick's Cathedral now stands in Fifth Avenue. Here, with Fathers Urbain and Vincent de Paul, he began a little community which resumed the regular life and exerted on outsiders a salutary influence. They cared for a number of children, most of them orphans; Protestants were edified, and some conversions were made among them. The effort to establish a community was abandoned, however, after two years' experience. Father Urbain made another attempt to found a colony upon a farm which was offered to him by M. Quesnet, Vicar-General of Philadelphia.

MONASTERY OF PETIT-CLAIRVAUX.—In 1814 Dom Augustin, after the abdication of Napoleon, resolved to return to France to re-establish there the Order of Cîteaux. He authorized Father Mary Joseph to remain in America, to continue the evangelization of the savages. Two groups left in October, the one under the conduct of Dom Augustin, the other under that of Father Urbain. A third group set sail later from New York for Halifax, under the guidance of Father Vincent de Paul (May, 1815). Here he was obliged to wait fifteen days for the vessel which was to take him back to his native land, but the vessel sailed while Father Vincent de Paul was engaged upon some business in town. He found himself without friends, without money, and in a country of which he knew nothing. But Father Vincent de Paul found there a vast field for the exercise of his zeal. He undertook to preach to the savages and, at the request of Monseigneur Lartigue, Bishop of Montreal, to found a monastery in Nova Scotia. He laboured eight years for the conversion of the infidels, and then, to carry out the latter project, he left for Bellefontaine in France (1823) and, the same year, returned to America, bringing with him four religious, with whom he founded, in 1825, the monastery of Petit Clair-

vaux, in Big Tracadie, Nova Scotia. Father Vincent de Paul lived twenty-eight years longer, spreading the blessings of the Gospel in that country. He died 1 January, 1853, in the odour of sanctity, and there is a question of introducing his cause at Rome.

For many years this foundation struggled for existence. Two fires in succession destroyed all. Discouraged thereby, the little community, in 1900, left that country and settled near Lonsdale, Rhode Island, where it founded the monastery of Our Lady of the Valley. Since 1903 the Nova Scotian solitude of Petit Clairvaux has been repeopled. Thirty religious from the Abbey of Thymadeuc (France), under the direction of Dom Eugène Villeneuve, continued the interrupted work, clearing 1000 acres of land, two-thirds of which are forest-lands, two-thirds of the remainder either pasture or meadow-lands; only about 15 acres are capable of being worked. The monastery is situated one mile from the Intercolonial Railway. Although the Cistercian Rule was in vigour there it was only incorporated in the Order of Reformed Cistercians in 1869.

Gethsemane and New Melleray.—The year 1848 saw the erection of two other monasteries in the New World, one in Nelson County in the Diocese of Louisville, Kentucky, not far from the scene of the labours and hardships of Fathers Urbain and Mary Joseph and their companions, the other in the Diocese of Dubuque, Iowa, twelve miles west of the Mississippi River. The monasteries are the present Abbeys of Our Lady of Gethsemane and Our Lady of New Melleray.

The Abbey of Gethsemane, in the Diocese of Louisville, was founded by the Abbey of Melleray in France. In 1848 Dom Maxime, abbot of that monastery, sent two of his religious to the United States to find a suitable location for a foundation. Bishop Flaget of Louisville—the saint of Kentucky, as he was called—indicated to them an establishment called Gethsemane, belonging to the Sisters of Loretto who were directing an orphanage. The property, consisting of about 1400 acres of good land, was purchased, and on the 20th of December, 1848, forty religious from Melleray took possession of it. On the 21st of July, 1850, Pius IX erected Gethsemane into an abbey. Dom Eutropius was chosen abbot in March, 1851, and on the 26th of the following October he received the abbatial blessing from the hands of Mgr. Spalding, successor of Mgr. Flaget in the Diocese of Louisville. The ten or twelve log houses which had served as dwellings for the Sisters of Loretto and their orphans had become entirely inadequate for the needs of the fathers, and Dom Eutropius decided to build a monastery. After eleven years of hard and incessant labour, which had considerably impaired his health, the zealous superior resigned his charge and returned to Melleray. From this place of retirement he was called to become the first superior of Tre Fontane near Rome.

His successor at Gethsemane was Dom Benedict Berger, under whose rule the beautiful abbatial church of Gethsemane was solemnly consecrated by Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, assisted by the Bishops of Louisville and Buffalo, 15 November, 1866. Mgr. Spalding, who had become Archbishop of Baltimore, was present on the occasion, and preached the sermon, a masterpiece of sacred eloquence. Dom Benedict died 13 August, 1890, and was succeeded by Dom Edward Bourban, who transformed into a college the little school which the Sisters of Loretto had left in charge of the new community. This college is situated about a quarter of a mile from the abbey in a picturesque location, and has since been incorporated by the legislature of Kentucky. In 1895 Dom Edward, while on a visit to France, resigned his charge on account of the poor state of his health, and was appointed chaplain of the Trappistines of Our Lady of Les Gardes, in the Diocese of Angers, France. On the 11th of October, 1898, Dom Edmond Obrecht, cellarer of the Abbey of Tre Fontane near Rome, was elected Abbot of Gethsemane, and was blessed by Bishop McCloskey of Louisville on the 28th of the same month. This community numbers 75 members.

The Abbey of New Melleray, in the Diocese of Dubuque, Iowa, about twelve miles west of the Mississippi, is so called because its mother-house is the Abbey of Mount Melleray in Ireland, which was founded by the Melleray Abbey of France. In 1848 Dom Bruno Fitzpatrick, Abbot of Mount Melleray, sent some of his religious to the State of Iowa. Mgr. Lorans, Bishop of Dubuque, offered them 80 acres of land in the vicinity of his episcopal city. The corner-stone of the monastery was laid 16 July, 1849. Raised to the dignity of an abbey in 1862, it had for first abbot, Dom Ephrem McDonald. After twenty years he resigned and returned to Mount Melleray. The Rev. Alberic Dunlea, who arrived in September, 1885, with an important colony from Mount Melleray, succeeded him as superior. He relieved the financial condition of the abbey, and ended the difficulties which had nearly ruined it under the preceding administration. In 1889 a new superior was elected in the person of Father Louis Carew. Later he became definitor of the order for the English-speaking countries, and was succeeded by Father Alberic who became titular prior. In 1897 the monastery was restored to its dignity of abbey, and Dom Alberic Dunlea was elected abbot. The property comprises some 3000 acres of land, with an abundance of excellent water. The abbey has been rebuilt, but in 1908 it was not yet completed.

GETHSEMANE ABBEY, KENTUCKY

Abbey of La Trappe, Canada.—The Abbey of Our Lady of the Lake of Two Mountains (better known by the name of La Trappe, the official name given to the post-office established there) is situated in the territory of Oka, in the Diocese of Montreal, about thirty miles from that city and upon the shores of the Lake of the Two Mountains, whence it derives its name. The first thought of founding this monastery was due to the venerable M. Rousselot, priest of St. Sulpice, and pastor of Notre-Dame of Montreal. Born at Cholet (Maine et Loire, France), a few leagues distant from the Abbey of Bellefontaine, M. Rousselot had often, in his youth, visited this monastery. Several times during his visits to France he had communicated his projects to the Abbot of Bellefontaine, Dom Jean-Marie Chouteau. The expulsion of the religious decreed by the French Government, and put into execution at Bellefontaine, 6 November, 1880, decided the Rev. Father Jean-Marie to accept the proposition of M. Rousselot. On the 8th of April, 1881, the Rev. Father Abbot, accompanied by one of his religious, arrived in Montreal, where he was most kindly received by Bishop Fabre. After some weeks of negotiation, the Seminary of St. Sulpice ceded to the Trappists 1000 acres of land in the seign-

iory of the Lake of the Two Mountains. At the same time the provincial Government of Quebec promised to encourage the foundation and to come to its aid. On his return to France the Rev. Father Abbot sent to Canada four of his religious, so that the infant colony comprised five members, including his companion who remained. Father William was the superior. They installed themselves for the time being as well as they could in a little wooden house that belonged to the Mill of the Bay, as it was called, in the territory of Oka. This temporary installation lasted until the month of September. The religious then took possession of a monastery which, without being a permanent abode, gave them room enough for faithfully carrying out the Cistercian observances and receiving new recruits. This first monastery was blessed, 8 September, 1881. It has since been transformed into an agricultural school.

The grain of mustard seed promised to become a great tree. Novices presented themselves, and at the same time the grounds, until then uncultivated, covered with brush and forests and filled with rocks, were cleared and tilled. After this a permanent monastery was planned. In the autumn of 1889, thanks to a generous benefactor, M. Devine, work was commenced upon it. In the month of May, 1890, the corner-stone was laid, and on the 28th of August, 1891, Mgr. Fabre solemnly blessed the first two wings which had been completed. This same day, by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, the priory of Our Lady of the Lake was erected into an abbey. On the 26th of March the community chose as abbot the Very Rev. Father Anthony Oger, who, on the 29th of the following June, received the abbatial blessing from the hands of Mgr. Fabre in the cathedral of Montreal. Finally, in 1897, by the aid of a benefactor as modest as he was generous, M. Rousseau, priest of St. Sulpice, the monastery and the abbatial church were entirely completed, and on the 7th of November Archbishop Bruchesi solemnly consecrated the church. Thenceforth the monks could give themselves fully to their lives of labour and prayer, without fearing any inconvenience in the fulfilment of their regular exercises. But on the 23d of July, 1902, a fire destroyed the monastery, and the community was obliged to take shelter in the agricultural school. While waiting for sufficient means to rebuild their monastery, the monks constructed a temporary wooden shelter, and on Holy Thursday, 1903, were able to leave the school. The aid rendered by the different houses of the order and the traditional generosity of the Canadian people and the people of the United States, without distinction of creed, soon enabled them to commence the building of a new monastery upon the site of the former, and on the 21st of August, 1906, Mgr. Bruchesi, Archbishop of Montreal, surrounded by several archbishops and bishops, consecrated the abbatial church.

The Abbey of Our Lady of the Lake had in 1908, according to statistics, 120 inmates, including the oblates. This name is given to boys of eleven to fifteen years who are entrusted to the monks by their parents to be brought up according to the Rule of St. Benedict, so that later, if the superiors judge them to be called to the religious life, they may become monks. The rule is mitigated for them in consideration of their tender age. This is a revival of the monastic school of the Middle Ages and of the first centuries of religious life. The principal industries of Our Lady of the Lake are the manufacture of cheese and of a medicinal wine. The monastery possesses also an important creamery for the manufacture of butter. But that which contributes most of all to the renown of La Trappe of Oka is its agricultural school. In this matter the Reformed Cistercians (Trappists) of Our Lady of the Lake follow the glorious traditions of their ancestors. From their very installation in the country, their skill in deriving profit from lands previously sterile was noticed by the farmers of the neighbourhood. Persons of every age and condition asked to be permitted to work with them, so as to learn their methods. This was the beginning of the agricultural school which the Government was in a short time to recognize officially, and which, reorganized since the burning of the former monastery, gives instruction in agricultural science every year to 80 or 100 students. To-day the building devoted to this school is a large modern construction delightfully situated in a picturesque location, and commands a beautiful view of the Lake of the Two Mountains. This agricultural school has been affiliated with the University of Laval.

Monastery of Lake St. John.—For a long time the Honourable Honoré Mercier, Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, had, at the request of the colonization agent of the province, been earnestly entreating the Abbot of Bellefontaine and Dom Anthony of Our Lady of the Lake to send some religious into the country of Lake St. John, recently opened to colonization. He had offered to the Trappist Fathers 6000 acres of land and a considerable sum of money. In the year 1891 he charged the Rev. Th. Greg. Rouleau, principal of the Laval Normal School, who accompanied Mgr. Begin on his visit *ad limina*, to urge this request of the Government upon the Abbot of Bellefontaine. When the abbot, with the necessary authorization from his order, arrived in Quebec to settle the matter, M. de Boucherville had succeeded M. Mercier as prime minister. M. Pelletier, Secretary of the Province, and the Honourable Louis Beaubien, Minister of Agriculture, were exceedingly happy to continue the work of the preceding ministry. They favoured with all their power the establishment of the Trappists at Lake St. John. Mgr. Labrecque, who had succeeded Mgr. Begin in the See of Chicoutimi, made the foundation the particular object of his personal care and attention. In 1892 Dom Anthony sent a little colony to Lake St. John. Thus was founded the prosperous and beneficent monastery of Our Lady of Mistassini at Lake St. John in the Diocese of Chicoutimi. In January, 1906, it was erected into a priory; and the Rev. Dom Pacomius Gaboury was elected prior. The monastery in 1907 had twenty inmates.

Monastery of Our Lady of the Prairies, Manitoba.—Archbishop Taché of St. Boniface had long desired to enrich his diocese with an institution of this kind. He wrote about it several times to the Abbot of Bellefontaine, and in the spring of 1892 the latter came to an understanding with the archbishop, and his collabourer, M. Ritchot, pastor of St. Norbert. The prelates gave the Rev. Father Abbot 1500 acres of good land in the parish of St. Norbert, and immediately sent thither a little colony under the direction of Father Louis de Bourmont. The work of construction was carried on with vigour and rapidity, and on the 18th of October in the same year, Archbishop Taché blessed the monastery and named it Our Lady of the Prairies. St. Norbert is situated on the west bank of the Red River, about nine miles south of Winnipeg, the great metropolis of Western Canada. It is exclusively an agricultural colony, and farming is carried on there on an extensive scale by means of the latest improved machinery. In 1893 the harvest was remunerative. In 1897 there were more than five hundred acres of first-class land under cultivation. The monastery of Our Lady of the Prairies had forty inmates in the year 1908. By this date a new building had been erected.

Monastery of Our Lady of the Valley, Lonsdale, Rhode Island, U. S.—This monastery is no other than the former Little Clairvaux transferred. After the disastrous events which made it impossible for the community of Little Clairvaux to continue its work

at Big Tracadie, Dom John Mary Murphy, yielding to the desire of Bishop Harkins of Providence to have some contemplative religious in his diocese, transferred it to Lonsdale, Rhode Island, in March, 1900, leaving to other religious who came from France his monastery of Little Clairvaux. He commenced without delay to build a wooden structure which would serve for a temporary shelter for the religious. At the same time he was constructing the buildings indispensable for farming. These preparations were pushed forward with such energy that by the month of July the community were able to commence the clearing and cultivation of the lands. It was an arduous and ungrateful task; no single-handed farmer would have undertaken it. But what was impossible to individual effort was soon effected by united labour, and the ungrateful soil became productive. The new monastery, begun in April, 1902, was finished in December of the same year, and in the month of January, 1903, the religious had the consolation of being installed in a building appropriate to their kind of life. For a farm the water supply is of prime importance. The religious of Our Lady of the Valley have discovered a spring which supplies water abundantly for all purposes. Moreover, this water, on account of its mineral properties, has a considerable commercial value. The total area of the property is 450 acres. The success which has thus far attended the efforts of the monks at Lonsdale is a precious encouragement for all those who are engaged in farming pursuits in that rocky part of Rhode Island.

The monastery was erected into a priory in 1907, and the religious elected the Rev. Dom John Mary Murphy prior. It retains in the order the rank of seniority corresponding to the date of incorporation of Little Clairvaux in the Order of Cîteaux in 1869.

Monastery of Our Lady of Calvary, Rogersville, N. B.—Foreseeing the evils with which their communities were threatened by the Law of 1901 (Waldeck-Rousseau), several abbots of the Order of Cîteaux in France looked to find a refuge in case of expulsion. Dom Anthony Oger, Abbot of Our Lady of the Lake, wrote to Mgr. Richard, pastor of Rogersville, N. B., who answered promptly, placing at his disposal certain mills and 1000 acres of land already partly cultivated. In August, 1902, the prior of Bonnecombe, France, the Rev. Father Anthony Piana and the Rev. Mother Lutgarde, prioress, with another sister, arrived in Montreal and afterwards at Our Lady of the Lake by way of Montreal. Dom Anthony Oger devoted his whole paternal solicitude to aiding his visitors in finding a place suitable for a foundation. The abbot communicated Mgr. Richard's proposal to the prior of Bonnecombe, who, after two visits to Rogersville decided to accept it, and the project was submitted to the approbation of the general chapter. The abbot general, Dom Sebastian Wyart, urged Dom Emile, Abbot of Bonnecombe, to accept the offer of the pastor of Rogersville. On the 25th of October, 1902, six religious—two priests, one novice, and three lay brothers—left Bonnecombe for Canada under the direction of Dom Anthony Piana. On the 5th of the following November the little colony was solemnly received at Rogersville by the pastor and his parishioners, and took possession of the monastery, to which was given the name of Our Lady of Calvary, which was canonically erected into a priory 12 July, 1904.

Monastery of Our Lady of Jordan, Oregon.—In 1904 the Cistercian monks of Fontgombault (Indre-et-Loire, France), were forced to abandon their monastery. They, too, looked for a refuge in America. Under the direction of their abbot, Dom Fortunato Marchand, they went to Oregon to ask for a place of retreat where they would be able to serve Almighty God, and observe their rule. The new foundation of Our Lady of Jordan is situated in the township of Jordan, Linn County, about 90 miles from the Pacific Coast, upon a plateau a mile and a half in area. The property consists of about 400 acres of land, almost 200 of which are actually under cultivation or in meadow-lands, 100 in wood land, and the remainder covered with brush. A torrent, tributary of the Santiam River, bounds it on the south. Upon this torrent has been built a steam saw-mill in connexion with the monastery. Here the Oregon firtrees, which attain immense heights, are converted into lumber for the needs of the community and for commerce. The future of this Cistercian community to a great extent rests upon this industry. The land is ordinarily fertile and produces cereals, vegetables, pears, plums, apples, etc. The monastery of Our Lady of Jordan was solemnly dedicated in 1907, the Archbishop of Oregon City officiating, in the presence of a large assembly of the laity, among whom were many non-Catholics, On the same occasion the Sacrament of Confirmation was administered by the archbishop. The Right Rev. Father Thomas, Abbot of the Benedictine Abbey of Mount Angel, preached the dedicatory sermon, in which he explained the nature and the object of the life of the Cistercians, or Trappists.

The Monastery of Our Lady of Maristella, at Taubaté in the Archdiocese of São Paulo do Brazil, is the first, and up to now the only monastery of the Cistercian Order in South America. It was founded in 1904 by the Abbey of Septfons in France, on a farm, or *fazenda*, at the foot of the Serra Mantiqueira, not far from the railroad between Rio and São Paulo, about twelve miles from Taubaté and six from Tremembé, a small place connected with Taubaté by a tramway. The property, consisting of 4000 or 5000 acres, had remained untilled since the abolition of slavery in 1888, and the buildings were falling into ruins. One half of the land lies along the River Parahyba, and the other, consisting of hills and valleys, forms the base of the chain of mountains of Mantiqueira. Rice, coffee, sugar-cane, Indian corn, etc., are cultivated, and cattle are raised. The climate is temperate, although it is within the tropics. The community, forty in number, has established a school for the children of the vicinity.

GAILLARDIN, *Histoire de La Trappe; Dom Augustin de Lestrange et les trappistes pendant la Revolution* (Grande Trappe, 1898); *Vie du R. P. Urbain Guillet* (Montligeon, 1899); VÉRITÉ, *Cîteaux, La Trappe et Bellefontaine* (Paris, 1885); SPALDING, *Sketches of the Early Missions of Kentucky, 1781–1826*; MAES, *The Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx* (Cincinnati, 1880); *L'abbaye de Notre-Dame du Lac et l'ordre de Cîteaux au Canada et dans les Etats-Unis* (Montreal, 1907); TESSIER, *Bibliotheca Patrum Cisterciensium* (4 vol. 4°, 1660); ALANUS DE INSULIS, *Opera Mosalia* (4°, 1654); BONA, *Opera Omnia* (4°, 1677); CARETTO, *Santosale del S. Ordine Cisterciense* (4 vol. 4°, 1705); DEBREYNE, many volumes on theology and medicine; UGHELLI, *Italia Sacra* (10 vol. folio, 1717); HENRIQUEZ should be quoted for having not only the *menologium* but also the *Phœnix reviviscens* (4°, 1626); *Regula Constit. et Privilegia Ord. Cist.* (folio, 1630); JANAUSCHECK, *Bibliographia Bernardina.*

F. M. GILDAS.

CISTERCIAN SISTERS.—The first Cistercian monastery for women was established at Tart in the Diocese of Langres (now Dijon), in the year 1125, by sisters from the Benedictine monastery of Juilly, and with the co-operation of St. Stephen Harding, Abbot of Cîteaux. At Juilly, a dependence of Molesme, Ste Humbeline, sister of St. Bernard, lived and died. The Cistercian Sisters of Tart founded successively Ferraque (1140) in the Diocese of Noyon, Blandecques (1153) in the Diocese of St-Omer, and Montreuil-les-Dames (1164) near Laon. In Spain the first Cistercian monastery of women was that of Tulebras (1134) in the Kingdom of Navarre. Then came Las Huelgas de Valladolid (1140), Santo Spiritu at Olmedo (1142), Villabona, or San Miguel de las Dueñas (1155), Perales (1160), Gradefes (1168), etc. But the most celebrated was Santa Maria la Real, or Las Huelgas de Burgos, founded in 1187 by Alfonso VIII of Castile. The observance was established there by Cistercian

nuns who came from Tulebras, under the guidance of Misol, who became its first abbess. The second abbess was Constance, daughter of the founder, who believed she had the power of preaching in her church and hearing the confessions of her religious. In the following year, 1190, the eighteen abbesses of France held their first general chapter at Tart. The abbesses of France and Spain themselves made the regular visits to their houses of filiation. The Council of Trent, by its decrees regarding the cloister of religious put an end to the chapter and the visits. In Italy, in 1171, were founded the monasteries of Santa Lucia at Syracuse, San Michele at Ivrea, and that of Conversano, the only one in the peninsula in which the abbesses carry a crosier. A century later the Cistercian Sisters were in Switzerland, in Germany, and in Flanders.

The decadence which manifested itself in the Cistercian Order towards the middle of the fourteenth century was felt also in the convents of nuns. But among them energetic efforts were made to restore the primitive observance or to introduce a new one. It was at this time that the Order of the Conception was founded in Spain, at Toledo, by Beatriz de Silva. But her religious were not slow to abandon the Cistercian rule for that of the Clares. In France Jeanne de Courcelles de Pourlan, having been elected Abbess of Tart in 1617, restored the regular discipline in her community, which was transferred to Dijon in 1625. Owing to the hostility of the Abbot of Cîteaux to the reform, she had her abbey withdrawn by the Holy See from the jurisdiction of the Order of Cîteaux. Another reform was effected at Port-Royal des Champs by Angélique Arnauld, 1602 (see ARNAULD, under JACQUELINE-MARIE-ANGÉLIQUE), who, to provide for the ever-increasing number of her religious, founded Port-Royal de Paris, in the borough of Saint-Jacques (1622). Queen Marie de Medicis declared herself protectress of this institution, and Pope Urban VIII exempted it from the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Cîteaux and placed it under that of Paris. The religious of Port-Royal de Paris and of Port-Royal des Champs ended by consecrating themselves to adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. But the vicinity of the Abbé de Saint-Cyran was dangerous to them, and these religious saw the suppression and destruction of Port-Royal des Champs by order of the king (1710), while they themselves were dispersed. The property and abbatial titles were annexed to Port-Royal de Paris, which subsisted up to the time of the French Revolution, and was transformed first into a prison, and then into a maternity hospital.

After the French Revolution another reform took place. Dom Augustin de Lestrange gathered the scattered Cistercian Sisters of France, with members of other orders that had been equally dispersed, and reconstructed the Cistercian Sisterhood. In 1795 he gave them a monastery which he called the Holy Will of God (La Sainte-Volonté de Dieu), situated in the Bas-Valais, Switzerland. The Trappistines, for so the new religious were called, were obliged to leave Switzerland in 1798. They courageously followed the Trappist monks in their travels over Europe, returned to Switzerland in 1803, and remained there until 1816, when at length they were able to return to France and take up their abode at Forges, near La Trappe. Two years later they occupied an old monastery of the Augustinians at Les Gardes, in the Diocese of Angers. The Trappistines spread quickly all over France, and into other countries of Europe. They have new monasteries in almost all parts of the world, and since the reunion of the three congregations of La Trappe, in 1892, they have been officially entitled: Reformed Cistercians of the Strict Observance.

The actual status (1908) of the Cistercian Sisters, Reformed and Non-Reformed, is as follows: The Reformed Cistercian nuns, or Trappistines, occupy 21 monasteries, with about 2000 religious. The monasteries are distributed as follows: nine in France, one in Italy, three in Holland, one in England, one in Spain, one in Belgium, one in Germany, one in Switzerland, two in Canada, one in Japan. To these twenty-one houses must be added twenty others of the Non-Reformed Cistercian nuns in Spain, affiliated to the order of Reformed Cistercians so far as spiritual matters are concerned, but remaining under the jurisdiction of the bishops. The Non-Reformed, or Common Observance of Cîteaux, possess: in the Congregation of Austria three monasteries with 124 members, in the Congregation of Switzerland 12 monasteries with 574 members, and in the Observance of Senanque two monasteries with thirty members. (See also BERNARDINES.)

CISTERCIAN NUNS IN AMERICA.—A Cistercian novice who came from Europe at the same time as the Trappists, and who was joined by seventeen American women, tried to establish a community. Circumstances prevented this. Father Vincent de Paul, at Tracadie, having asked the Congregation of Notre-Dame of Montreal for three sisters to help him with his mission in Nova Scotia, established them there and after probation admitted them to the profession of simple vows of the Third Order of La Trappe. But the community never in reality formed a part of the Order of Cîteaux and never even wore the Cistercian habit. The monastery of Our Lady of Good Council, St. Romuald, near Quebec, the first genuine community of Cistercian nuns in America, was established in 1902 by Mother Lutgarde, prioress of Bonneval, France. On 21 November, 1902, she brought thither a small colony of religious women. On 29 July of the following year Mgr. Marois, as delegate of the Archbishop of Quebec, blessed the new monastery. Though this kind of life was entirely new to the young women of Canada, vocations were not wanting. The means of subsistence for this house are agricultural labour and the manufacture of chocolate. The community is under the direction of the Archbishop of Quebec. Another at Rogersville, New Brunswick, where there were already some Cistercian monks, was established by the sisters expelled by the French Government from their monastery of Vaise, at Lyons.

HÉLYOT, *Dictionnaire des ordres religieux;* GAILLARDIN, *Histoire de La Trappe; L'Abbaye de N.-D. du Lac et l'ordre de Cîteaux au Canada et dans les Etats-Unis.*

F. M. GILDAS.

Citation (Lat. *citare*), a legal act through which a person, by mandate of the judge, is called before the tribunal for trial. It is called verbal when the judge sends an apparitor to the accused to call him to judgment on a fixed day. If the citation be made by a public summons it is called edictal. When a person has been arrested by the officers of the law his citation is said to be real. Citations are also distinguished into simple and peremptory. The former is had when the judge orders a person to appear on a determined day before his tribunal, but does not add a threat nor declare that a prolongation of the time will not be allowed; the latter, or peremptory citation, is that which imposes a strict obligation to appear, and declares that no later summons will be issued, so that if the person cited does not obey this one, he will be considered contumacious. Real citation is had recourse to, when the accused is suspected of meditating flight or is contumacious; edictal citation, when the defendant can be reached in no other way; peremptory citation, only under extraordinary circumstances. A peremptory citation is held to be the equivalent in effect to three simple citations. In a judicial process, a citation is ordinarily so necessary that if it be omitted, every other act of the trial is null and void. There are some exceptions to this, as, for example, if a person be taken red-handed, or when the accused is already before the tribunal, or when there is danger in

delay. There are many requisites for a legitimate citation, as that it be asked for by one party to the suit, that it contain the names of plaintiff and defendant, the cause of the summons, the day and place of judgment and so forth. When a certain judge has issued a valid citation, the case must be tried before him, even though other judges would have been competent. If the citation be not couched in the prescribed legal style, or if it be issued for one beyond the court's jurisdiction, it may be disregarded. When the plaintiff is contumacious, he may be condemned to pay the expenses of the court and sentence may be pronounced without him. Contumacity on the part of the defendant creates a presumption of his guilt, and in a real action puts the other party in temporary possession of the disputed object.

DE LUCA, *Prælect. Jur. Can.* (Rome, 1898), IV; LAURENTIUS, *Inst. Jur. Eccl.* (Freiburg, 1903); SMITH, *Elements of Eccl. Law* (New York, 1892), II.

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Cîteaux, ABBEY OF, founded in 1098 by St. Robert, Abbot of Molesme, in a deserted and uninhabited part of the Diocese of Châlons-sur-Saône, to-day the Diocese of Dijon (Côte-d'Or, France), from which city it is four leagues distant. A small stream of water which overflowed its banks formed there a marsh covered with rushes and coarse grass called in the language of the country *cistels*, whence the name Cistell or Cîteaux (Lat. *Cistercium*). Here, in a place unknown to men and hitherto inhabited only by wild beasts, St. Robert and his companions, to the number of twenty-one, placed the foundations of the Order of Cîteaux, and commenced the literal observance of the Rule of St. Benedict. St. Robert built the first monastery of the Cistercian Order, which he named *Novum Monasterium* (new monastery), to distinguish it from the monastery of Molesme from which he and his brethren had come. The domain in which Cîteaux was situated belonged to Raynald, Viscount of Beaune, who, with his wife Hodierna, gave it voluntarily to God and the Virgin Mary. The name of Cîteaux, which this place formerly bore, soon supplanted that of *Novum Monasterium*, by which it is called in the "Exordium Cisterciensis Ordinis". The Duke of Burgundy, Eudes I, touched by the holy life of the monks of Cîteaux, encouraged the work and took upon himself the obligation of defraying all the expenses. The new monastery was inaugurated on the feast of St. Benedict, 21 March, 1098. St. Robert was elected Abbot of Cîteaux, but, recalled to Molesme a year afterwards, he was succeeded by St. Alberic, who gave the monks the white habit and placed the monastery immediately under the protection of the Holy See. Under St. Alberic's successor, St. Stephen Harding, the number of subjects was increased by the arrival of St. Bernard and his twenty-four companions, all young noblemen of Burgundy, and the order commenced to send out colonies. La Ferté (*Firmitas*), in the Diocese of Châlons (to-day of Autun), Pontigny (*Pontiniacum*) in the Diocese of Auxerre, Clairvaux (*Claravallis*), in the Diocese of Langres (to-day of Troyes), and Morimond (*Morimundus*), in the same Diocese of Langres, were the first four daughters of Cîteaux, which, in their turn, gave birth to many monasteries. The abbots of these houses were called the first four Fathers of the order, and the "Charter of Charity", work of St. Stephen, conferred upon them the right of visiting the Abbey of Cîteaux.

Popes and kings bestowed many honours and privileges upon Cîteaux. This being the mother-abbey of the Cistercian Order, the abbot was recognized as head and superior general of the whole order. The office was elective, the incumbent to be chosen only from among the religious of the order, and only by the religious of the house of Cîteaux. To-day the abbot is elected by the general chapter, the religious of Cîteaux not participating. The election was formerly cumulative, that is, to the abbot general belonged, *de jure*, full administration in spiritual and temporal matters, without waiting for the confirmation of the Holy See. To-day this confirmation is required before the abbot general can exercise his powers. The abbot of Cîteaux was also *ipso facto* prime counsellor (*primus consiliarius natus*) in the Parliament of Burgundy. He had the right to be called to the assembly of States General of the kingdom and to that of the states of the Province of Burgundy. In the councils he sat immediately after the bishops and had the same honours and prerogatives. He was regarded as the first of the abbots, "the abbot of the abbots". As head and superior general, he had the right, as he has to-day, to visit, either in person or by his delegate, all the monasteries of the order, and during the visit to exercise all jurisdictional powers.

Cîteaux has been a nursery of saints and illustrious personages. From St. Robert to Blessed Guy III, twenty-three abbots are venerated in the order as saints and blessed. Lambert (1155–61), Gilbert (1163–67), Alexander (1168–75), and Arnaud I (1201–12) are recognized for the eminent services rendered to the popes and to the kings. Six abbots of Cîteaux were honoured with the Roman purple. Henri (1304–16) and Jean IV de Martigny (1405–28) were illustrious for their knowledge in the œcumenical councils. Guy d'Autun (1460–62), Hymbert Martin de Losne (1462–76), Jean IV de Cirey (1476–1501) were the courageous defenders of the order against the practice of *Commendam*. Others signalized themselves by their zeal for the restoration of discipline and by their reformatory tendencies: Edme I de la Croix (1585–1604), Nicholas II Boucherat (1604–25), Claude Vaussin (1643–70), John XII Petit (1670–92), Nicholas Larcher (1692–1712). But its past glory and the regularity which still existed at the end of the eighteenth century could not save Cîteaux. It is remarkable, however, that with the exception of one lay brother, none of the religious of Cîteaux accepted the pension of the State. On 4 May, 1791, the abbey was sold for the first time as national property. The sixty-second and last abbot was Dom Francis Trouvé (1748–90). Having lost all hope of saving his monastery, he begged Pius VI, 25 July, 1790, to transfer his powers to Dom Robert Schlecht, Abbot of Salmansweiler, a precaution which left life and hope to the other provinces. Dom Trouvé died 27 April, 1797.

The monks of Cîteaux created the vineyards of Clos-Vougeot and Romanée, the most celebrated of Burgundy. In 1791, the abbey, which possessed 9800 acres of land, was sold for 862,000 pounds, and this money was used in turn for various purposes. In December, 1841, it was sold to an Englishman, Arthur Young, a disciple of Fourier, for the purpose of establishing there a phalanstery, which, however, failed completely in 1846. The Abbé Joseph Rey, founder of the Brothers of St. Joseph, purchased it in 1846, established a colony for agricultural purposes there, and opened a school for the reception and education of young delinquents and abandoned children. The colony was suppressed in 1889, and on 2 October, 1898, the Order of Reformed Cistercians took possession again of Cîteaux, and Dom Sebastien Wyart became the sixty-third abbot, after an interruption of 107 years. He was succeeded (Oct., 1904) by Dom Augustin Marre, Abbot of Igny, titular Bishop of Constance, and General of the Order of Reformed Cistercians, who, having his residence at Rome, appointed for the government of Cîteaux an auxiliary, Dom Robert Lescand, titular Abbot of Saint-Aubin and Prior of the house of Cîteaux.

Exordia Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis (Fr. tr., Paris, 1884); LE NAIN, *Essai de l'histoire de Cîteaux* (Paris, 1696–97); PARIS, *Nomasticon Cisterciense* (Paris, 1669); JANAUSCHEK, *Originum Cisterciensium* (Vienna, 1897), I; *L'Union Cistercienne* (Hautecombe, 1892—); *Ménologe Cistercien, par un moine de Thymadeuc*

(Saint-Brieuc, 1898); *Histoire abrégée de l'Ordre de Cîteaux, par un moine de Thymadeuc* (Saint-Brieuc, 1898).

F. M. GILDAS.

Citharizum, a titular see of Armenia. The city was situated in Asthianene or Balabitene, a region between Masius and Anti-Taurus, north of Commagene and Mesopotamia. Justinian built a castle there, in which he stationed a garrison under the command of a duke. He also included it in the province, Armenia Quarta, which he had just formed. In 613 Citharizum was taken by Ashot, a general of the Persian king, Chosroes II. In the records of the Trullan Council (692) we meet the name of Marianus, Bishop of Kitharizon (or Kithariza), for the name seems to have been indeclinable (Lequien, I, 453). No other bishop is known. The city is mentioned in Parthey, "Notitia Prima", about 840 as belonging to Armenia Quarta, under the metropolis of Melitene. It is identified with the modern village Keterig.

GELZER, *Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis romani* (Leipzig, 1893), 174.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Città della Pieve, DIOCESE OF (CIVITATIS PLEBIS).—Città della Pieve is a city of obscure origin in the province of Perugia in Umbria, Central Italy. It certainly was an episcopal see in the eleventh century, since in 1099 the bishop was expelled by the Ghibellines. Later Paschal II united it with the Diocese of Chiusi. Clement VIII re-established it as a separate see (1601), the first bishop being Fabrizio Paolucci of the Counts of Cabulo. In 1642, while Giovanni Battista Carcarasio was bishop, the city was sacked by the German soldiers of the Duke of Parma. The diocese is immediately subject to the Holy See. The cathedral, dedicated to Sts. Gervasius and Protasius, is said to have been erected at the exhortation of St. Ambrose. The diocese has a population of 60,000, with 33 parishes, 86 churches and chapels, 65 secular priests, and 4 religious houses of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844); *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 402–03.

U. BENIGNI.

Città di Castello, DIOCESE OF (CIVITATIS CASTELLI).—Città di Castello is a town in the province of Perugia, in Umbria, Central Italy, situated on a slope of the Apennines, not far from the Tiber, whence its ancient name of *Tifernum* or *Civitas Tiberina*. Pliny built there a magnificent villa. In 550, Fantalogus, by order of the Ostrogothic king, Totila, took and destroyed the city, which was later rebuilt around a castle, whence its name. By the donation of Pepin the Short (752), it became subject to the Holy See. In subsequent centuries it was under various rulers, among them Pier Saccone di Pietramala. In the later Middle Ages it was governed successively by the Guelphs and Ghibellines. In 1375 Città di Castello joined in the insurrection of other cities of the States of the Church. Cardinal Robert of Geneva (later antipope as Clement VII), undertook to recapture it with Breton mercenaries, but was repulsed. Under Martin V, however, it was taken by Braccio da Montone (1420). Later, Nicolò Vitelli, with the help of Florence and Milan, became absolute ruler or *tiranno*. In 1474 Sixtus IV sent thither his nephew, Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere (later Julius II). After fruitless negotiations he laid siege to the city, but Vitelli did not surrender until he learned that the command of the army had been given to Duke Federigo of Urbino. The following year Vitelli tried unsuccessfully to recapture the city; fear of Cæsar Borgia alone induced him to desist. During the persecution of Diocletian St. Crescentianus, a Roman knight, and ten others suffered martyrdom at Tifernum. The first-known bishop of this see was Ennodius, present at a Roman council (465) under Pope Hilary. At the time of the sack of the city by Fantalogus (550), the bishop was Florius, later a friend of St. Gregory the Great. In 711 Lombard Arians put to death for the Faith the bishop of the city, Albertus, and his deacon Britius. Città di Castello is the birthplace of Pope Celestine II (1143–44). The cathedral is a noble monument of architecture, and has among its treasures an altar-front (*paliotto*) of chiselled silver dating back to the twelfth century, and a crosier of the fifteenth. The diocese has a population of 50,250, with 158 parishes, 300 churches and chapels, 162 secular and 10 regular priests, and 12 religious houses of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), IV, 581–748; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 403–6; MUZI, *Memorie eccl. e civili di Città di Castello* (ibid., 1842–47).

U. BENIGNI.

City of Refuge. See REFUGE.

Ciudad Real (ECCLESIA CLUNIENSIS), Bishopric-Priorate of the Military Orders of Spain, directly subject to the Holy See. To counteract the disadvantages caused by the dispersion of the church lands appertaining to the military orders of Santiago, Alcántara, Calahorra, and Montesa, Article VI of the Concordat of 1851 decrees that a special circumscription (*coto redondo*) be formed for the churches belonging to the aforesaid orders and that the government thereof be confided to a prior, with episcopal rank, and furthermore that said see be designated as *in partibus infidelium*. Consequently, by the Bull "Ad Apostolicam Beati Petri", Pius IX created (1875) the Bishopric-Priorate of the Military Orders, assigning to it as territory all the province of Ciudad Real, some towns of which had hitherto belonged to the Diocese of Toledo, others to the Dioceses of Cuenca and Cordova. The residence of the bishop is at Ciudad Real (population, 1900, 15,327). At the same time the pope accorded to King Alfonso XII and to his successors, as Grand Masters of the Military Orders, the right to nominate within three months the bishop-prior, whenever a vacancy occurred, and at the same time to solicit for him from the Holy See the title of Bishop of Dora *in partibus infidelium*, which church was to remain perpetually united to the Priorate of Ciudad Real. The execution of the Bull was confided to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, by whom (4 June, 1876) the entire province of Ciudad Real was made a bishopric-priorate of the Military Orders, and for all canonical purposes constituted a territory *vere et proprie nullius diœcesis*, i. e. exempt from all neighbouring jurisdiction.

GOMEZ SALAZAR Y LA FUENTE, *Lecciones de disciplina eclesiástica* (3d ed., Madrid, 1880), I, 268–70, 484–91; HERVÁS Y BUENDÍA, *Diccionario hist. geograf. de la prov. de Ciudad-Real* (Madrid, 1892).

EDUARDO DE HINOJOSA.

Ciudad Rodrigo, DIOCESE OF (CIVITATENSIS), suffragan of the Diocese of Santiago, comprises the greater part of the province of Salamanca, and a portion of the province of Cáceres. The city of Ciudad Rodrigo, which is the capital of the diocese, was named for the Count Rodrigo González, who founded it about the middle of the twelfth century. It has approximately a population of 7000 inhabitants, and is the head of the judicial district. The bishopric was established by Ferdinand II, King of Leon, its establishment being confirmed by Pope Alexander III in 1175. This see finally succeeded that of Caliabria, which dated from the Visigothic era, and existed from 621 to 693. Alfonso VIII gave the city of Caliabria to the Diocese of Ciudad Rodrigo in 1191. The first bishop of whom anything certain is known was called Pedro (1165); the most celebrated was the learned jurist Don Diego de Covarruvias y Leyva (1560).

FLÓREZ, *De las iglesias de Avila, Caliabria, etc.* in *España*

Sagrada (Madrid, 1786), XIV, 45–50; GONZÁLES-DÁVILA, *Theatro eclesiástico de las Iglesias de las dos Castillas* (Madrid, 1700), IV, 1–48.

EDUARDO DE HINOJOSA.

Ciudad Vittoria, DIOCESE OF. See TAMAULIPAS.

Cius (KIOS), a titular see of Asia Minor. Kios was a Milesian colony on the Bithynian coast in the Kianos Kolpos, a bay formed by the Propontis. It was captured by Hymeos, a general of Darius, was destroyed by Philip III, and restored by Prusias, whence its new name *Prusias ad Hippum*. Its episcopal see was suffragan to Prusa. Bishop Cyrillus was present at Nicæa in 325. At an early date the see was raised to a higher rank; according to Ramsay (Asia Minor, 428) Julianus, who played an important part at Constantinople and Chalcedon as *apocrisiarius* of Pope Leo, was Bishop of Kios, not of Kos. At the Council of Constantinople, under the Patriarch Menas, in 546, Hedistus subscribes as metropolitan of Cius, but this must be a later interpolation, for at the sixth and seventh Œcumenical Councils the see holds again only episcopal rank; at the Eighth General Council and as late as the twelfth century we find archbishops. Of the sixteen titulars quoted by Lequien (I, 631), the most worthy of notice is St. Eustathius, a confessor under the Iconoclasts. Kios may be Civitot, the landing-place of the Crusaders on their way to Nicæa, though this is placed by many geographers at Yalova. The Turks call it Ghemlek. It has 5000 inhabitants (4600 Greeks, 300 Mussulmans, 100 Armenians), and is the chief town of a caza in the vilayet of Brusa, and also the residence of the Greek metropolitan of Nicæa. There remain yet some ruins of its ancient walls. The little haven exports chrome.

CUINET, *Turquie d'Asie*, IV, 141–145; CLEONYMOS AND PAPADOPOULOS, *Bithynica*, Gr. (Constantinople, 1867), 48–51; EVANGELIDÉS, *The City of the Kians*, Gr. (Athens, 1892); KOKKINAKÉS, *Essay on Kios*, Gr. (Constantinople, 1895); SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.* (London, 1878), 629.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Civil Allegiance.—By civil allegiance is meant the duty of loyalty and obedience which a person owes to the State of which he is a citizen. The word allegiance is a derivative of *liege*, free, and historically it signifies the service which a free man owed to his liege lord. In the matter in hand its meaning is wider, it is used to signify the duty which a citizen owes to the State of which he is a subject. That duty, according to the teaching of the Catholic Church, rests on nature itself and the sanctions of religion. As nature and religion prescribe to children dutiful conduct towards the parents who brought them into the world, so nature and religion impose on citizens certain obligations towards their country and its rulers. These obligations may be reduced to those of patriotism and obedience. Patriotism requires that the citizen should have a reasonable esteem and love for his country. He should take an interest in his country's history, he should know how to value her institutions, and he should be prepared to sacrifice himself for her welfare. In his country's need it is not only a noble thing, but it is a sacred duty to lay down one's life for the safety of the commonwealth. Love for his country will lead the citizen to show honour and respect to its rulers. They represent the State, and are entrusted by God with power to rule it for the common good. The citizen's chief duty is to obey the just laws of his country. To be able to distinguish what laws of the civil authority are just and obligatory, it will be advisable to lay down the principles of Catholic theology respecting the nature, subject-matter, and limits of the obedience which citizens owe to the State. To understand these we must know something of the mutual relations between Church and State. From the time of Our Lord to the present, no accusation has been more persistently made against Catholics than that they cannot be good Catholics and good citizens at the same time. They owe, it is said, a divided allegiance. On the one hand they are bound to obey an infallible pope, who is the sole judge of what comes within his sphere of authority, and who may be a foreigner; and on the other they must satisfy the claims of the State to the loyalty and obedience of its subjects. It is asserted that the duties of the citizen are sure to be sacrificed by a devout Catholic to the interests of his Church. This conflict of jurisdictions did not arise in pre-Christian times. Each nation had its own religion, its own gods, its own worship. The national religion was a primary element in the constitution of the State. The chief ruler of the State was also supreme pontiff. As a citizen owed obedience to his country's laws, so he owed reverence and worship to his country's gods. The State domineered with absolute sway over both the spiritual and the temporal; it claimed the whole devotion of both body and soul. Jesus Christ established a spiritual kingdom on earth, which we call His Church. He gave His Church authority over all matters concerned with the worship of the one, true God, and the salvation of souls; it was His intention that the Gospel should be preached to every creature, that all men should enter His kingdom, that His Church should be Catholic, i. e. universal. This fact is of supreme importance not only in religion, but also in history and politics. As von Ranke said: "The rise of Christianity involved the liberation of religion from all political elements. From this followed the growth of a distinct ecclesiastical class with a peculiar constitution. In this separation of the Church from the State consists perhaps the greatest, the most pervading and influential peculiarity of all Christian times. . . . The mutual relations of the spiritual and secular powers, their position with regard to each other, form from this time forward one of the most important considerations in all history" (The Popes, I, 10).

The teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the duty of civil allegiance will be clear if we lay down her doctrine about the origin and limits of the temporal and spiritual power, and the relation in which they stand to each other. The Church's teaching on these points is part of her doctrinal system, derived from Scripture and tradition. The archbishops and bishops of the United States made use of the following weighty words in the joint pastoral letter which they addressed to the clergy and laity of their charge in the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in the year 1866: "The enemies of the Church fail not to represent her claims as incompatible with the independence of the Civil Power, and her action as impeding the exertions of the State to promote the well-being of society. So far from these charges being founded in fact, the authority and influence of the Church will be found to be the most efficacious support of the temporal authority by which society is governed. The Church indeed does not proclaim the absolute and entire independence of the Civil Power, because it teaches with the Apostle that 'all power is of God'; that the temporal magistrate is his minister, and that the power of the sword he wields is a delegated exercise of authority committed to him from on high. For the children of the Church obedience to the Civil Power is not a submission to force which may not be resisted; nor merely the compliance with a condition for peace and security; but a religious duty founded on obedience to God, by whose authority the Civil Magistrate exercises his power." In order to learn in detail what the Catholic doctrine is concerning the duty of civil allegiance we cannot do better than consult the authoritative utterances of the popes themselves. Leo XIII touches upon this doctrine in several of his Encyclical letters, and he

treats of it at length in that which begins with the words "Immortale Dei," issued 1 November, 1885.

ORIGIN OF THE STATE.—According to Catholic teaching man is by nature a social animal, he naturally seeks the society of his fellows, and he cannot attain to his proper development except in society. As he is born and bred in the bosom of the family, from the necessities of his nature, so, in order to defend himself, in order to attain the full perfection of his bodily, mental, and spiritual faculties, families must join together and form a higher and more powerful society, the State. Nature prescribes that the father should be the head of the family, and to keep the peace between citizens, to secure to all their rights, to punish the wrongdoer, to foster the common good, nature imperiously demands that there should be a supreme authority in the State. As Leo XIII says in the Encyclical "Immortale Dei", "It is not difficult to determine what would be the form and character of the State were it governed according to the principles of Christian philosophy. Man's natural instinct moves him to live in civil society, for he cannot, if dwelling apart, provide himself with the necessary requirements of life, nor procure the means of developing his mental and moral faculties. Hence it is divinely ordained that he should lead his life, be it family, social, or civil, with his fellowmen, amongst whom alone his several wants can be adequately supplied. But as no society can hold together unless someone be over all, directing all to strive earnestly for the common good, every civilized community must have a ruling authority, and this authority, no less than society itself, has its source in nature, and has consequently God for its author. Hence it follows that all public power must proceed from God. For God alone is the true and supreme Lord of the world. Everything without exception must be subject to Him, and must serve Him, so that whosoever holds the right to govern, holds it from one sole and single source, namely God, the Sovereign Ruler of all. 'There is no power but from God.' "

The state of civil society then is the state of nature; there never was, nor, man's nature being what it is, could there be a state in which men led a solitary life of freedom without the restraints and the advantages of civil society, such as was dreamed of by Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau. The authority of the State is derived not from a social compact, voluntarily entered into by men, but, like the authority of the father of a family, it is derived from nature herself, and from God, the Author and the Lord of nature. This Catholic doctrine concerning the Divine origin of civil authority, as it is inherent in society, must be carefully distinguished from the theory of the Divine right of kings which was popular in England among the High Church party in the seventeenth century. According to the theory of Divine right the king was the Divinely constituted vicegerent of Jesus Christ on earth; he was responsible to God alone for his acts; in the name of God he governed his subjects in both spiritual and temporal matters. The theory united the spiritual and the temporal power in one subject, and derived the combined authority from the direct and immediate delegation of God. It has not ineptly been called Cæsaropapism.

But though nature and God prescribe that there should be a supreme authority in the State, and that all citizens should conscientiously render due obedience to it, yet they do not determine the subject of the supreme civil authority. Whether a particular State be a monarchy, an oligarchy, or a democracy, or any combination of these forms of government, is a matter that depends on history and the character of the people. Provided that the government fulfils its function, its form in the eyes of the Catholic Church is of comparatively little importance. As Leo XIII says, "The right to rule is not necessarily bound up with any special mode of government. It may take this or that form, provided only that it be of a nature to ensure the general welfare. But whatever be the nature of the government, rulers must ever bear in mind that God is the paramount ruler of the world, and must set Him before themselves as their exemplar and law in the administration of the State" (Encyclical, Immortale Dei). The same pope touches on this subject in his Encyclical (10 January, 1890) on the chief duties of Christians as citizens: "The Church", he says, "the guardian always of her own right and most observant of that of others, holds that it is not her province to decide which is the best among many different forms of government and the civil institutions of Christian States, and amid the various kinds of State rule she does not disapprove of any, provided the respect due to religion and the observance of good morals be upheld." He returned to the same point in his Encyclical of 16 February, 1892, on allegiance to the republic in France: "Various political governments have succeeded one another in France during the last century, each having its own distinctive form: the Empire, the Monarchy, and the Republic. By giving one's self up to abstractions one could at length conclude which is the best of these forms, considered in themselves; and in all truth it may be affirmed that each of them is good, provided it lead straight to the end—that is to say, to the common good, for which social authority is constituted—and finally, it may be added that, from the relative point of view, such and such a form of government may be preferable because of being better adapted to the character and customs of such or such a nation. In this order of speculative ideas, Catholics, like all other citizens, are free to prefer one form of government to another, precisely because no one of these social forms is, in itself, opposed to the principles of sound reason or to the maxims of Christian doctrine."

THE STATE NOT SECULARIST.—The State should not be indifferent to religion and profess mere secularism. "The State," says Leo XIII, in the Encyclical "Immortale Dei", "constituted as it is, is clearly bound to act up to the manifold and weighty duties linking it to God, by the public profession of religion. Nature and reason, which command every individual devoutly to worship God in holiness, because we belong to Him and must return to Him since from Him we came, bind also the civil community by a like law. For men living together in society are under the power of God no less than individuals are, and society, not less than individuals, owes gratitude to God, who gave it being and maintains it, and whose ever-bounteous goodness enriches it with countless blessings. Since, then, no one is allowed to be remiss in the service due to God, and since the chief duty of all men is to cling to religion in both its teaching and practice—not such religion as they may have a preference for, but the religion which God enjoins, and which certain and most clear marks show to be the only one true religion—it is a public crime to act as though there were no God. So, too, is it a sin in the State not to have care for religion, as a something beyond its scope, or as of no practical benefit; or out of many forms of religion to adopt that one which chimes in with the fancy; for we are bound absolutely to worship God in that way which he has shown to be His will. All who rule, therefore, should hold in honour the holy name of God, and one of their chief duties must be to favour religion, to protect it, to shield it under the credit and sanction of the laws, and neither to organize nor enact any measures that may compromise its safety. This is the bounden duty of rulers to the people over whom they rule. For one

and all are we destined by our birth and adoption to enjoy, when this frail and fleeting life is ended, a supreme and final good in heaven, and to the attainment of this every endeavour should be directed. Since, then, upon this depends the full and perfect happiness of mankind, the securing of this end should be of all imaginable interests the most urgent. Hence civil society, established for the common welfare, should not only safeguard the well-being of the community, but have also at heart the interests of its individual members, in such mode as not in any way to hinder, but in every manner to render as easy as may be, the possession of that highest and unchangeable good for which all should seek."

The Church a Divine Society.—Although the State must not be indifferent to religion, yet direct authority in matters pertaining thereto, since the coming of Jesus Christ, no longer belongs to the State but to the Church, a Divinely constituted and perfect society which He founded, and to which He gave full spiritual power to rule its subjects in matters of religion, and guide them to God. As Leo XIII says, in his Encyclical of 10 January, 1890: "No one can without risk to faith, foster any doubt as to the Church alone having been invested with such power of governing souls as to exclude altogether the civil authority." And in the Encyclical "Immortale Dei" he says: "For the only-begotten Son of God established on earth a society which is called the Church, and to it He handed over the exalted and Divine office which He had received from His Father, to be continued through the ages to come. 'As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.' Consequently, as Jesus Christ came into the world that men 'might have life and have it more abundantly', so also has the Church for its aim and end the eternal salvation of souls, and hence it is so constituted as to open wide its arms to all mankind, unhampered by any limit of either time or place. 'Preach ye the Gospel to every creature.' Over this mighty multitude God has Himself set rulers with power to govern; and He has willed that one should be the head of all, and the chief and unerring teacher of truth, to whom He has given 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Feed my lambs, feed my sheep. I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.' This society is made up of men, just as civil society is, and yet is supernatural and spiritual, on account of the end for which it was founded, and of the means by which it aims at attaining that end. Hence it is distinguished and differs from civil society and, what is of highest moment, it is a society chartered as of right Divine, perfect in its nature and in its title, to possess in itself, through the will and loving kindness of its Founder, all needful provision for its maintenance and action. And just as the end at which the Church aims is by far the noblest of ends, so is its authority the most exalted of all authority, nor can it be looked upon as inferior to the civil power or in any manner dependent upon it. In very truth Jesus Christ gave to His Apostles unrestrained authority in regard to things sacred, together with the genuine and most true power of making laws, as also with the two-fold right of judging and of punishing, which flow from that power. 'All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth: going therefore teach all nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.' And in another place, 'If he will not hear them, tell the Church.' And again, 'In readiness to revenge all disobedience.' And once more, 'That . . . I may not deal more severely according to the power which the Lord hath given me, unto edification and not unto destruction.' Hence it is the Church, and not the State, that is to be man's guide to heaven. It is to the Church that God has assigned the charge of seeing to, and legislating for, all that concerns religion; of teaching all nations; of spreading the Christian faith as widely as possible; in short, of administering freely and without hindrance, in accordance with her own judgment, all matters that fall within its competence."

Relation Between the Two Powers.—In the same Encyclical the pope shows that this power has always been claimed and exercised by the Church, and then goes on to trace the relation which exists between the two powers. "The Almighty, therefore, has appointed the charge of the human race between two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, the one being set over Divine, and the other over human things. Each in its kind is supreme, each has fixed limits within which it is contained, limits which are defined by the nature and special object of the province of each, so that there is, we may say, an orbit traced out within which the action of each is brought into play by its own native right. But inasmuch as each of these two powers has authority over the same subjects, and as it might come to pass that one and the same thing—related differently, but still remaining one and the same thing—might belong to the jurisdiction and determination of both, therefore God, who foresees all things, and who is the author of these two powers, has marked out the course of each in right correlation to the other. 'For the powers that are, are ordained of God.' Were this not so, deplorable contentions and conflicts would often arise, and not infrequently men, like travellers at the meeting of two roads, would hesitate in anxiety and doubt, not knowing what course to follow. Two powers would be commanding contrary things, and it would be a dereliction of duty to disobey either of the two. But it would be most repugnant to deem thus of the wisdom and goodness of God. Even in physical things, albeit of a lower order, the Almighty has so combined the forces and springs of nature with tempered action and wondrous harmony that no one of them clashes with any other, and all of them most fitly and aptly work together for the great purpose of the universe. There must, accordingly, exist between these two powers a certain orderly connexion, which may be compared to the union of the soul and body in man. The nature and scope of that connexion can be determined only, as We have laid down, by having regard to the nature of each power, and by taking account of the relative excellence and nobleness of their purpose. One of the two has for its proximate and chief object the well-being of this mortal life; the other the everlasting joys of heaven. Whatever, therefore, in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either of its own nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgment of the Church. Whatever is to be ranged under the civil and political order is rightly subject to the civil authority. Jesus Christ has Himself given command that what is Cæsar's is to be rendered to Cæsar, and that what belongs to God is to be rendered to God. There are nevertheless occasions when another method of concord is available for the sake of peace and liberty: We mean when rulers of the State and the Roman Pontiff come to an understanding touching some special matter. (See Concordat.) At such times the Church gives signal proof of her motherly love by showing the greatest possible kindliness and indulgence."

The Church's Temporal Jurisdiction.—The pope then briefly describes the advantages which would follow from the establishment of this Christian scheme of society if both powers were content to keep within their legitimate sphere. Human nature,

however, is prone to go wrong, and many and bitter have been the conflicts between the two powers. While no Catholic would maintain that in these struggles the Church was always in the right, modern historians of the scientific school freely admit that the civil power was generally the aggressor. One cause of conflict was the jurisdiction over many merely temporal matters which the Christian emperors of Rome granted to the popes and to bishops. During the Middle Ages bishops continued to claim and to exercise this jurisdiction, which was sometimes enlarged, sometimes curtailed, by local customs and laws. In various ways the pope became paramount lord of whole kingdoms during the same period. Thus, by the voluntary act of King John and his barons, England was made a fief of the Holy See and became for a time tributary to it. When the Church had once lawfully acquired such rights as these, it was natural that she should wish to retain them; indeed, no churchman could lawfully surrender the justly acquired rights of his church, even in temporal matters, without just cause and the leave of the Holy See. Still, the double jurisdiction led to strife between the two powers, and by degrees the State in most European countries not only deprived the Church of the jurisdiction in temporal matters which she once possessed, but made large inroads into the spiritual domain which belongs exclusively to the Church. Conflicts also arose over mixed causes, such as legitimacy, which belonged to both jurisdictions, and in consequence of the claim of the Church to an indirect and incidental jurisdiction in matters temporal. Thus the Church claims authority over the education of her children even in subjects which do not pertain directly to religion, and in all probability in the same way she obtained in England the power which she once enjoyed over testamentary dispositions. This is a matter of the greatest importance in the history of English law. Owing to it the English law of property at the present day is divided into halves, that of realty and that of personalty. The division is due to the fact that the Church, on account of her authority over pious causes and legacies to charitable purposes, early obtained jurisdiction over all testamentary dispositions of personalty, while the realty was left to the civil courts. There was a controversy among theologians and jurists as to the extent of the Church's power over temporal matters. All admit that her authority does in some way extend to temporal affairs; indeed, the proposition that she has no direct or indirect temporal authority was condemned by Pius IX in the Syllabus of Errors. To explain the nature of that power three systems have been devised by theologians and jurists.

. (*a*) *Theory of Direct Power.*—One school, which comprised such men as John of Salisbury and his friend St. Thomas Becket, maintained that the pope had direct power over temporal as over spiritual matters. All power was given to Jesus Christ, the King of kings and Lord of lords, and He made over the plenitude of the power which He had received to His vicars, the Roman pontiffs. Consequently the popes are the supreme rulers of the world in both spiritual and temporal matters, they keep the spiritual power in their own hands, while they delegate the temporal to emperors and kings. These, therefore, are directly responsible for their acts to the pope in whose name they govern. It is possible to quote expressions from papal documents which seem to support this opinion. Gregory VII, Innocent III, and other popes, used phrases which are capable of being interpreted in that sense; but if the scope of those documents be considered, and especially if the teaching of these popes on other occasions be taken into account, they must be explained in another way. Thus Innocent III, writing to the Patriarch of Constantinople, says that "not only the Church universal but the whole world was left to Peter to govern." But his aim is to show the universality of the pope's spiritual jurisdiction in contrast to that exercised over particular churches by other spiritual rulers. In his celebrated Decretal "Novit," Innocent III defends himself from the imputation of desiring to usurp or curtail the jurisdiction or power of the King of France: "Why", he asks, "should we desire to usurp the jurisdiction of another, when we are not competent to wield our own?" He explains that he had summoned the French king before his spiritual tribunal to answer for a sin, a matter which belonged to the ecclesiastical court. Similarly, in his Decretal "Per venerabilem", the same great pope says that he is well aware that Christ said, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's", but that, notwithstanding, in certain causes the pope exercises temporal jurisdiction casually and incidentally.

(*b*) *Theory of Indirect Power.*—Hence there was another opinion defended by Hugo of St. Victor, Alexander of Hales, and others, according to which the power granted by Christ to the Church and to the pope was spiritual, and had reference only to religion and the salvation of souls. The Church had no merely temporal jurisdiction of Divine right; Christian emperors and kings were supreme within the limits of their temporal authority. However, inasmuch as all must give way when there is question of the salvation of souls, "For what doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul?" and, "If thy right eye scandalize thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee"; so all impediments to salvation must be removed. He, therefore, who has the care of the salvation of souls should have the power to remove any impediment to salvation, even if it be caused by a Christian emperor or king. Besides, Christian emperors and kings are children of the Church, and as such subject to the supreme rulers of the Church. The first Christian emperors acknowledged this; great saints and bishops like St. Ambrose and St. Chrysostom taught it and acted on it; the popes of the Middle Ages were only following precedent when they acted in like manner. Bellarmine, one of the chief exponents of this theory of the indirect power of the popes over temporal affairs, says that it was the common opinion of theologians; Suarez, another great upholder of the same view, in his volume against James I of England, says that it was the more received and approved opinion among Catholics. In our time this opinion has become generally accepted, and Leo XIII seems to adopt it in his Encyclical quoted above on the Christian constitution of States. "Whatever", he says, "in things human is of a sacred character, whatever belongs either of its own nature or by reason of the end to which it is referred, to the salvation of souls or to the worship of God, is subject to the power and judgment of the Church."

(*c*) *Theory of Directive Power.*—A third opinion was held by Fénelon, Gosselin, and a few others, that the pope has only a directing and guiding, not a constraining, power over temporal affairs. These writers taught that the Church should instruct, exhort, warn, and admonish temporal rulers; she may declare that a civil law is unjust, but that she has no coercing power even indirectly in temporal matters. This position of the Gallican School is now abandoned by all Catholics, and has become obsolete. From what has been said it will be clear what are the nature, the extent, and the limits of civil allegiance according to the teaching of the Catholic Church. According to that teaching citizens are religiously bound to reverence and obey their civil rulers in all matters which belong to the sphere of civil government.

That sphere comprises whatever may contribute to the temporal welfare of the whole body of citizens. As religion is a sacred duty and its practice contributes much to the well-being of the citizens, the State must not be indifferent to religion. Still the direct care of religion has not been committed to the State, but to the Church founded by Christ, which is a society to which the baptized members of the State throughout the world belong, which has all the powers necessary for the attainment of its supernatural end, the sanctification and salvation of souls, and which is independent of the State. Hence, there are limits set to the duty of civil allegiance. The State is not competent to make laws in matters of religion, nor may it interfere with the rights of the Church. If the State transgresses the limits assigned to it, the duty of obedience ceases: "We ought to obey God rather than men." This undoubted Christian principle is not invoked by the Catholic to shield his disloyalty and disobedience to the State under the specious pretext of following his conscience. The Catholic is not guided in matters of duty by private judgment, but by the public teaching and law of the Catholic Church. The State has nothing to fear from the action of the Catholic Church; her whole energies are bent on making her children good men, good Christians, good citizens. Moreover, the spiritual teaching, power, and influence of the Church are necessary in order to correct certain modern tendencies to exaggerate the power of the State. In proportion as certain doctrines of some socialists and idealists are translated into fact, the power of the State will be increased, and the liberty with which Christ has made free the Christian world will be in serious peril.

WYNNE, *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York, 1903); HERGENRÖTHER, *Catholic Church and Christian State* (London, 1876); RICKABY, *Political and Moral Essays* (New York, 1902); NEWMAN, *A Letter to the Duke of Norfolk on Occasion of Gladstone's Expostulation* (London, 1875); WERNZ, *Jus Decretalium*, 2d ed. (Rome, 1905), 15–21, 21–54; BIANCHI, *Della Potestà e della Politica della Chiesa* (Rome, 1745; French version by Peltier, Paris, 1857).

T. SLATER

Civil Constitution of the Clergy. See REVOLUTION.

Civilization, CHRISTIAN. See FAMILY; FREEDOM; INDIVIDUAL; MISSIONS; MORALITY; PROGRESS; SLAVERY; SOCIETY; WOMAN.

Civil Law, INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON. See LAW.

Civil Marriage. See MARRIAGE.

Cività Castellana, Orte, and Gallese, DIOCESE OF (CIVITATIS CASTELLANÆ, HORTANENSIS ET GALLESINENSIS). Cività Castellana is a town in the Province of Rome, on the Treia, an affluent of the Tiber, and was built on the ruins of the ancient *Falerii*, capital of the Falisci, a Latin tribe frequently at war with the Romans until subdued by Camillus, 394 B. C. In 356 B. C., however, and during the Samnite War, this tribe renewed the struggle with Rome. Excavations on the site of the ancient city have brought to light many important finds illustrating ancient Faliscan civilization. Pope Alexander III died, and was buried at Cività Castellana. In 1798 the Austrians under Mack were defeated here by the French general, Macdonald. A number of martyrs suffered within the limits of the Diocese of Cività Castellana. Its first known bishop was Crescentius, who discovered, in 998, the relics of Martianus and Johannes. In 1437 the Diocese of Cività Castellana was united with that of Orte. Orte (the ancient *Horta*) is a town that rises on a travertine hill some distance north of Rome. Not far from here are the catacombs of St. Eutychius and others recently discovered. Thirty-eight bishops of Cività Castellana are known previous to its union with Orte. Among the noteworthy bishops since that date may be mentioned: Angelo Pichinoli (1486), nuncio to Hungary; Angelo Gozzadini (1621), and Gianfrancesco Tenderini (1736), who died in the odour of sanctity. In 1252 the Diocese of Gallese was incorporated with that of Cività Castellana. Re-established in 1562, Gallese was again suppressed in 1573. The diocese has a population of 40,200, with 29 parishes, 202 churches and chapels, 105 secular and 27 regular priests, 6 religious houses of men, and 13 of women. It is immediately subject to the Holy See.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), VI, 9, 16, 49, 68; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907), 406–08.

U. BENIGNI.

Cività di Penne. See PENNE.

Cività-Terranuova, DIOCESE OF. See AMPURIAS.

Civitavecchia and Corneto, DIOCESE OF (CENTUMCELLARUM ET CORNETANA).—Civitavecchia is an important and fortified Mediterranean seaport, in the province of Rome. Part of its fortifications and piers date from the time of the Emperor Trajan. The city, which enjoyed considerable importance, military and commercial, under the temporal sovereignty of the popes, was improved to great advantage by Eugene IV, Nicholas V, Julius II, Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, Urban VIII, and others. During the persecution of Gallus, Pope Cornelius was exiled to Centumcellæ, the ancient name of this city (Lib. Pont., ed., Duchesne, I, 150–52). Catacombs have been found here. In 314 Epictetus, its bishop, was present at the Council of Arles. Another Epictetus, Bishop of Centumcellæ towards the middle of the fourth century, was a rabid Arian and a bad counsellor of Emperor Constantius. In 1086 the see was suppressed and Civitavecchia was united to Toscanella and in 1193 to Viterbo. In 1825 Leo XII re-established the see, uniting it to Porto and Santa Rufina. In 1854 the union with Santa Rufina was severed and Civitavecchia was united with the Diocese of Corneto. The latter is a town in the province of Rome, situated on a hill about three miles from the sea, near the ruins of the ancient Tarquinii, once the capital of the Etruscans or rather of the southern part of ancient Etruria; it was in its time a seat of advanced civilization, if we are to judge from the painted earthenware and other objects found in the numerous tombs scattered through this region. The catacombs are a proof of the early introduction of Christianity, which however seems to have made its way thither, neither from Rome nor by sea, but from the neighbouring Bolsena. No bishops of Corneto are known for the ancient Christian period. The basilicas of Santa Maria in Castello and of Santa Restituta are very ancient. Cappelletti believes that it was made a diocese in 1435. The diocese is immediately subject to the Holy See, has 29,700 Catholics, 12 parishes, 7 religious houses of men and 7 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1844), I, 529; V, 649; *Ann. eccl.* (Rome, 1907) 426–7; DE ROSSI, *Bullett. di arch. crist.* (1887) V, 104–8; CALISSE, *Statuti della città di Civitavecchia* in *Studi e Documenti* (1885) VII, 109–37.

U. BENIGNI.

Clairvaux, ABBEY OF, third daughter of Cîteaux and mother in the fourth line of numerous and celebrated monasteries, founded in 1115 by St. Bernard, in a deep valley upon the left bank of the Aube, and known as the *Vallée d'Absinthe* (Valley of Wormwood or Bitterness), then in the Diocese of Langres, to-day in that of Troyes in Champagne, Department of the Aube, France. Hugues I, Count of Troyes, donated this valley to the colony of Cistercians. In a short time it became the *Clara Vallis*, or Clairvaux, as the new abbey is already called in a charter of 1116. After a trying and laborious beginning, Clairvaux, under the direction of St. Bernard, de-

veloped rapidly. His renown attracted such large numbers of postulants that even in his lifetime sixty-eight monasteries were founded from it in France, Italy, Germany, England, Spain, and Portugal.

In 1116 twelve monks from Clairvaux installed themselves at Trois-Fontaines in the Diocese of Châlons, under the guidance of Roger, one of the first converts St. Bernard by his eloquence had attracted from the celebrated school of Stephen of Vitry. In 1119 Bernard sent another colony to found Fontenay in the Diocese of Autun, to-day in that of Troyes. Then were founded Foigny in the Diocese of Noyon; Cherlieu in the Diocese of Besançon; Longpont in the Diocese of Soissons; Vauclair in the Diocese of Laon; La Grace-Dieu in the Diocese of Saintes; Buzay in the Diocese of Nantes; Bonmont in the Diocese of Geneva (Switzerland); Hautecombe in the Diocese of Geneva, to-day in that of Chambéry; Chiaravalle in the Diocese of Milan; Moreruela in the Diocese of Zamora (Spain); Rievaulx and Fountains in the Diocese of York (England). Towards 1153 it became necessary to extend the limits of Clairvaux and erect other claustral buildings. The new buildings were quickly constructed. "The Church," says a witness, "arose from the soil as though it was animated with a living soul and capable of self-motion". It was 347 feet long and 114 feet wide, with a triple nave in eleven divisions. The transept was 177 feet, and contained eight square altars facing one another. No architectural or artistic ornament relieved the severity of the style either of the interior or of the exterior.

Illustrious persons were buried at Clairvaux in the livery of the poor of Christ, among them Henry of France, brother of King Louis VII; Alexander of Cologne, who was later one of the successors of St. Bernard of Clairvaux; Henry Murdach, who became Abbot of Vauclair and later Archbishop of York; Philip, Archdeacon of Liège, etc. Religious even of the other orders, flocked there. The Congregation of Savigny, founded in 1105 by Blessed Vital of Mortagne, with seventeen houses, became affiliated to Clairvaux in 1147, as also that of Obazine, founded by St. Stephen of Durfort in 1142. Affonso I, King of Portugal, in 1143 made his kingdom a vassal of the Abbey of Clairvaux and obliged his successors to pay to it every year, on the feast of the Annunciation, fifty marabitains of gold. In 1148, in memory of the victory over the Moors which he had gained the preceding year through the prayers of St. Bernard, he founded the Abbey of Alcobaça, whose abbots were always Grand Almoners of the Kings of Portugal. St. Bernard at his death, in 1153, left at Clairvaux seven hundred religious.

After two centuries of fervour, Clairvaux did not escape the evils of the decadence. But it was one of the first to reform. In 1615, Denis Largentier, who was its abbot, converted while in meditation at the tomb of St. Bernard, restored the fasts, abstinences, and other practices of the order, and re-established in his monastery the regularity and the fervour of its first days. Clairvaux became the principal seat of the strict Observance. (See CISTERCIANS.) At the time of the Revolution (1790) Clairvaux had only 26 professed religious, counting the abbot, Dom Louis-Marie Rocourt, 10 lay brothers, and 10 affiliated pensioners of the house; 19 of the religious and all the lay brothers were secularized. After the Revolution the abbot retired to Bar-sur-Aube, where he died in obscurity, the fifty-first and last Abbot of Clairvaux, 6 April, 1824. In 1790 Clairvaux had in affiliation in France ninety-two houses with 864 religious. This abbey had given to the Church one pope, Eugene III, fifteen cardinals, and a great number of archbishops and bishops. Clairvaux became the property of the State, and during the Restoration its buildings were converted into a prison.

MANRIQUE, *S. Bernardi Opp.*, I, xix; *Cisterc. Annal.*, (Paris, 1642–59), IV, II, 1115; MABILLON, *Ann. Ord. S. Bened.*, 603; SHARPE, *The Architecture of the Cistercians* (London, 1874); DE JUBAINVILLE, *Interieur des abbayes cisterciennes au XII^e et au XIII^e siècles* (Paris, 1858); *Gallia Christiana*, IV, 696; *Exordia Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* (Pampeluna, 1631. tr. French, Paris, 1885); VACANDARD, *Vie de S. Bernard, Abbé de Clairvaux* (Paris, 1897); JANAUSCHEK, *Originum Cisterciensium*, I: *Nomasticon Cisterciense* (Solesmes, 1892); CHEVALIER, *Topo-bibliogr.* (Paris, 1894–99), s v. *Clairvaux*, *Cisterciens*.

F. M. GILDAS.

Clancy, JOHN. SEE ELPHIN, DIOCESE OF.

II